WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

PROPOSED
Salmon Recovery Funding Board Meeting Agenda

August 22, 2013
Conference Call and Natural Resources Building, Room 259, Olympia, WA 98504

Time: Opening session will begin as shown; all other times are approximate.

Public Participation and Comment:
Members of the public may participate by attending at the Natural Resources Building, Room 259, Olympia, WA or by participating in the conference call.

- If you wish to participate by phone, contact Stephanie Fudurich (stephanie.fudurich@rco.wa.gov) to receive the phone number and other call-in information.
- Those participating by phone will be muted during the call. If you wish to comment by phone, you must send an email to Rebecca Connolly (rebecca.connolly@rco.wa.gov) by 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 21.
- Members of the public also may submit written comments to the board by emailing them to Rebecca Connolly, Board Liaison at rebecca.connolly@rco.wa.gov. Please send the email by 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 21 so comments can be distributed to board members.

Public comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

Special Accommodations:
If you need special accommodations to participate in this meeting, please notify us at 360/902-3000 or TDD 360/902-1996.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 2013

10:15 a.m.	**Conference Line Open** Board members to check sound and ability to view materials	*Staff*
OPENING AND WELCOME		
10:30 a.m.	**Call to Order** • Determine Quorum • Introduce new member Rob Duff, Ecology Designee • Approve minutes from May and June 2013	*Chair*
BRIEFING		
10:35 a.m.	**Director's Report**	*Kaleen Cottingham*
10:40 a.m.	**Service Recognition for Outgoing Board Members** • Harry Barber • Melissa Gildersleeve	*Chair*
10:45 a.m.	**1. Available and Potential Funding for 2013-15 Biennium** • Legislative Appropriations • PCSRF 2013 • PCSRF 2014	*Brian Abbott* *Kaleen Cottingham*

DECISIONS

11:00 a.m.	**2. Project, Lead Entity, and Regional Organization Funding Allocation for the Remainder of the Biennium** • Address regional funding issues raised by the Coast, Puget Sound, and Lower Columbia • Address Council of Regions' request to allocate funding for communications and outreach strategy development	*Brian Abbott* *Kaleen Cottingham*
11:20 a.m.	**Public Comment on Item #2; See instructions above.**	
11:30 a.m.	**Item 2, Funding Allocation Decisions, Continued** • Board Discussion and Decisions about Funding Allocation	
11:50 a.m.	**3. Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) Grant Awards**	*Brian Abbott*
Noon	**Public Comment on Item #3; See instructions above.**	
12:10 p.m.	**Item 3, PSAR Awards, Continued** • Board Discussion and Decision	
12:20 p.m.	**ADJOURN** Next regular meeting: October 16-17, Dayton	

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Summarized Meeting Agenda and Actions, May 21, 2013

Agenda Items without Formal Action

Item	Follow-up Actions
Item 1: Management Reports	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 2: Salmon Recovery Management Reports	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 3: Reports from Partners	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 4: Federal Ruling on Tribal Culvert Case	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 5: Update on the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Region	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 6: Budget Update	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 8: Monitoring Program Findings & Results	There were no follow-up actions.

Agenda Items with Formal Action

Item	Formal Action	Follow-up Actions
Minutes	Approved Minutes from September 2012	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 7: Project, Lead Entity, and Regional Organization Funding Allocation Decisions	Deferred funding decisions and directed the chair to call a special meeting via conference call once budgets are authorized.	Chair to call a special meeting via conference call for future funding decisions.
Item 9: Contract Awards for Ongoing Monitoring Programs	Approved $217,000 from 2012 PCSRF funds to continue the existing project effectiveness program with TetraTech through April 1, 2014. Fully funded the intensively monitored watersheds through 2013 field season, pending receipt of PCSRF funds for federal fiscal year 2013, and subject to review in October, and delegated authority to director to negotiate an appropriate contract.	Staff to present findings of monitoring assessment in October.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: **May 21, 2013**
Place: **Olympia, WA**

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members Present:

David Troutt, Chair	Olympia	**Jennifer Quan**	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Josh Brown	Kitsap County	**Carol Smith**	Conservation Commission
Phil Rockefeller	NWPCC	**Megan Duffy**	Department of Natural Resources
Nancy Biery	Jefferson County	**Mike Barber**	Department of Transportation
Harry Barber	Washougal		

It is intended that this summary be used with the notebook provided in advance of the meeting. A recording is retained by RCO as the formal record of meeting.

Opening and Welcome

Chair David Troutt called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and a quorum was determined. New members Nancy Biery and Megan Duffy introduced themselves.

Josh Brown moved to adopt the agenda.
Seconded by: **Phil Rockefeller**
Motion: **APPROVED**

Phil Rockefeller moved to adopt the February 2013 minutes.
Seconded by: **Josh Brown**
Motion: **APPROVED**

Service Recognition: Donald R. "Bud" Hover

Chair Troutt read the resolution and thanked Hover for his service as a board member and as board chairman. Other members also shared their thanks, memories, and good wishes.

Josh Brown moved to approve service resolution #2013-02.
Seconded by: **Phil Rockefeller**
Motion: **APPROVED**

Proposed August Meeting Date

Josh Brown moved to approve August 22, 2013 for regular meeting via conference call
Seconded by: **Harry Barber**
Motion: **APPROVED**

Item 1: Management Reports

Director Cottingham stated that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) informed her that the state will receive a $20 million PCSRF grant for federal fiscal year 2013. This is less than previous awards and the amount requested. She does not have details about where the cuts will need to be taken.

Nona Snell gave an update on the special legislative session, which began on May 13, noting that she would give more information about budget later in the day. She reviewed HB 1194, which passed during legislative session. Director Cottingham noted that they do not expect any other bills to come forward during special session that affect the board.

Item 2: Salmon Recovery Management Reports

Brian Abbott reviewed the 2013 grant round, noting that site visits are underway and they are using the PRISM online application for the first time. The system is capturing more information and ensuring greater accuracy. The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office is working on a strategic plan, and is nearly ready to submit a draft to the director. He reviewed the work plan for the monitoring assessment strategy, which was submitted on May 17 and incorporated into the board materials.

The salmon recovery conference had 626 attendees. He thanked Sarah Gage, the conference coordinator, as well as the salmon staff, presenter, and presentation moderators. They are currently conducting a survey of participants.

The board viewed the salmon video that was created to supplement the State of the Salmon report.

Projects of Note

Marc Duboiski presented two projects of note from the Upper Columbia region: the Dillwater Large Woody Debris Enhancement on the Entiat River (10-1843) and the Poorman Creek Barrier Removal on the Twisp River (08-1985).

Item 3: Reports from Partners

Council of Regions: Jeff Breckel noted that Julie Morgan has left the Upper Columbia Region. In addition, the regions are looking at the effects of potential budget cuts on their programs. They are working with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and Department of Natural Resources on better communication and priority setting. They are engaged with GSRO on the monitoring assessment strategy as members of the steering committee.

Lead Entity Advisory Group: Cheryl Baumann noted that the lead entity coordinators are busy helping project sponsors with the grant round. Many of them were at the project conference. They also had a training conference in April, where they did considerable work on strategic planning for the advisory group. They are focused on an update of their mission and goals, enhanced information exchange among lead entities (e.g., idea sharing, business solutions), and long-term funding. The committees working on those topics already have been meeting. LEAG will meet again in June to set short term goals.

Conservation Commission: Carol Smith noted that various versions of the budget have only modest cuts for the Conservation Commission, so they are hopeful. The federal Office of Management and Budget recently took action to make funding available for the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). They had been on hold since October 1 when the Farm Bill expired, even though legislation was

passed exempting the program. Two counties may receive funding to develop plans for the Voluntary Stewardship Program.

Northwest Power Council: Phil Rockefeller noted that the solicitation for input on the update to Power Council's *Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program* is underway and will continue through July 19.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW): Jennifer Quan discussed the trip back to Washington DC. They had good conversations hatchery, harvest reform, and habitat; many of their private and tribal partners were there. She reiterated the need to continue to tell the story of all-H integration in the salmon recovery story.

WDFW is restructuring the watershed stewards program so that there is more generalized expertise; they will do a careful transition so that there is better integration within their agency.

Department of Natural Resources: Megan Duffy noted that three pieces of agency legislation were passed during session and will be signed by the Governor. She highlighted details of the derelict vessel removal program bill. For the budget, they have some concerns for some programs, including Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans (RMAPs), but the aquatic program fared well in the proposed budgets.

Department of Transportation: Mike Barber reported that the budget includes about $35 million for fish passage. This summer, they have about 20 projects moving forward. They have another $25 million to correct two chronic environmental deficiency projects; construction will start in 2014.

General Public Comment

There was no general public comment.

Item 4: Federal Ruling on Tribal Culvert Case

Brian Abbott noted that there was an overview in the memo.

David Troutt offered the tribal perspective, noting that he was presenting as a representative of the Nisqually Tribe, not as the board chair. He reported that the tribes were pleased with the decision, and that the courts have said there have to be fish, therefore it is appropriate that salmon have habitat. The tribes made the case that fish were losing habitat faster than it was being restored. The amount of funding is substantial, but can be budgeted. The projects needed are mitigations for actions in the past. Troutt stated that this is a focused case, and noted that the general preference is not to litigate, but rather to work together to find and implement solutions.

Brian Abbott noted that this case is specific to the treaty tribes in Western Washington, and that it does not address other barriers on state, federal, and private land across the state.

Member Brown pointed out opportunities for collaboration and partnership. He gave an example from Kitsap County where they are working with the Suquamish Tribe to remove a barrier on Chico Creek. He commented on the need for a concerted focus to address maintenance and issues such as barriers, otherwise no one does it.

Department of Transportation: Megan White, Director, Environmental Services, reviewed the presentation provided in board materials about the Department of Transportation (DOT) actions to

replace barriers. Work is already underway. She noted that the ruling requires that they use a specific approach. They have had a program in place since the 1990s to replace the barriers; the ruling puts it on a more aggressive timeline. The overall plan will cost $2.4 billion. In this biennium, they will focus on design and scoping so that they increase the pace of corrections in future biennia. They are looking at ways to improve their approach to they can implement the projects more efficiently. The $20 million requested to expedite the work was approved by the Governor on May 20.

In response to a question from Member Rockefeller, Member Mike Barber noted that there are about 700 barriers outside the case area. White noted that some work is being done on those barriers, and they are trying to have the legislature not forget about the barrier outside the case area, but they may not be able to address those barriers while they focus in the case area.

Brown asked about prioritization and communication with cities and counties in situations where a state-owned culvert may be surrounded by local or private property or culverts. He stated that he was concerned about the litigation driving outcomes that are not the highest priorities, and having that decrease the political will and funding. White responded that they work with WDFW, and the ruling requires them to use habitat as the focal point for prioritization. Further, they are guided by the principle of opening up the greatest amount of habitat in the shortest amount of time. They want to work with others to share information.

Member H. Barber asked how they manage maintenance after the culvert is replaced so that new blockages are not created. White responded that they have an active maintenance program.

Department of Natural Resources: Member Duffy presented the slides from the board materials. DNR has 87 barriers remaining in the case area. She noted that DNR is moving ahead to meet the obligation by 2016, but needs to find at least $3.4 million in additional funding; the stream simulation required by the ruling may increase that figure. Member Rockefeller referred to funding slide and asked why Bonneville funds were used. Liz Klumpp, Bonneville Power, was seated in the audience and explained they had shared access roads on DNR land.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW): Jennifer Quan presented the slides from the board materials, noting that they are fixing culverts in the case area and Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) areas. There are 23 culverts in the case area, 16 are nearly complete. They prioritized fixing the culverts in the capital budget. Their concern includes the ongoing monitoring cost.

State Parks: Larry Fairleigh, Assistant Director of State Parks, noted that they have 72 blockages in the case area. Of those, fifty affect salmon, but only 16 are on roads. The rest are on trails. They will address seven in 2013, four were included in the 2013-15 budget request. They have asked for funding for the remaining five.

Item 5: Update on the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Region

Derek Van Marter, Associate Director, and James White, Program Manager, presented information about activity in the Upper Columbia region. Van Marter gave an overview of the region, including their mission statement, listed species, recovery plan, and adaptive management framework. He and James White explained their four main programs:

- Project Selection and Funding;
- Science and Integrated Recovery Reporting;

- Forest Health; and
- Internal Operations.

They focus on collaborative efforts and wise resource management to achieve the goals in the recovery plans through these programs. White explained the significant work they are doing to share and use scientific information to improve projects through the adaptive management cycle. They also have sought to diversify funding in all of their programs, leveraging board funds with other public sources, tribal support, and private foundation monies. Van Marter noted that their ongoing challenges include stewardship to protect investments, clear roles, and integrated recovery. Van Marter concluded by reviewed the progress they are making, as indicated by data about the abundance of specific populations.

Board members noted that the Upper Columbia is on the cutting edge for the use of science and adaptive management, and thanked them for their leadership.

Item 6: Budget Update

Nona Snell and Brian Abbott reviewed the information provided in the staff memo. Snell noted that the special session is scheduled to end June 11, and the next revenue forecast is due June 18. She hopes that the budget is completed by June 30.

Since the publication of the memo, the only new information is regarding NOAA funding. Snell noted that NOAA had informed the RCO verbally that the state would receive only $20 million in 2013 PCSRF funds, rather than the $25 million requested. Director Cottingham noted that specific reductions for habitat grants and capacity funding are unknown at this time.

Member Biery asked if there was any outreach to try to change the award for 2013. Director Cottingham responded that it was a competitive grant. Member Quan noted that the outreach happens as the budget is developed, and they are seeking to increase the amount above the President's proposed $50 million for federal fiscal year 2014.

Item 7: Project, Lead Entity, and Regional Organization Funding Allocation Decisions

Brian Abbott, Section Manager, noted that there were no approved budgets and described the two options for the board to take. The first would be to delegate authority to the director and the second would be to set a special meeting for decisions. He reviewed the briefing memo, reminding the board that it had changed the contracts for the lead entities and regions to an annual basis. He stated that even with the reduction in PCSRF funds, the staff is not changing the recommendations in the memo.

Abbott explained that the regions had been asked to model five and ten percent reductions in their budgets and scopes of work to accommodate the lead entity budget.

Chair Troutt asked if the premise was to maintain the balance between projects, monitoring, and capacity. Abbott said that the intent was to do that, and not to take money from projects to fund capacity. Chair Troutt suggested that the proportions could be shifted, and are not dictated by NOAA, despite that agency's stated PCSRF priorities.

Public Comment

Cheryl Baumann stated that the lead entity advisory group appreciated the support and recognition that the funding has remained static for thirteen years. Many lead entities operate on a part time basis. The

board is faced with tough decisions, but the lead entities are very cost effective. They appreciate the effort to maintain the status quo. Their reality is that the contracts end June 30; without a funded contract, some of them will not have a job in July. This also will affect the grant round.

Jeff Breckel said that on behalf of the regions, they appreciate the effort to maintain funding. It has been crucial to create the recovery plans and now implement them. Many of the regions also are lead entities. No one argues that the infrastructure is critical. Many of them are in a tough funding spot because other sources are drying up. Collectively, the regions are willing to work with the board and staff to make the resources work as well as possible to maintain the infrastructure.

Alex Conley questioned why the board would defer a decision, given that the net change seemed to be positive compared to the previous biennium. He stated that preserving the status quo would be a significant accomplishment.

Board Discussion

Member H. Barber suggested that their philosophy would not change if the numbers changed; this makes him comfortable delegating authority. Member Brown asked what would have to happen to change the recommendation. Director Cottingham responded that the proposal uses a lot of the available money, and that they would need to think about the effect on the second year of the biennium.

Chair Troutt stated that he thought that there was too much that was unknown, funding is a critical decision, and that he wanted to be involved in the decision once there was information. He leaned toward having a special board meeting. Member H. Barber suggested that delegation of authority would work if the funding available did not change significantly from the memo assumptions. Chair Troutt clarified that his concern had more to do with the negotiation about the split of federal funds and the lack of direction from NOAA.

The board members asked for more information before the special meeting about how the funding is allocated between projects, capacity, and monitoring. Member Brown noted that he thinks it is important to find a way to keep the regions and lead entities whole.

Chair Troutt noted that the board needs the lead entities and regions to tell them at what point they can no longer leverage funds. Director Cottingham said that she was told that the high proportion of capacity funds (priority four) to project funds (priority one) made the PCSRF application less competitive. Chair Troutt said that he hoped that the formal response from NOAA was clear on that point this year because he found the direction to be vague about capacity.

Member Quan addressed the question of whether the hatchery projects were the factor that made the application less competitive. She noted that in the PCSRF application, there are four priorities. There are hatchery reform priorities in categories one and two. The projects in category two are the ones that affect the competitiveness of the state application. She was told that other states had improved their applications, while our application continued the status quo.

Josh Brown moved to defer funding decisions and direct the chair to call a special meeting via conference call once budgets are authorized.
Seconded by: **Nancy Biery**
Motion: **APPROVED**

Item 8: Monitoring Program Findings & Results

Jennifer O'Neal presented information about findings from the Effectiveness Monitoring program funded by the board. She gave an overview of the project, reviewing the costs, categories, timeline, monitoring locations, metrics used, and how they ensure data compatibility. She then reviewed some key findings from projects regarding floodplain enhancement approaches and instream structures. She noted that projects are effective at achieving habitat outcomes, but further work needs to be done to document fish response. O'Neal also provided findings showing that some project types are more effective for specific goals and species and showed how monitoring data can be used to improve project design. She shared how the information is being shared with sponsors and the public.

She concluded the presentation by noting that there are opportunities to do more integration across programs and existing data sets so that everyone gets a better understanding of fish response to projects and habitat preferences. Doing so will maximize the investments in monitoring. It is important to develop partnerships across the state with local entities and other agencies.

Member Quan asked how they are coordinating with the Upper Columbia on protocols. O'Neal responded that they are coordinating so that the efforts are complementary. Member Quan also asked how many years of data the design would capture at a single site. O'Neal responded that the most data that they have at a single site is eight years. The question is how long it takes habitat and fish to respond; ten years is an average to give habitat and fish a chance to respond.

Member Rockefeller asked if these findings should be incorporated into Manual 18. Director Cottingham responded that the appropriate place is the Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines, which the board just helped to update. Brian Abbott explained that the guidelines provide scientific guidance for projects, and reminded the board that they are currently updating the monitoring appendix of those guidelines. Member Rockefeller suggested that the board could reduce the cost of monitoring by using this science up front to design better projects. Chair Troutt suggested that the information is being used informally now since it is available on Habitat Work Schedule.

Member Rockefeller asked if the results can be generalized from one watershed to another. O'Neal responded that the information is useful, but does not take the place of watershed-level knowledge.

Item 9: Contract Awards for Ongoing Monitoring Programs

Brian Abbott noted that there are two requests described in Item 9, and reminded the board that the monitoring assessment is ongoing. There is about $508,000 in remaining 2012 PCSRF funds; one option would be to use a portion of that to fund the TetraTech continuation. He explained the request for additional Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) funds, noting that the board had heard information about the program at previous meetings. Funding would come from the fiscal year 2013 PCSRF funds when they become available.

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, reported that they have been unable to find additional funding for the restoration projects needed to support the IMW in the Lower Columbia. They funded two projects last year, hope to fund one this year, and will design two next year. If they continue funding the implementation element of the IMW through the regional allocation, it will take about six years to complete. Director Cottingham noted that she had heard that that PCSRF might fund a project in the IMW through the Cowlitz Tribe. Breckel confirmed that he had heard the same.

Member Rockefeller asked what level of monitoring could be done at that level of restoration. Bill Ehinger, Department of Ecology, stated that it would be hard to scale back on the monitoring and have results that make any sense. Member H. Barber asked if there was monitoring related to the carcass analog work. Ehinger responded that the analogs went in during 2010; they do not yet have results from that monitoring work. Chair Troutt asked if the monitoring could be redesigned to focus on that question. Ehinger responded that the only monitoring that could be dropped would be habitat, but even that would be difficult to do because it might be necessary in the future. Chair Troutt suggested that the board was struggling with the idea of whether the IMW could be redesigned to focus on nutrient enhancement.

Member Quan stated that the questions were (1) could they fill the project funding gap, (2) could they prioritize funding toward these priority treatment areas, and (3) is this the right time to change investments when the assessment is still outstanding?

Member Smith asked if the money is the problem, or is the problem a reticence on the part of landowners. Breckel responded that the work needs to be done on Department of Natural Resources land, so the problem is mostly money. They are talking with the private landowners who need to be involved.

Member H. Barber said he would like to see the nutrient enhancement piece driven to conclusion in the Lower Columbia IMW. Jeff Breckel agreed. The board discussed this option at length, considering the potential costs, practical considerations, impacts, timing, and continuing value of the IMW. Board members identified information that would be needed from Ecology before they could make a decision to change the focus of the IMW.

Member Duffy noted that the discussion of changing the IMW approach ignored the threshold question of whether the board wants to invest in restoration actions. She suggested that it would be better to address that question, and then think about how to change the approach for IMW. Member Quan asked for opportunity to talk to staff about habitat investments. Director Cottingham stated that the board could maintain status quo until after they hear recommendations from the board-funded assessment in October. Member Brown stated that it was a logical approach. Member Rockefeller asked if deferment gave them an opportunity to consider the funding gap for restoration. Director Cottingham responded that it spread the investment in treatments over a longer period.

Chair Troutt asked if they approved status quo funding, and then wanted to change direction after receiving the assessment, if they negotiate a change to the approach. Ehinger responded that he believed that they could. Chair Troutt stated that he thinks that getting ahead of the assessment is premature. Director Cottingham noted that the assessment would include a plan to ramp-down any monitoring that they recommended the board discontinue.

Phil Rockefeller moved to approve $217,000 from 2012 PCSRF funds to continue the existing project effectiveness program with TetraTech through April 1, 2014.
Seconded by: Harry Barber
Motion: APPROVED

Josh Brown moved to fully fund the intensively monitored watersheds through 2013 field season, pending receipt of PCSRF funds for federal fiscal year 2013, and subject to review in October, and to delegate authority to director to negotiate an appropriate contract.
Seconded by: Phil Rockefeller
Motion: APPROVED

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes approved by:

_____ _____

David Troutt, Chair Date

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Summarized Meeting Agenda and Actions, June 24, 2013

Agenda Items with Formal Action

Item	Formal Action	Follow-up Actions
Project, Lead Entity, and Regional Organization Funding Allocation Decisions	The board approved the following: • Extended the existing contracts with lead entities and regional organizations through August 31, 2013. • Delegated authority to the Director to use either reappropriated returned funds or newly appropriated funds to fund the ongoing monthly administrative functions of the regions and lead entities through August 31, 2013 as shown on Tables B-1 and B-2. • Reserve $500,000 to be used for project cost increases in fiscal year 2014, to be used consistent with policies in Manual 18.	Staff to present funding options for the remainder of fiscal year 2014 at the August 22 meeting

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Summary Minutes

Date: **June 24, 2013, SPECIAL MEETING**

Place: **Olympia, WA; MEMBERS PARTICIPATING VIA CONFERENCE CALL**

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members Present:

David Troutt, Chair	Olympia	**Harry Barber**	Washougal
Josh Brown	Kitsap County	**Jennifer Quan**	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Phil Rockefeller	NWPCC	**Carol Smith**	Conservation Commission
Nancy Biery	Jefferson County		

It is intended that this summary be used with the materials provided in advance of the meeting. A recording is retained by RCO as the formal record of meeting.

Opening and Welcome

Chair David Troutt called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. and a quorum was determined.

Decisions

Item 1: Project, Lead Entity, and Regional Organization Funding Allocation Decisions

Director Cottingham noted that the budget was not passed over the weekend, so Option 2 was needed. It is a short-term fix that would amend current contracts. She noted that three letters were submitted; they were emailed to board members and posted to the web.

Brian Abbott, Salmon Section Manager, reviewed the information provided in the advance materials, which were posted to the web site on June 21, 2013. He reviewed Table 1 (page 3 of the memo), which estimated available funds for the biennium. He ran through Option 1; Director Cottingham noted that due to budget uncertainty, staff was recommending Option 2. Chair Troutt noted that he preferred to keep the discussion focused on option 2.

Brian explained that Option 2 would delegate authority to the director to approve funding through the end of August for lead entities and regional organizations. Grant round funding for 2013 and funding for the remainder of the year for lead entities and regions would be approved in August. Director Cottingham noted that Option 2 requires the Legislature to adopt a budget.

Chair Troutt clarified that this would not require the board to have another meeting. Director Cottingham confirmed that, and noted that she would be sending out notices suspending the contracts after midnight June 30. Carol Smith asked if the amounts would be reduced if the budget were adopted after July 1; Director Cottingham responded that she expected that the budget would be backdated to July 1.

Abbott noted that the funding tables were in Attachment B of the memo. The figures were determined by dividing the annual totals by twelve.

Public Comment

Jeanette Dorner, Puget Sound Partnership, submitted a letter to the board noting that the funding for the Puget Sound region had been decreased in 2011-13 by $200,000 to fund work done by the lead entities. That funding was not reinstated for either the region or lead entities in the staff proposal. She did not speak at the meeting.

Jeff Breckel, Council of Regions, said that the letter they submitted really addressed interests and concerns for fiscal year 2014 and beyond. They appreciate the actions of staff to sustain operations over the next couple of months. This is a busy time for all, and it is important to maintain continuity over the summer. There will be questions about the process, but those are things they can work with RCO staff to address.

Cheryl Baumann, LEAG, thanked the staff and board for the efforts to keep work going during this critical time. One thing that concerns her is the recommendation to defer setting the target round until August. This will make the PSAR early action process more difficult.

Director Cottingham noted that she is optimistic that staff can recommend an $18 million grant round, but it depends on what the Legislature adopts.

Josh Brown moved to adopt Option 2, inclusive of the three motions presented in the staff memo.
Seconded by: **Phil Rockefeller**
Motion: **APPROVED**

Director Cottingham noted what to expect in the next few days. Sponsors can expect notice of suspension of contracts effective of July 1. RCO hopes to rescind that notice if the Legislature acts before July 1. Regions and lead entities also will receive contract extensions. Once the budget is adopted, they will get a scope change and cost increase for two months.

Minutes approved by:

_____ _____

David Troutt, Chair Date

Table B-1: Regional Organizations, Funding for July and August 2013

Region	July 2013	August 2013	Totals
Lower Columbia	$33,904	$33,904	$67,808
Hood Canal	$31,250	$31,205	$62,500
Puget Sound	$57,430	$57,430	$114,860
Snake	$27,799	$27,799	$55,598
Upper Columbia	$36,250	$36,250	$72,500
Washington Coast	$21,174	$21,174	$42,348
Yakima	$23,750	$23,750	$47,500
Total	**$231,557**	**$231,557**	**$463,114**

Table B-2: Lead Entities, Funding for July and August 2013

Lead Entities	July 2013	August 2013	Totals
Lower Columbia Regional Salmon Recovery*	**$6,667**	**$6,667**	**$13,334**
Hood Canal Regional Salmon Recovery*	**$6,667**	**$6,667**	**$13,334**
Northeast Region	$5,000	$5,000	$10,000
Puget Sound			
Green/Duwamish & Central Sound Lead Entity	$4,167	$4,167	$8,334
Island County Lead Entity	$4,167	$4,167	$8,334
Lake Washington/Sammamish Lead Entity	$5,000	$5,000	$10,000
Mason CD Lead Entity	$3,500	$3,500	$7,000
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	$5,208	$5,208	$10,416
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity	$6,667	$6,667	$13,334
Pierce County Lead Entity	$4,583	$4,583	$9,166
San Juan County Lead Entity	$4,167	$4,167	$8,334
Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity	$6,667	$6,667	$13,334
Snohomish Basin Lead Entity	$5,208	$5,208	$10,416
Stillaguamish Co-Lead Entity	$5,167	$5,167	$10,334
Thurston CD Lead Entity	$3,334	$3,334	$6,668
West Sound Watersheds Lead Entity	$4,167	$4,167	$8,334
WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	$5,416	$5,416	$10,832
Snake River Regional Salmon Recovery*	**$5,416**	**$5,416**	**$10,832**
Upper Columbia Regional Salmon Recovery*	**$11,250**	**$11,250**	**$22,500**
Washington Coast			
Grays Harbor Lead Entity	$4,583	$4,583	$9,166
Pacific Lead Entity	$4,167	$4,167	$8,334
North Coast Lead Entity	$3,750	$3,750	$7,500
Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity	$3,750	$3,750	$7,500
Yakima (Includes Klickitat)			
Klickitat County Lead Entity	$4,583	$4,583	$9,166
Yakima Basin Regional Salmon Recovery	$5,416	$5,416	$10,832
Subtotal, Lead Entities	**$128,667**	**$128,667**	**$257,334**
Lead Entity Training	$667	$667	$1,334
Lead Entity Chair	$375	$375	$750
Subtotal, Lead Entity Support	**$1,042**	**$1,042**	**$2,084**
Totals	**$129,709**	**$129,709**	**$259,418**

* Regional organization administering the lead entity

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo **Director**

Meeting Date: August 2013

Title: Director's Report

APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

Summary

This memo is the director's report on key agency activities.

Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

- ☐ Request for Decision
- ☐ Request for Direction
- ☒ Briefing

In this Report

- Agency Operations
- Salmon Recovery News

Agency Operations

GSRO Executive Coordinator Selected

I am pleased to announce that after a long recruitment process with excellent candidates, I have decided to select Brian Abbott as the new Executive Coordinator for the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office. As you know, Brian comes from our own ranks, where he's served for many years as the salmon recovery grant section manager. Brian will continue to serve in both capacities until we fill behind him. We will do an internal recruitment to fill the Section Manager position.

Once we fill the vacant position, Brian will work to transition his grant management workload to the new section manager. Because we are at a critical point in our 2013 grant round, Brian will likely retain some role in the project review and board approval process. But I have plans for Brian to spend some time in Washington D.C. and to help rally the troops to find sustainable funding to maintain the incredible salmon recovery process. Please join me in congratulating Brian on his new role.

New Policy Specialist Selected

I am also pleased to announce that we have filled the vacant policy specialist position in our Policy Group. Leslie Ryan-Connelly will start in that role in September. Leslie has worked for RCO since 2004 as an Outdoor Grant Manager, Salmon Recovery Policy Specialist, Acquisition Specialist, and Compliance Specialist. She also worked on temporary assignment as a research analyst for the House of Representatives. Leslie brings policy experience from many aspects of RCO work to the policy group and will be a valuable addition to work on salmon, recreation, and conservation policy.

Salmon Recovery News

Changes for the Salmon Recovery Board

Over the summer, the Governor reappointed Kitsap County Commissioner Josh Brown to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board. This is the second term for Commissioner Brown.

At the end of August, we will bid a fond farewell to board member Harry Barber, whose term ends on August 31. Harry has served on the board since February 2008. He is well known for his matter-of-fact approach to decisions, business insight, and willingness to ask tough questions.

We will also be saying goodbye to Melissa Gildersleeve, who has represented the Department of Ecology on the board since February 2008. As the manager of Ecology's Water Quality program, Melissa heightened the connections between water quality and salmon in policy discussions. The new designee for the Department of Ecology will be Rob Duff. Rob has been a frequent presence in front of our board on matters related to monitoring. He currently serves as Ecology's Environmental Assessment Program Manager. In addition, he served for many years on the Monitoring Forum, which advised the board on monitoring issues and funding allocation.

And finally, the Governor has appointed Bob Bugert as the new citizen member to the board starting September 1. Bob is currently the Executive Director of the Chelan-Douglas Land Trust. Before that he was the eastern Washington representative for the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and held several positions at the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

Meeting Date: August 2013
Title: Service Recognition: Harry Barber
Prepared By: Rebecca Connolly, Board Liaison

APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

Summary
Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) member Harry Barber will leave the board at the end of August 2013 following the end of his second term. The board is asked to recognize his service.

Board Action Requested
This item will be a:
- ☒ Request for Decision
- ☐ Request for Direction
- ☐ Briefing

Proposed Motion Language
Move to approve resolution 2013-03, recognizing the service of Harry Barber to the board.

Background

Board member Harry Barber was appointed to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) in 2008 by Governor Gregoire. During his tenure, the board established and refined the policies and structure for its approach to salmon recovery, provided millions of dollars for projects and monitoring, and worked hard to ensure efficiencies, accountability, and effectiveness.

Member Barber completes his second term on August 31, 2013.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the board approve the service recognition of board member Harry Barber with the attached resolution.

Attachments

Resolution 2013-03

WASHINGTON STATE
RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery
Funding Board

A Resolution to Recognize the Service of

Harry Barber

To the Residents of Washington State and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board

WHEREAS, from 2008 through 2013, Harry Barber served the citizens of the state of Washington as a member of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board); and

WHEREAS, Mr. Barber brought both a business perspective and an understanding of the community-based approach to salmon recovery to the board's discussions; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Barber's management experience and knowledge helped the board develop strong program policies that promoted sound investments of public money and respected the "Washington Way;"

WHEREAS, Mr. Barber has served two terms, continually demonstrating thoughtful leadership, a good sense of humor, and an ability to communicate with others in a way that supports decision making; and

WHEREAS, members of the board wish to recognize his support, leadership, and service, and wish him well in future endeavors;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that on behalf of the residents of Washington and in recognition of Mr. Barber's dedication and excellence in performing his responsibilities and duties as a member, the board and its staff extends their sincere appreciation and compliments on a job well done.

Approved by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board
in Olympia, Washington on August 22, 2013

David Troutt
Board Chair

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

Meeting Date: August 2013

Title: Service Recognition: Melissa Gildersleeve

Prepared By: Rebecca Connolly, Board Liaison

APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

Summary

Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) member Melissa Gildersleeve left the board at the beginning of August 2013. The board is asked to recognize her service.

Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

- ☒ Request for Decision
- ☐ Request for Direction
- ☐ Briefing

Proposed Motion Language

Move to approve resolution 2013-04, recognizing the service of Melissa Gildersleeve to the board.

Background

Board member Melissa Gildersleeve was appointed to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) in 2008 by Jay Manning, who was then Director of the Department of Ecology. In his letter designating her as the department's representative, Manning noted her work in establishing water quality standards, water quality improvement plans, and the nonpoint pollution source control program. She brought this expertise and insight to the board as it established and refined the policies and structure for its approach to salmon recovery, provided millions of dollars for projects and monitoring, and ensured efficiencies, accountability, and effectiveness.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the board approve the service recognition of Melissa Gildersleeve with the attached resolution.

Attachments

Resolution 2013-04

WASHINGTON STATE
RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery
Funding Board

A Resolution to Recognize the Service of

Melissa Gildersleeve

To the Residents of Washington State and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board

WHEREAS, from 2008 through 2013, Melissa Gildersleeve served the citizens of the state of Washington and the Department of Ecology as the agency's designee on the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board); and

WHEREAS, Ms. Gildersleeve's dedication and commitment to the board gave her a "big picture" perspective of issues that helped the board promote salmon recovery by protecting and restoring salmon habitat; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Gildersleeve's intellect, deep understanding of key water issues, and exceptional ability to perceive the policy implications of complex situations, heightened the connections between water quality and salmon in policy discussions and helped the board develop strong program policies that promoted sound investments of public moneys; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Ecology has determined that it needs Ms. Gildersleeve's talents to advance other goals of the department, and will assign other staff to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board; and

WHEREAS, members of the board wish to recognize her support, leadership, and service, and wish her well in future endeavors;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that on behalf of the residents of Washington and in recognition of Ms. Gildersleeve's dedication and excellence in performing her responsibilities and duties as a member, the board and its staff extends their sincere appreciation and compliments on a job well done.

Approved by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board
in Olympia, Washington on August 22, 2013

David Troutt
Board Chair

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

Item **1**

Meeting Date: August 2013

Title: Available and Potential Funding for 2013-15 Biennium

Prepared By: Nona Snell, Policy Director
Brian Abbott, Salmon Section Manager

APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

Summary
This memo summarizes the available, and potentially available, funds for the 2013-15 biennium.

Board Action Requested
This item will be a:
- ☐ Request for Decision
- ☐ Request for Direction
- ☒ Briefing

Federal Funding

The board receives federal funding through the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) for projects, monitoring and for work done by lead entities and regions. The grants from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) are made on an annual basis by federal fiscal year.

2013 Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) grant application

NOAA awarded only $20 million to Washington from the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund. This is a decline in funding from the amounts awarded in previous years. On a percent basis, however, this amount is consistent with the previous awards, which have ranged from 28 to 35 percent of the total federal program amount.

The distribution of funds is shown in Table 1. There will be $3.33 million available for lead entities and regions and about $10.55 million available for projects. This is about a 15 percent decrease in federal capacity dollars, and a 7 percent decrease in federal project dollars[1].

[1] Compared to average annual awards in federal fiscal years 2011 and 2012. The change to annual awards for capacity funds makes direct comparison ineffective.

Table 1

Category	Amount	Percent
Site-specific salmon habitat protection & restoration projects	$10,550,000	52.8%
Hatchery and harvest reform projects managed by NWIFC	$36,000	0.2%
Support to salmon recovery regions and lead entities	$3,330,000	16.6%
Hatchery reform projects managed by WDFW	$1,916,095	9.6%
NWIFC hatchery reform/cooperative genetics program	$200,000	1.0%
Monitoring	$1,684,000	8.4%
Lower Columbia monitoring to fill gaps	$400,000	2.0%
Salmonid population and habitat monitoring necessary for exercise of tribal treaty rights	$1,013,905	5.0%
RCO Administration and Grant Management	$600,000	3.0%
SRFB Technical Review Panel	$195,000	1.0%
Reporting database updates	$75,000	0.4%
TOTAL:	**$20,000000**	**100%**

Federal Budget Outlook for FY 2014

Federal funding in the second year of this biennium (federal fiscal year 2014) is unknown. The President's fiscal year 2014 budget proposes $50 million for PCSRF. The House budget proposes only $35 million, and the Senate budget includes $65 million. As noted above, Washington State typically receives about 33 percent of the total funding.

State Operating and Capital Budgets, 2013-15

The Governor signed both operating and capital budgets at the end of the second special legislative session.

Operating Budget

The operating budget includes general fund appropriations for RCO administration (including the board's expenses), the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO), and lead entities. The 2013-15 general fund total is $1.638 million (Table 2).

Table 2

Operating Budget Item	11-13 Amount	13-15 Amount
GSRO	$500,908	$476,474
RCO/SRFB/Salmon Admin	$261,031	$248,298
Lead Entity Grants	$960,061	$913,228
Total	**$1,722,000**	**$1,638,000**

This continues a downward trend; the 2011-13 budget was a five percent reduction from the 2009-11 biennium, and the 2013-15 budget is a five percent reduction from the 2011-13 biennium.

Capital Budget

The capital budget included $15 million[2] in state bond funds for the board's grant program. The budget also allows the expenditure of any federal funds received, up to $60 million.

The Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration program received $70 million, including $40 million for a special large project list.

Two other programs of interest to the board received funding as follows:

- Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP): $10 million
- Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFFPP): $2 million

Available and Potentially Available Funds

Based on the current information known about the state and federal budgets, the following funds are potentially available for the board's programs[3]. In reviewing Table 3, it is important to note that state funds are appropriated for the entire biennium. Some state funds must be reserved so they are available as match for the 2014 PCSRF grant application.

Table 3: Estimated Funds for the 2013-15 Biennium[4]

Purpose	Source	Available	Funds Potentially Available
Lead entities	State operating budget	913,228	
Lead entities and regions	PCSRF (FFY 2013)	$3,330,000	
	PCSRF (FFY 2014)		Staff estimates $2.3 to $3.3 million, based on $50 million and $65 million total available.
		$4,243,228	**$2.3 - $3.3 million**
Projects	State capital budget[5]	$14,282,000	
	PCSRF (FFY 2013)	$10,550,000	
	PCSRF (FFY 2014)		Staff estimates $8.1 to $10.55 million, based on $50 million and $65 million total available.
		$24,832,000	**$8.1 - $10.55 million**
Projects, regions, lead entities, other	Returned funds	$4,800,000	Unknown
Subtotal, capacity (available and potentially available):			**$6.5 to $7.6 million**
Subtotal, projects (available and potentially available):			**$33.2 to $35.6 million**
Subtotal, capacity and projects (returned funds):			**About $4.8 million**
Total available and potentially available:			**$44.5 to $48 million**

[2] The 2013-15 Capital Budget, Section 3162, Chapter 19, Laws of 2013 (SB 5035) provides $100,000 of the total $15 million appropriation to be used to identify transportation mitigation projects that minimize permit delays and optimize salmon habitat restoration.

[3] PCSRF funds also are available for monitoring. The board made some decisions regarding monitoring expenditures in May 2013. Other decisions have been deferred pending the assessment of the board's approach, due in October.

[4] Not including monitoring funds

[5] Subtracts funds noted in footnote 2 and those necessary for RCO administration.

Implications for Board Funding Decisions

Funds to be Allocated

In August, the board will be asked to allocate the following:

- State capital funds
- State operating funds for lead entities
- Federal fiscal year 2013 PCSRF grant funds

State Returned Funds

"Returned funds" refers to money allocated to projects and activities that is returned when projects/activities either close without spending their entire budget or are not completed. These dollars are returned to the overall budget. The board typically uses "returned funds" for cost increases, capacity needs, and to increase the funding available for projects in the upcoming grant round. There is currently about $4.8 million in returned funds available to support the 2013 grant round and other needs as determined by the board.

Policy Implications

As the board makes its decisions and considers the staff proposal in Item 7, there are a few policies it will need to keep in mind:

- State salmon bond funds cannot be used to fund contracts for lead entities or regional organizations.
- State general fund dollars may be used to fund lead entity contracts, but are also used to fund the RCO director and policy director, the Board's administrative and travel costs, the administration of lead entity contracts, and the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office. The allocation is noted in table 2 above.
- Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund dollars may be used to fund lead entities and regional organizations, but doing so is a lower priority for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) than on-the-ground projects. The current 2013 grant award from NOAA has a fixed amount ($3,330,000) allowed for regions and lead entities.

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

Item **2**

Meeting Date: August 2013

Title: Project, Lead Entity, and Regional Organization Funding Allocation for the Remainder of the Biennium

Prepared By: Kaleen Cottingham, Director
Brian Abbott, Salmon Section Manager

APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

Summary

At its June special meeting, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) approved two months of funding for lead entity and regional organization contracts, pending budget approval. At its August meeting, the board will need to consider funding for the remainder of fiscal year 2014, as well as project funding for the 2013 grant round. This memo outlines the staff proposal and alternatives.

Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

- ☒ Request for Decision
- ☐ Request for Direction
- ☐ Briefing

Proposed Motion Language

- Move to set a target grant round of $18 million for calendar year 2013, with allocations as shown in Table A-4.
- Move to fill the funding gap in state fiscal year 2014 with returned funds.
- Move to approve funding for each regional organization for the remainder of fiscal year 2014 as shown in Table A-5.
- Move to approve funding for each lead entity for the remainder of fiscal year 2014 as shown in Table A-6.

Background

The Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) funds both projects and activities with the state and federal funds dedicated to salmon recovery in Washington State. Most of these funds are allocated to monitoring, capacity, and projects.

- The federal Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) grant award requires that monitoring expenditures be a minimum of 10 percent of the PCSRF amount awarded to

Washington each federal fiscal year. This year (2013) the PCSRF grant counts some of the monitoring associated with hatcheries and genetics as part of the 10 percent. The federal grant allocates $1,684,000 to the board for monitoring purposes, most of which was allocated by the board in May to specific monitoring contracts.

- Funding for lead entities, regional organizations, and projects are determined in light of Washington's annual PCSRF grant award and the state dollars appropriated by the Washington State Legislature each biennium. Funding amounts for projects and for lead entity and regional capacity are set annually[1].

Funds Available

Available funds are described in Item 1. The following is a funding summary[2].

Table 1: Estimated Funds for the 2013-15 Biennium

Purpose	Source	Available	Funds Potentially Available
Lead entities	State operating budget	$960,000	
Lead entities and regions	PCSRF (FFY 2013)	$3,330,000	
	PCSRF (FFY 2014)		Unknown. Staff estimates $2.3 to $3.3 million, based on $50 million and $65 million total available.
		$4,290,000	**$2.3 - $3.3 million**
Projects	State capital budget	$14,282,000	
	PCSRF (FFY 2013)	$10,550,000	
	PCSRF (FFY 2014)		Unknown. Staff estimates $8.1 to $10.55 million, based on $50 million and $65 million total available.
		$25,100,000	**$8.1 - $10.55 million**
Projects, lead entities, regions, other	Returned funds	$4,800,000	Unknown
Subtotal, capacity (available and potentially available):			**$6.5 to $7.6 million**
Subtotal, projects (available and potentially available):			**$33.2 to $35.6 million**
Subtotal, capacity and projects (returned funds):			**About $3 million**
Total available and potentially available:			**$42.7 to $46.2 million**

[1] Lead entities and regional organizations received biennial federal appropriations until 2013. Annual awards were approved by the board in 2012 to improve alignment with the PCSRF grant process.

[2] This chart does not include monitoring funds, nearly all of which have already been obligated.

Status Quo (2011-13) Funding Levels

For the 2011-13 biennium, the board authorized two $18 million grant rounds and provided the lead entities and regions with the same funding they received in the 2009-11 biennium. Maintaining the same level of funding for lead entities and regional organizations in the 2013-14 biennium would require less money than in the previous biennium due to efficiencies realized through the consolidation in the Upper Columbia Region and discontinuation of the Foster Creek Lead Entity.

Table 2: 2011-13 funding levels

Purpose	2011-13 Funding
Lead Entities	$3,325,740
Regions	$5,557,370
Projects	$36,000,000
Total	**$44,883,110**

Requests for Additional Funding or Funding Approaches

Additional Funds for Washington Coast and Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

In June, the regional organization executive directors sent a letter to the board asking that it provide an additional $50,000 in fiscal year 2014 for both the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership and the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (Attachment B). The total request is $100,000 for fiscal year 2014. These funds would be used to maintain existing regional positions at a full, not partial FTE. Without additional resources, the positions would be part-time or eliminated.

The Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Chair, Tom Linde, also requested $50,000 in fiscal year 2014 to support and maintain an existing staff position (Attachment C). This is the same request summarized in the Council of Regions letter.

Puget Sound Funding Approaches

In June, the Puget Sound Partnership (Partnership) reminded the board that $200,000 of the region's allocation was given to lead entities in 2011-13 for a project to populate three new metrics in the Habitat Work Schedule to enhance implementation data reporting. There was no decision at the time whether these funds were considered part of the regional allocation or reduction in future regional support. The Partnership sent a follow-up letter in August to address the allocation of that $200,000 (Attachment D).

Additional Funds for a Communication and Outreach Strategy

The Council of Regions also sent a letter requesting up to $40,000 to develop a communication and outreach strategy (Attachment E). The regional organizations propose to work with a consultant and the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office on this effort.

Additional Comments from the Regions

The Council of Regions sent a final letter addressing the handling of unexpended capacity grant funds, the allocation of funding for monitoring activities, and funding for habitat project maintenance (Attachment F).

Board Decisions

Staff recommends that the board make the following funding decisions:

A. Set a target grant round of $18 million for calendar year 2013.

B. Fill the funding gap[3] in state fiscal year 2014 with returned funds.

C. Approve funding for each regional organization for the remainder of fiscal year 2014.

D. Approve funding for each lead entity for the remainder of fiscal year 2014.

Additionally, the board may wish to consider the written requests from several of the regional organizations.

Funding details are in Attachment A.

Staff Proposal

At the May meeting, board members asked that staff clearly indicate the effects that this year's (2014) funding decisions could have on the board's state fiscal year 2015 funding decisions. To that end, staff prepared funding scenarios for state fiscal years 2014 and 2015 based on the known budgets and two possible scenarios for the federal budget in federal fiscal year 2014. The board does not need to choose Scenario A or B; they are presented for reference only.

- The first scenario (Scenario A) for federal fiscal year 2014 assumes that the board will receive the same amount of PCSRF funding for projects, lead entities, and regional organizations.
- The second scenario (Scenario B) for federal fiscal year 2014 assumes that PCSRF will be reduced from $65 million to $50 million, and takes a proportionate reduction to projects, lead entities, and regional organization funding.

For projects, the staff funding proposal relies heavily on returned funds and PCSRF in the first year of the biennium so that more of the state funds can be used in the second year of the biennium. Doing so creates a buffer if PCSRF funding falls below current levels, as shown in Scenario B.

For lead entities and regional organizations, the goal is to provide each at the minimum with the same funding that they received in 2011-13. As highlighted with red type, there is a gap of

[3] Some of the gap is due to a lower 2013 PCSRF grant, with impacts in both projects and capacity funding. State returned funds can only be used to fill gaps in project funding; whereas federal returned funds can be used to fill both.

about $548,571 in funding capacity at status quo levels; this increases to $648,571 if the Lower Columbia and Coast regions each receive an additional $50,000 in fiscal year 2014. This amount increases dramatically if PCSRF drops in federal fiscal year 2014. Options for addressing the gap in fiscal year 2014 are below.

Table 3: Staff Funding Proposal: Grant Round Project Funding

Source	State Fiscal Year 2014 Funding	State Fiscal Year 2015 *Scenario A: WA PCSRF 2014 @ $20 M*	State Fiscal Year 2015 *Scenario B: WA PCSRF 2014 @ $15.3 M*
PCSRF (Projects)	$10,550,000	$10,550,000	$8,115,384
13-15 State Salmon	$4,682,000	$9,600,000	$9,600,000
Returned Funds	$2,768,000		$284,616
Grant Round	**$18,000,000**	**$20,150,000**	**$18,000,000**

Table 4: Staff Funding Proposal: Lead Entity and Regional Organization (Capacity) Funding

	Status Quo	State Fiscal Year 2014 Funding	State Fiscal Year 2015 *Scenario A: PCSRF 2014 @ $20 M*	State Fiscal Year 2015 *Scenario B: PCSRF 2014 @ $15.3 M*
Regional Organizations				
PCSRF (Capacity)	$2,778,685	$2,400,150	$2,400,150	$1,630,038
Lead Entity Contracts				
State General Fund	$480,000	$456,614	$456,614	$456,614
PCSRF (Capacity)	$1,076,500	$929,850	$929,850	$631,499
GAP (See Options)		$548,571	$548,571	$1,617,034
Total Capacity	**$4,335,185**	**$4,335,185**	**$4,335,185**	**$4,335,185**

Analysis

Options Concerning Capacity Funding

Funding for capacity comes from the state general fund and PCSRF. Lead entities receive funding from both sources, while regional organizations are funded solely by PCSRF. Capacity funds from both sources are reduced; the general fund support has declined steadily over the years, and the reduction of PCSRF led to a 9 percent decrease in capacity funds. Together, these created a minimum $548,571 gap for capacity funding in state fiscal year 2014; a similar situation is likely for state fiscal year 2015.

Staff proposes that the board consider the following three options to address the funding gap:

1. **Fill the budget gap** by allocating older PCSRF returned funds from projects, lead entities, and regions to the state fiscal year 2014 contracts. Doing so would help maintain the current project-to-capacity ratio (see below). Staff expects that many regional and lead entity contracts for 2011-2013 will close without expending all of the budgeted funds; there may be returned funds of at least $200,000 just from these contracts. Staff will provide an updated figure at the August board meeting.

2. **Partially fill the budget gap** by instituting an across-the-board cut of 10 percent to all capacity grants (lead entities and regional organizations). Doing so would reduce the gap by about $430,000. Returned funds could then be used to fill the remaining gap. The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office asked the regional organizations to document how they would take a 10 percent cut in their 2013-15 scope of work. Staff will share with the board how a 10 percent cut would affect regional organizations.
3. **Do not fill the gap**, and instruct staff to develop recommendations on funding reductions to Regional Organization and consolidation of lead entities.

Effect of Additional Funding Requests

RCO staff has analyzed the effect of adding $100,000 to the capacity funding to meet the requests for the Washington Coast Sustainable Partnership and the Lower Fish Recovery board ($50,000 each). Staff believes these requests could be accommodated with returned funds.

The Balance of Projects and Capacity in Fiscal Year 2014

In each biennium since 2003, the percent distribution among projects, monitoring and capacity has remained fairly consistent.

In May, the board noted that one consideration would be the effect of the proposal on the balance of funding between projects, capacity, and monitoring. Tables A-3 compares the average historical budgeted distribution of board funds from state fiscal year 2004 through fiscal year 2013 to the proposal 2014.

Table 5: Funding Comparison for State Fiscal Year 2014

		Capacity	Projects	Monitoring[4]
	2004 – 2013 Average	**16.0%**	**76.5%**	**7.4%**
Option for addressing 2014 funding gap	1 Fill the budget gap. Regions & lead entities funded at status quo level	17.8%	73.7%	8.5%
	2 Partially fill the budget gap. Regions & lead entities 10% reduction.	16.3%	75.0%	8.7%
	3 Do not fill the gap.	15.9%	75.3%	8.7%

Next Steps

The board will also make project grant award decisions in December 2013.

[4] The monitoring percentage is a combination of all fund sources. The 10 percent requirement is for PCSRF funds only. This requirement has only been in effect for the past several years.

Attachments

A. Funding tables for adoption

B. Letter from the regional organizations regarding additional funds for Washington Coast and Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

C. Letter from the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

D. Letter from the Puget Sound Partnership

E. Letter from the regional organizations regarding additional funds for communication strategy

F. General letter from regional organizations

Funding Tables for Adoption

Grant Round

Based on Board Adopted Allocation Formula

Table A-4

Region	Percent	Allocation
Hood Canal Coordinating Council*	2.35%	$1,195,165
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board	15%	$2,700,000
Northeast Washington	2%	$360,000
Puget Sound Partnership	42.04%	$6,795,035
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board	8.88%	$1,598,400
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board	10.85%	$1,953,000
Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership	9%	$1,620,000
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board	9.87%	$1,776,600
	Total	**$18,000,000**

* Hood Canal also receives a portion of the Puget Sound Partnership allocation. That amount is reflected in the total dollar allocation shown here.

Regional Organization Funding

Status Quo

Table A-5

Region	Previous Biennium *2011-2013*	State Fiscal Year 2014		
		July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014	*Awarded in June*	*September 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014*
Lower Columbia	$813,700	$406,850	$67,808	$339,042
Hood Canal	$750,000	$375,000	$62,500	$312,500
Puget Sound	$1,378,324	$689,162	$114,860	$574,302
Snake	$667,176	$333,588	$55,598	$277,990
Upper Columbia	$870,000	$435,000	$72,500	$362,500
Washington Coast	$508,170	$254,085	$42,348	$211,737
Yakima	$570,000	$285,000	$47,500	$237,500
Total	**$5,557,370**	**$2,778,685**	**$463,114**	**$2,315,571**

Lead Entity Funding

Status Quo

Table A-6

Region and Lead Entities	Previous Biennium *2011-2013*	State Fiscal Year 2014		
		July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014	*Awarded in June*	*September 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014*
Lower Columbia Regional Salmon Recovery*	**$160,000**	**$80,000**	**$13,334**	**$66,666**
Hood Canal Regional Salmon Recovery*	**$160,000**	**$80,000**	**$13,334**	**$66,666**
Northeast Region*	**$100,000**	**$50,000**	**$10,000**	**$40,000**
Puget Sound				
Green/Duwamish & Central Sound Lead Entity	$120,000	$60,000	$8,334	$51,666
Island County Lead Entity	$100,000	$50,000	$8,334	$41,666
Lake Washington/Sammamish Lead Entity	$120,000	$60,000	$10,000	$50,000
Mason CD Lead Entity	$84,000	$42,000	$7,000	$35,000
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	$125,000	$62,500	$10,416	$52,084
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity	$160,000	$80,000	$13,334	$66,666
Pierce County Lead Entity	$110,000	$55,000	$9,166	$45,834
San Juan County Lead Entity	$100,000	$50,000	$8,334	$41,666
Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity	$160,000	$80,000	$13,334	$66,666
Snohomish Basin Lead Entity	$125,000	$62,500	$10,416	$52,084
Stillaguamish Co-Lead Entity	$124,000	$62,000	$10,334	$51,666
Thurston CD Lead Entity	$80,000	$40,000	$6,668	$33,332
West Sound Watersheds Lead Entity	$100,000	$50,000	$8,334	$41,666
WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	$130,000	$65,000	$10,832	$54,168
Snake River Regional Salmon Recovery*	**$130,000**	**$65,000**	**$10,832**	**$54,168**
Upper Columbia Regional Salmon Recovery*	**$308,000**	**$135,000**	**$22,500**	**$112,500**
Washington Coast				
Grays Harbor Lead Entity	$110,000	$55,000	$9,166	$45,834
Pacific Lead Entity	$100,000	$50,000	$8,334	$41,666
North Coast Lead Entity	$90,000	$45,000	$7,500	$37,500
Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity	$90,000	$45,000	$7,500	$37,500
Yakima				
Klickitat County Lead Entity	$110,000	$55,000	$9,166	$45,834
Yakima Basin Regional Salmon Recovery	$130,000	$65,000	$10,832	$54,168
Subtotal, Lead Entities	**$3,126,000**	**$1,544,000**	**$257,334**	**$1,286,666**
Lead Entity Training	$16,000	$8,000	$1,334	$6,666
Lead Entity Chair	$9,000	$4,500	$750	$3,750
Subtotal, Lead Entity Support	**$25,000**	**$12,500**	**$2,084**	**$10,416**
Total	**$3,151,000**	**$1,556,500**	**$259,418**	**$1,297,082**

* Regional organization administering the lead entity

Alternate Regional Organization Funding

Additional Funds for Washington Coast and Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

Table A-7

Region	Previous Biennium *2011-2013*	State Fiscal Year 2014		
		July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014	*Awarded in June*	*September 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014*
Lower Columbia	$813,700	$456,850	$67,808	$389,042
Hood Canal	$750,000	$375,000	$62,500	$312,500
Puget Sound	$1,378,324	$689,162	$114,860	$574,302
Snake	$667,176	$333,588	$55,598	$277,990
Upper Columbia	$870,000	$435,000	$72,500	$362,500
Washington Coast	$508,170	$304,085	$42,348	$261,737
Yakima	$570,000	$285,000	$47,500	$237,500
Total	**$5,557,370**	**$2,878,685**	**$463,114**	**$2,415,571**

WASHINGTON STATE'S REGIONAL SALMON RECOVERY ORGANIZATIONS

June 24, 2013

David Troutt, Chairman
Salmon Recovery Funding Board
WA Recreation and Conservation Office
PO Box 40917
Olympia WA 98504-0917

Dear Chairman Troutt:

We recognize that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) faces a challenging task in deciding how to best allocate its funding resources to further Washington's salmon recovery efforts. We also appreciate the SRFB's efforts to maintain stable funding for habitat projects and the capacity of regional recovery organizations and lead entities.

On June 11, the Council of Regions met with Kaleen Cottingham and Brian Abbott to discuss the funding outlook and possible scenarios the SRFB might consider in making its fiscal year 2014 funding decisions. We were pleased to see that it would be possible to maintain current funding levels for habitat projects and for regional organizations and lead entities in fiscal year 2014, given the PCSRF grant award and the funding levels under consideration in the legislature at that time. Moreover, it appears that it may also be plausible to sustain those funding levels through fiscal year 2015.

Should this outlook prove to be the case, we hope the SRFB will take action to maintain current funding levels. Doing so will continue to provide the stable foundation critical to recovery efforts in every region of the state. It will allow regional organizations, lead entities, and project sponsors to be more strategic and efficient in planning and implementing habitat projects. It will allow regional organizations to continue to engage with their federal, state, tribal, and local partners to pursue the full suite of habitat, hatchery, harvest, and hydro actions essential to achieving recovery. And, finally, it will allow regional organizations and lead entities to leverage additional resources critical to recovery efforts.

Yet, while the SRFB has been successful in maintaining status quo funding levels for 3 biennia, increasing costs have resulted in a real reduction in the capability to implement habitat projects and the capacity of regional organizations to further broader recovery efforts. Still most regional organizations believe that current capacity funding levels are manageable. All have worked to reduce costs and are now budgeting to absorb possible future funding cuts. Some have left vacancies unfilled, further reducing their capacity to implement recovery plans.

However, the current budget situation presents particularly difficult challenges for two regions. Since fiscal year 2010, operational funding for the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board has declined by over 20 percent due in large part to the decline of watershed management funding from the Department of Ecology. The LCFRB has reduced staffing and its costs for goods and services, but despite these actions, the LCFRB faces a further reduction in operational funding of over 6 percent even if its current SRFB funding level is maintained. This additional reduction will likely result in the loss of an additional staff and will jeopardize the ability of the LCFRB to be effective as a regional organization and lead entity.

The Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership faces a different but equally challenging situation. The Partnership is working hard to build organizational capacity comparable to the other regional recovery organizations and to begin implementing the just-completed Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Plan. We believe that both of these organizations deserve special consideration and we recommend that the funding levels for each organization be increased by $50,000 for FY 2014.

Looking beyond FY 2014, the regional organizations strongly believe there needs to be a concerted effort to narrow the growing salmon recovery funding gap. An analysis prepared for The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and the regional organizations in 2011 demonstrated a significant gap between estimated funding needs and availability. Even though status quo funding levels have been maintained in the face of fiscal constraints, the gap has continued to grow. Clearly action is needed to expand funding for all aspects of salmon recovery and we are eager to work with the SRFB and others to do so. It is time to begin working for the adequate and stable long-term funding needed to sustain salmon recovery efforts.

Finally, while it is too early to be able to make any definitive decisions regarding funding levels and allocations for fiscal year 2015, we recommend that planning and discussion of possible funding scenarios begin well in advance of the need to make a decision and we urge the SRFB to engage the Council of Regions and the Lead Entity Advisory Group in such discussions. As in the past, regional organizations are committed to working with the SRFB to forge workable and effective scenario and to assist in making the difficult decisions should it be necessary.

Sincerely,

Miles Batchelder
WA Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

Jeff Breckel
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Chair, Council of Regions

Jeanette Dorner
Puget Sound Partnership

Steve Martin

Scott Brewer
Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Board
Vice Chair, Council of Regions

Alex Conley
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

Derek Van Mater
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

Cc: Brian Abbott
Kaleen Cottingham

Attachment C

LOWER COLUMBIA FISH RECOVERY BOARD

2013 BOARD

Tom Linde, Chairman
Skamania County Citizen Designee

F. Lee Grose, Vice Chairman
Lewis County Commissioner

Randy Sweet, Treasurer
Cowlitz County Citizen Designee
Private Property Representative

Taylor Aalvik
Cowlitz Indian Tribe

Bob Anderson
Skamania County Commissioner

Blair Brady
Wahkiakum County Commissioner

Jim Irish
SW WA Cities Representative

Irene Martin
Wahkiakum County Citizen Designee

Tom Mielke
Clark County Commissioner

Todd Olson
Hydro-Electric Representative

Don Swanson
SW WA Environmental Representative

Dean Takko
WA State Legislative Representative

Charles TenPas
Lewis County Citizen Designee

Jade Unger
Clark County Citizen Designee

Dennis Weber
Cowlitz County Commissioner

~~

Jeff Breckel
Executive Director

June 24, 2013

David Troutt, Chairman
Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Recreation and Conservation Office
PO Box 40917
Olympia WA 98504-0917

Dear Chairman Troutt:

It is our understanding that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) will be meeting on June 24 to consider possible funding allocations for Fiscal Year 2014. We further understand the scope and extent of any decisions by the SRFB depends on the status of the Legislature's efforts to adopt a budget for the 2013-15 biennium.

SRFB funding plays a particularly critical and ever more important role in supporting salmon recovery efforts in the Lower Columbia. It is the single most important funding source for habitat restoration efforts in the region. It is also an increasingly important source of capacity funding for the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB), which is both the regional organization and lead entity, representing the five Southwest Washington counties and 17 watersheds. As the regional organization, the LCFRB works with federal, state, tribal and local partners to implement the full range of habitat, harvest, hatchery, and hydro actions set forth in the recovery plan. As lead entity, the LCFRB maintains a regional habitat strategy, recommends projects for funding and works with project sponsors and landowners to identify, develop and implement sound restoration projects. Additionally, the LCFRB is the designated lead agency for 2 multi-WRIA watershed planning units.

Although the SRFB has been successful in maintaining stable funding levels over the past several biennia for habitat projects and the capacity of regional organizations and lead entities, overall capacity funding for the LCFRB has dropped dramatically. This drop is attributable primarily to the continuing decline in watershed management funding the LCFRB received from the Department of Ecology. In 1998, at the urging of the state, the LCFRB chose to integrate salmon recovery and watershed management planning. This effort furthered both salmon recovery and water management efforts while at the same time leveraging resources and providing efficiencies of scale.

In Fiscal Year 2010, watershed management funding represented over 20 percent of the LCFRB operational or capacity funding. Since that time watershed funding has declined incrementally each year. In Fiscal Year 2013, it represented about 6 percent of the LCFRB capacity funding. The funding will end entirely in Fiscal Year 2014. The LCFRB has had some success in offsetting the loss of watershed management funding through several smaller, relatively short-duration grants. Over the last two years, the Board has also reduced costs for goods and services by 7 percent, frozen all staff salaries for the past 2 years, and left one staff position unfilled, reducing staff from 6 to 5 positions.

Based on anticipated funding in Fiscal Year 2014, the LCFRB faces another drop in capacity funding of over 6 percent even if the SRFB maintains status quo funding for capacity. Such a reduction will place another staff position at risk and seriously jeopardizes the ability of the LCFRB to sustain a viable and effective program.

While the LCFRB will continue to pursue other funding, we feel at this time that we have no other choice, if we are to continue to be effective, but to request the SRFB's help in closing our funding gap. According, we ask that the SRFB increase our status quo regional organization/ lead entity funding level by $50,000 from $486,850 to $536,850.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tom Linde, Chairman

Cc: Brian Abbott
Jeff Breckel
Kaleen Cottingham
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board members

STATE OF WASHINGTON

PugetSoundPartnership
LEADING PUGET SOUND RECOVERY

Aug 8, 2013

David Troutt, Chairman
Salmon Recovery Funding Board
WA Recreation and Conservation Office
PO Box 40917
Olympia, Washington 98504-0917

RE: Lead Entity and Regional Organization Funding Allocation

Dear Chair Troutt:

For your June meeting a memo was submitted to remind the board of the agreement that was made last biennium to transfer $200,000 from the Puget Sound regional organization capacity funding to Puget Sound lead entity capacity funding. This biennium, as a result of that agreement, our regional base contract amount was $200,000 less and this funding was instead added to Puget Sound lead entity contracts.

The 2013-15 status quo capacity funding recommendation from staff in the June did not include carrying forward the $200,000 for Puget Sound lead entities as part of their base capacity in the new biennium. We request that you instead allow the region to work with Puget Sound lead entities to reallocate $100,000 of those capacity funds for this biennium to select lead entities that are in significant need of additional funds and that the other $100,000 be returned to the overall pot to support other capacity requests for other regional organizations or lead entities in other regions.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Dorner
Director of Ecosystem and Salmon Recovery

326 East D Street | Tacoma, WA 98421-1801 www.pugetsoundpartnership.org
www.psp.wa.gov office: 360.464.1231

WASHINGTON STATE'S REGIONAL SALMON RECOVERY ORGANIZATIONS

August 9, 2013

David Troutt, Chairman
Salmon Recovery Funding Board
P.O. Box 40917
Olympia WA 98504-0917

Dear Chairman Troutt:
The Council of Regions (COR) requests up to $40,000 in regional organization 2011-2013 biennial return funds for the purpose of developing a communication and outreach strategy. The regional organizations believe that such a strategy is needed now, more than ever, if we are to sustain a strong and viable state-wide recovery effort.

As the SRFB knows, restoring our salmon and steelhead to healthy, harvestable levels is a challenging and complex undertaking. Recovery plans are in place across the state to guide this undertaking and we are now working with our federal, state, tribal and local partners to implement the multitude of actions needed to achieve recovery. Reaching our goal will be a long and demanding task requiring a sustained effort. Community acceptance and participation, and the continued support of elected officials so critical to success will be challenged. A well-crafted outreach and communication strategy is needed to meet this challenge. Such a strategy would provide a consistent and focused approach that can be applied within salmon recovery regions and state-wide to:

- Gain broad support and understanding of recovery strategies, needs and priorities;
- Effectively and clearly communicate the salmon recovery story to local, regional, state, and national stakeholders; and
- Build partnerships with our recovery partners based on clear and consistent themes and priorities.

If the SRFB agrees to fund this initiative, COR would work with the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and a consultant to complete a communication and outreach plan and implementation strategy by early next spring. A draft Request for Proposals is attached outlining the goals, themes, and project approach.

Sincerely,

Miles Batchelder
WA Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

Jeff Breckel
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Chair, Council of Regions

Scott Brewer
Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Board
Vice Chair, Council of Regions

Alex Conley
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

Jeanette Dorner
Puget Sound Partnership

Steve Martin
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

Derek Van Mater
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

Attachment: Draft Solicitation Proposal
Cc: Brian Abbott
Kaleen Cottingham

D R A F T

Request for Proposals to Develop a Stakeholder Outreach and Communication Plan for Washington State's Council of Salmon Recovery Regions

Release Date: August, 2013

Closing Date: September 13, 2013

Contact Person: Brian Abbott
briana@rco.wa.gov
360-902-2638
Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
PO Box 40917
1111 Washington Street
Olympia, WA 98504

The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office invites qualified consultants to submit a proposal to develop a **stakeholder outreach and communication plan** for Washington State's Council of Salmon Recovery Regions.

Introduction

Salmon recovery efforts in Washington State are being implemented by federal, state, and local organizations, and overseen and coordinated at a regional level by seven salmon recovery organizations (http://www.rco.wa.gov/salmon_recovery/regions/regional_orgs.shtml). The Council of Regions is comprised of Directors from each of these regional organizations. The Council of Salmon Recovery Regions strives to "speak with one voice" about the broad-scale, grass-roots Washington Way of facilitating the salmon recovery.

While each region is unique in its geography, demographics, economics, and politics, they share the need to:

1. Ensure that the State of Washington continues to provide enthusiastic, energetic and credible leadership in salmon recovery.

2. Ensure there is a strong, viable and balanced relationship between state, regional and local partners working toward recovery.

3. Ensure that the investments we make in salmon recovery are meeting expectations so that we communicate an agreed upon message to the widest audience possible.

4. Develop effective guidance for outreach and reporting.

5. Communicate data and information as efficiently as possible.

To address these needs, the Council of Regions and the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office are working together to develop and implement a shared outreach and communications plan.

Project Description

The Council of Regions would like to improve and strengthen communications with restoration partners, elected officials, agency executives, news media, local opinion leaders, and the public. Regional organizations have worked with federal, state, tribal and local interests to develop recovery plans that identify and prioritize a broad range of actions needed to recover and enhance salmon and steelhead populations. Implementing these plans provides the necessary foundation for restoration and protection of habitat and watershed processes, careful management of harvest practices, revised hatchery practices, and mitigation for hydro impacts. It is a complex and challenging undertaking requiring sustained effort. It can also pose challenging local, regional, and statewide economic, social, and cultural issues.

Success in implementing the plans and achieving recovery goals depends on the participation and cooperation of federal, state, tribal and local interests, and, most importantly, public acceptance and support. A well-crafted outreach and communication plan is a key element in the effort to achieve long-term salmon recovery goals. The following are primary themes that a communication plan will need to address.

1. Communicating recovery strategies so that they are broadly understood and accepted;
2. Encouraging active participation of local communities, landowners, and other stakeholders;
3. Communicating with partners to coalesce around central recovery themes and strategies;
4. Building ongoing political and financial support at the local, state, and federal levels; and
5. Telling the story of restoration and recovery in a manner that clearly and consistently communicates progress, celebrates accomplishments, and highlights remaining challenges.

The Council of Regions will play an active role in the development of the framework and strategy by providing direction, information and feedback to the consultant throughout the planning process.

Proposed Scope of Work

1. Complete a Needs and Situational Analysis

The consultant shall conduct an assessment and analysis of the situation and needs of each region and statewide. The analysis will include review of pertinent planning documents, interviews of the partners and other stakeholders as appropriate, and any other data gathering means necessary. It will outline recommendations regarding the elements and substance of an outreach and communication plan that reflect findings.

Deliverables: Needs and Situation Analysis Report

2. Develop an Outreach and Communications Plan

The consultant shall prepare one plan with sections that address the specific needs of each region, and integrates regional needs statewide for at least the next 5 years.

The communications framework should be fully integrated (regionally and statewide) and be flexible in its approach. The plan should focus on efficient and effective delivery of messages and materials that are within the fiscal and staffing capacity of the partner organizations. It should integrate the following:

- Identification of challenges
- Goals and objectives that are clearly linked to desired outcomes and provide a means for evaluation
- Identification and presentation of strategies to address both immediate and long-term needs
- Strategies that reflect the diversity of stakeholders
- Guidance on the translation of technical information

2.1. Implementation Strategy

The consultant shall prepare an implementation strategy that recognizes the staffing and financial limitations of the partner organizations. Consultant shall identify partnership and phasing options available to meet the needs of the Council of Regions in a cost-effective and efficient manner. Pros and cons of various approaches shall be identified.

2.2. Evaluation Strategy

The completed framework will provide a strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of implemented strategies that is based on explained assumptions and supporting hypotheses for how partners are expected to achieve program goals and objectives.

Deliverables: Produce Outreach and Communications Plan

Project Management

The consultant shall identify its Project Manager in the Proposal. The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office Project Manager is Brian Abbott (info above). Lines of communication and protocols for engagement with the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and the Council of Regions should be articulated in the Project Approach section. The Consultant should propose an approach that is sensitive to the impacts of extensive travel on cost.

Project Schedule

Consultant shall begin work upon execution of a Professional Services Contract through the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office. The following table contains an outline of key dates in the project schedule:

1. Request for Proposals released	TBD
2. Proposals submitted	TBD
3. Proposals reviewed and consultant selected	TBD
4. Contract negotiated and signed	TBD
5. Needs and Situation Analysis Presented	TBD
6. Draft Communications Plan Presented	TBD
7. Final Communications Plan Presented	TBD
8. Project Complete	TBD

Compensation

The consultant shall be compensated for professional services on an hourly basis per the rate schedule provided and at the hours negotiated by the Consultant and the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office following the consultant selection.

The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office expects bids for this contract to range from $30,000 - $40,000.

Instructions for Submittal

A. Submit an electronic copy of the proposal to Brian Abbott at the email address above.

B. Deadline: Proposals are due **Friday, September 13, 2013** by 5:00 p.m.

C. Proposal Contents

Submittals will be limited to no more than eight (8) pages of material including:

- Project Approach and Management (1 page)
- Staff proposed, expertise, time commitment to project, and organization (2 pages)
- Relevant project experiences (within last 5 years) and references (2 pages)
- Proposed scope clarifications, changes, suggestions, assumptions (2 pages)
- Schedule of tasks to complete and budget (1 Page)
- Resumes (2 page max per person) may be attached as an appendix and are not included in the page count

Failure to follow the above limits on materials requested will result in disqualification of the proposal.

F. Request for Proposals not Basis for Obligations

This Request for Proposals does not constitute an offer to contract and does not commit the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office to the award of a contract to anyone, or to pay any costs incurred in the preparation and submission of proposals. The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office reserves the right to reject any or all quotes that do not

conform to the requirements stated herein. The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office also reserves the right to cancel all or part of this Request for Proposals for any reason determined to be in its interest.

Selection Procedure

Two representatives from the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and two representatives from the Council of Regions will analyze and score the proposals using the evaluation criteria identified below. The highest scoring Consultant will be eligible for the award of the contract.

	Evaluation Criterion	Weight
1.	Project approach	30%
2.	Staff / Company expertise and capability	30%
3.	Innovation regarding scope, process	10%
4.	Relative value/overall cost	20%
5.	Apparent ability to meet schedule	10%

WASHINGTON STATE'S REGIONAL SALMON RECOVERY ORGANIZATIONS

August 9, 2013

David Troutt, Chairman
Salmon Recovery Funding Board
P.O. Box 40917
Olympia WA 98504-0917

Dear Chairman Troutt:

The Council of Regions understands that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) will be meeting on August 22 to make final funding allocation decisions for Fiscal Year 2014. In our letter of June 24, we provided the SRFB comments and recommendations regarding this funding allocation. This letter offers additional comments for the SRFB's consideration. These additional comments involve the handling of unexpended capacity grant funds, the allocation of funding for monitoring activities, and funding for habitat project maintenance.

It is not uncommon for a regional organization or lead entity to have an unexpended fund balance at the end of its contract period. These unexpended balances can result for a number of reasons. In some cases, work was completed at a lower cost than anticipated. But, in many instances, these balances are the result of valuable work being deferred for a variety reasons. As you know, facilitating a regional collaborative framework around natural resource issues requires a tremendous amount of feeding and care. This is the role of the regional organizations. Whether for political, social or scientific reasons, sometimes key partners are not ready to proceed with a task as originally scheduled. In other instances, a regional organization may not have found the right "fit" to fill a critical staff position that subsequently remains vacant for longer than anticipated.

We propose the SRFB deal with unexpended capacity grant balances as it does with habitat projects. Specifically, if an unexpended balance results due to an unforeseen delay in completing a contract tasks, the SRFB should approve permitting the regional organization or lead entity to retain the funds in order to complete the unfinished work in a subsequent or extended contract period. These retained funds could not be used to expand the scope or add a task to an existing contract. Conversely, if a regional organization or lead entity completes all its contract tasks without fully expending its funds, the surplus amount should be placed in a dedicated capacity return fund. Regional organizations and lead entities should be allowed to request returned capacity funds if they have an unanticipated cost overrun on a contract task or wish to add a new contract task. If the SRFB approves this change in policy, we would work with the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) to develop workable decision criteria to implement the approach.

The Council of Regions has two recommendations regarding funding for monitoring activities.

1. The SRFB should allocate some portion of the PCSRF monitoring funds to the regional organizations to help meet high priority monitoring needs specific to each region. These funds could be distributed based on the current project fund allocation shares or on a competitive basis.

To: David Troutt, SRFB
Fr: Council of Regions
Re: Funding Allocations for FY14

2. The SRFB should make monitoring projects eligible for funding from SRFB habitat project funds. To ensure consistency with monitoring needs and priorities identified in recovery plans, we recommend that such projects be sponsored only by a regional organization or in partnership with a regional organization. We know that this latter recommendation raises the issue of maintaining an appropriate balance between funding for habitat projects and monitoring. While this approach may not be appropriate in all regions, we believe that regional organizations in consultation with lead entities are in the best position to identify the right funding balance in their regions to address the most important regional monitoring needs.

Nevertheless, the SRFB would retain the final decision making authority for such allocations. We hope that these recommendations can be considered as part of the current SRFB review of its monitoring investments and implemented in 2014.

Finally, we propose that the SRFB make eligible for funding habitat project maintenance requests. Project maintenance beyond what can currently be achieved during the original grant period is essential to the long-term success of a project. Maintenance can include such things as control of invasive species and replacement plantings for riparian projects, or adjustments to instream structures that have weathered several years of high water conditions. Clear guidelines are needed to define an acceptable scope and scale for maintenance projects and to ensure that they are not used to expand the scope of the original project. Nevertheless, we believe that allowing reasonable maintenance actions to be funded will help ensure the full value of the SRFB's investment in a project is recognized. The Council of Regions also believes this is a proactive decision consistent with the recently implemented Landowner Liability statute (RCW 77.85.050).

We wish to thank the SRFB in advance for its consideration of these recommendations. We are ready to work with the SRFB to implement the policy changes. We also wish to reiterate the recommendation in our letter of June 24 that the SRFB and GSRO engage the Council of Regions and the Lead Entity Advisory Group before the end of the year to discuss funding allocation and possible funding scenarios for fiscal year 2015.

Respectfully,

V. Miles Batchelder

Miles Batchelder
WA Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

Jeffrey P. Breckel

Jeff Breckel
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Chair, Council of Regions

Scott Brewer
Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Board
Vice Chair, Council of Regions

Alex Conley
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

Jeanette Dorner
Puget Sound Partnership

Steve Martin
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

Derek Van Mater
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

Attachment: COR letter to the SRFB, June 24, 2013
Cc: Brian Abbott
Kaleen Cottingham

WASHINGTON STATE'S REGIONAL SALMON RECOVERY ORGANIZATIONS

June 24, 2013

David Troutt, Chairman
Salmon Recovery Funding Board
WA Recreation and Conservation Office
PO Box 40917
Olympia WA 98504-0917

Dear Chairman Troutt:

We recognize that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) faces a challenging task in deciding how to best allocate its funding resources to further Washington's salmon recovery efforts. We also appreciate the SRFB's efforts to maintain stable funding for habitat projects and the capacity of regional recovery organizations and lead entities.

On June 11, the Council of Regions met with Kaleen Cottingham and Brian Abbott to discuss the funding outlook and possible scenarios the SRFB might consider in making its fiscal year 2014 funding decisions. We were pleased to see that it would be possible to maintain current funding levels for habitat projects and for regional organizations and lead entities in fiscal year 2014, given the PCSRF grant award and the funding levels under consideration in the legislature at that time. Moreover, it appears that it may also be plausible to sustain those funding levels through fiscal year 2015.

Should this outlook prove to be the case, we hope the SRFB will take action to maintain current funding levels. Doing so will continue to provide the stable foundation critical to recovery efforts in every region of the state. It will allow regional organizations, lead entities, and project sponsors to be more strategic and efficient in planning and implementing habitat projects. It will allow regional organizations to continue to engage with their federal, state, tribal, and local partners to pursue the full suite of habitat, hatchery, harvest, and hydro actions essential to achieving recovery. And, finally, it will allow regional organizations and lead entities to leverage additional resources critical to recovery efforts.

Yet, while the SRFB has been successful in maintaining status quo funding levels for 3 biennia, increasing costs have resulted in a real reduction in the capability to implement habitat projects and the capacity of regional organizations to further broader recovery efforts. Still most regional organizations believe that current capacity funding levels are manageable. All have worked to reduce costs and are now budgeting to absorb possible future funding cuts. Some have left vacancies unfilled, further reducing their capacity to implement recovery plans.

However, the current budget situation presents particularly difficult challenges for two regions. Since fiscal year 2010, operational funding for the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board has declined by over 20 percent due in large part to the decline of watershed management funding from the Department of Ecology. The LCFRB has reduced staffing and its costs for goods and services, but despite these actions, the LCFRB faces a further reduction in operational funding of over 6 percent even if its current SRFB funding level is maintained. This additional reduction will likely result in the loss of an additional staff and will jeopardize the ability of the LCFRB to be effective as a regional organization and lead entity.

The Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership faces a different but equally challenging situation. The Partnership is working hard to build organizational capacity comparable to the other regional recovery organizations and to begin implementing the just-completed Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Plan. We believe that both of these organizations deserve special consideration and we recommend that the funding levels for each organization be increased by $50,000 for FY 2014.

Looking beyond FY 2014, the regional organizations strongly believe there needs to be a concerted effort to narrow the growing salmon recovery funding gap. An analysis prepared for The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and the regional organizations in 2011 demonstrated a significant gap between estimated funding needs and availability. Even though status quo funding levels have been maintained in the face of fiscal constraints, the gap has continued to grow. Clearly action is needed to expand funding for all aspects of salmon recovery and we are eager to work with the SRFB and others to do so. It is time to begin working for the adequate and stable long-term funding needed to sustain salmon recovery efforts.

Finally, while it is too early to be able to make any definitive decisions regarding funding levels and allocations for fiscal year 2015, we recommend that planning and discussion of possible funding scenarios begin well in advance of the need to make a decision and we urge the SRFB to engage the Council of Regions and the Lead Entity Advisory Group in such discussions. As in the past, regional organizations are committed to working with the SRFB to forge workable and effective scenario and to assist in making the difficult decisions should it be necessary.

Sincerely,

Miles Batchelder
WA Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

Jeff Breckel
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Chair, Council of Regions

Jeanette Dorner
Puget Sound Partnership

Steve Martin

Scott Brewer
Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Board
Vice Chair, Council of Regions

Alex Conley
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

Derek Van Mater
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

Cc: Brian Abbott
Kaleen Cottingham

08-21-2013

To: Chairman Troutt and esteemed members of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board,

As you know, PCSRF is declining and along with it the ability of WA State to fund salmon recovery efforts where they are needed most. The Lower Columbia River region where I work is home to 55% of the Columbia basins ESA listed stocks, and all other Columbia basin stocks migrate through our region to and from the ocean. More startling is the fact that the Lower Columbia region provides habitat for half of all ESA listed salmon, trout and steelhead populations in WA State as a whole! Despite this fact, our region receives just 15% of the habitat funds allocated from PCSRF! And, unlike other recovery regions, we do not have access to EPA, PSAR or BPA dollars with which to supplement our PCSRF allocation.

Because there is so much need to address habitat deficiencies in our region, we are compelled to express our concerns to you regarding the erosion of effective dollars allocated to on the ground habitat restoration projects. Over the past 5 years SRFB policies have changed in several critical ways which has increased our costs, lengthened our project implementation schedules and generally increased the bureaucracy associated with developing and implementing habitat projects. Required design standards and the arbitrary budget cap on design-build projects are just two examples of recent policy changes that reduce our efficiency as a project sponsor and increase costs.

SRFB is approving allocation of PCSRF funds to an ever increasing array of "priorities" while at the same time reducing the portion of funds available to habitat projects. Shrinking the habitat project budget in order to fund other priorities should be carefully considered in context with percent completion of the habitat work schedule in each region, especially in the Lower Columbia where the need for restoration actions far exceed monetary resources. Given that half of all ESA listed populations are produced within and/ or swim through our region, and because we have no other funding options, we feel justified in asking you/ SRFB to increase the allocation of PCSRF funds to our region specifically for on the ground habitat restoration projects.

In conclusion, we believe our concerns are shared by other stakeholders including NOAA Fisheries with regards to allocation of funds and increasing bureaucracy (see your notes, below). With that in mind we suggest a meeting with your project sponsors and other stakeholders to address funding priorities and recent policies that hinder on the ground restoration actions.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our concerns, we don't typically get involved in these issues and hope you appreciate the reasoning behind this communication.

Sincerely,

Tony Meyer
Executive Director
Lower Columbia RFEG

"Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund dollars may be used to fund lead entities and regional organizations, **but doing so is a lower priority for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) than on-the-ground projects**. The current 2013 grant award from **NOAA has a fixed amount ($3,330,000) allowed for regions and lead entities."**

"Chair Troutt asked if the premise was to maintain the balance between projects, monitoring, and capacity. Abbott said that the intent was to do that, and not to take money from projects to fund capacity. ***Chair Troutt suggested that the proportions could be shifted, and are not dictated by NOAA, despite that agency's stated PCSRF priorities.***" May 2013 minutes pg. 6

"The board members asked for more information before the special meeting about how the funding is allocated between projects, capacity, and monitoring. ***Member Brown noted that he thinks it is important to find a way to keep the regions and lead entities whole*.**" May 2013 minutes pg 7

"Chair Troutt noted that the board needs the lead entities and regions to tell them at what point they can no longer leverage funds. *Director Cottingham said that she was told that the high proportion of capacity funds (priority four) to project funds (priority one) made the PCSRF application less competitive.* Chair Troutt said that he hoped that the formal response from NOAA was clear on that point this year because he found the direction to be vague about capacity. Member Quan addressed the question of whether the hatchery projects were the factor that made the application less competitive. She noted that in the PCSRF application, there are four priorities. There are hatchery reform priorities in categories one and two. The projects in category two are the ones that affect the competitiveness of the state application. She was told that other states had improved their applications, while our application continued the status quo." Pg 7

2013 Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) grant application

NOAA awarded only $20 million to Washington from the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund. This is a decline in funding from the amounts awarded in previous years. On a percent basis, however, this amount is consistent with the previous awards, which have ranged from 28 to 35 percent of the total federal program amount. The distribution of funds is shown in Table 1. There will be $3.33 million available for lead entities and regions and about $10.55 million available for projects. This is about a 15 percent decrease in federal capacity dollars, and a 7 percent decrease in federal project dollars1.

Table 1

Category	Amount	Percent
Site-specific salmon habitat protection & restoration projects	$10,550,000	52.8%
Hatchery and harvest reform projects managed by NWIFC	$36,000	0.2%
Support to salmon recovery regions and lead entities	$3,330,000	16.6%
Hatchery reform projects managed by WDFW	$1,916,095	9.6%
NWIFC hatchery reform/cooperative genetics program	$200,000	1.0%
Monitoring	$1,684,000	8.4%
Lower Columbia monitoring to fill gaps	$400,000	2.0%
Salmonid population and habitat monitoring necessary for exercise of tribal treaty rights	$1,013,905	5.0%
RCO Administration and Grant Management	$600,000	3.0%
SRFB Technical Review Panel	$195,000	1.0%
Reporting database updates	$75,000	0.4%
TOTAL:	**$20,000000**	**100%**

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Briefing Memo

Item **3**

Meeting Date: August 2013

Title: Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) Grant Awards

Prepared By: Brian Abbott, Salmon Section Manager

APPROVED BY RCO DIRECTOR KALEEN COTTINGHAM

Summary

The 2013-15 biennial budget includes funds for the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) grant program. In accordance with Manual 18, Appendix P, the Puget Sound Partnership is asking the board to approve funding for some projects in an accelerated grant round.

Board Action Requested

This item will be a:

- ☒ Request for Decision
- ☐ Request for Direction
- ☐ Briefing

Proposed Motion Language

Move to approve $12,318,288 in Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) funds for the projects shown in Attachment A.

Background

The legislatively-approved state 2013-15 capital budget includes $70 million for the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) grant program; $30 million of this appropriation can be used for the regular (formula driven) PSAR grant round, and the remainder is for large capital projects.

The Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board) distributes the funds in coordination with the Puget Sound Partnership. To improve flexibility and quickly fund projects that are ready for construction, the program typically allocates PSAR funds in two rounds:

1. An accelerated first round, which will allocate funds on August 22, 2013. This includes both regular PSAR projects and large capital projects.
2. A second round that parallels the timing of the board's grant round and allocates funds in December.

Additional rounds will be conducted in 2014, as necessary, depending on project readiness and watersheds' needs.

Accelerated Grant Round

The Partnership is asking the board to approve funding for 19 projects as part of the PSAR grant program, per Manual 18, Appendix P.

The Puget Sound Partnership coordinates with lead entities and the board to submit projects. PSAR projects must meet the same eligibility requirements and go through the same review process as other board-funded projects.

These projects were submitted by Puget Sound lead entities in the 2013 grant round. They have been reviewed by the board's Technical Review Panel and approved by both the Partnership Leadership Council and the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council. The board's approval gives the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) director the authority to enter into agreements for the projects.

Board Decisions

The board is being asked to make the following funding decision:

- Approve PSAR funding for the projects listed in Attachment A.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the board approve PSAR funding for the projects listed in Attachment A, as shown.

Analysis

Review of the Proposed Projects

These PSAR projects were evaluated through the board's 2013 grant round review process. The Review Panel attended site visits for each lead entity and provided comments for all project applications, including early action projects. Lead entities followed their local process of technical and citizen review before submitting their early action PSAR project list to RCO by July 15.

- The Leadership Council of the Puget Sound Partnership has approved the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Fund process and regional project list through a resolution adopted on October 26, 2012. The Leadership Council and the Salmon Recovery Council have delegated the timing of the distribution of funds to the Lead Entity Citizen's Committees and the regional review of fit to recovery strategy to the Recovery Implementation Technical Team.
- The local watershed technical committees and the Regional Implementation Technical Team (RITT) have reviewed these projects and determined they are consistent with the regional and watershed recovery strategies.

- The board's Review Panel reviewed the projects for technical feasibility, including field reviews, and recommended them for funding. The board's Review Panel met on July 17 to finalize comments on the early action projects.
- The projects would advance the implementation of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan and the Partnership's Action Agenda.

The attached project summaries and Review Panel evaluation comment forms include more information on these projects.

Next Steps

The board will also make project grant award decisions on PSAR and other board-funded projects in December 2013.

Attachments

A. Project list and funding requests

B. Project summaries and Review Panel evaluation forms

Summary Spreadsheet PSAR, August 2013 List

Lead Entity	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	PSAR Regular Formula-driven Amount	Large Cap Amount	Match	Total
Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity	13-1239	Seahurst Park Shoreline Phase IIb	Burien Parks & Recreation		$2,277,806	$607,567	$2,885,373
Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity	13-1173	Southern Hood Canal Riparian Enhancement Phase II	Mason Conservation District	$374,695		$287,484	$662,179
	13-1198	Snow Creek Watershed Acquisition and Restoration	Jefferson Land Trust	$370,854		$247,236	$618,090
	13-1199	East Jefferson Summer Chum Riparian Phase II	North Olympic Salmon Coalition	$221,138		$50,000	$271,138
	13-1204	Lower Skabob Creek Restoration Preliminary Design	Mason Conservation District	$47,060		$0	$47,060
	13-1209	Lower Big Quilcene River Master Plan Design	Hood Canal SEG	$200,000		$54,408	$254,408
	13-1215	Lower Big Beef Creek Restoration- Construction	Hood Canal SEG	$700,000		$672,133	$1,372,133
	13-1218	Lower Union River Assessment and Design	Hood Canal SEG	$100,000		$18,204	$118,204
	13-1220	Skokomish Confluence Levee Design and Acquisition	Mason Conservation District	$628,755		$110,957	$739,712
Lake Washington, Cedar, Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity	13-1103	Royal Arch Reach Protection - Selland	Seattle Public Utilities	$214,500		$71,500	$286,000

Lead Entity	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	PSAR Regular Formula-driven Amount	Large Cap Amount	Match	Total
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	13-1144	Lower Ohop Restoration Phase III	Nisqually Land Trust	$1,394,411		$251,162	$1,645,573
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon	13-1062	Pysht Floodplain Acquisition Phase III	North Olympic Land Trust	$94,199		$16,624	$110,823
	13-1066	Dungeness Riparian Habitat Protection	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	$221,775		$39,140	$260,915
	13-1094	Lyre Estuary & Nelson Creek Protection	North Olympic Land Trust		$3,350,000	$591,417	$3,941,417
Pierce County Lead Entity	13-1423	Puyallup River S Fork Setback 2013	Pierce Co Water Programs Div	$191,095		$33,723	$224,818
San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity	13-1354	Reid Harbor Conservation Easement	San Juan Preservation Trust		$800,000	$250,000	$1,050,000
West Sound Watersheds Lead Entity	13-1140	W Bainbridge Shoreline Protection PSAR	Bainbridge Island Land Trust		$810,000	$396,000	$1,206,000
	13-1142	Whiteman Cove Estuary Restoration - Design	South Puget Sound SEG	$72,000		$0	$72,000
	13-1143	West Sound Watertyping III	Wild Fish Conservancy	$250,000		$45,000	$295,000
			TOTAL	**$5,080,482**	**$7,237,806**	**$3,742,555**	**$16,060,843**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed
Project Number:	13-1239
Project Name:	Seahurst Park Shoreline Restoration Phase IIb
Project Sponsor:	Burien Parks and Recreation
Grant Manager:	**Elizabeth Butler**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	6/7/2013	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 6/10/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Kelley Jorgensen

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☐ Yes ☒ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   The high cost of the project is largely a result of the amount of seawall rock removal, waste disposal, and regrading necessary at the site. The project also has to proceed carefully with known cultural resources at the site. The planting costs are extremely high at almost $400,000 for about 1 acre of revegetation, with about $300,000 allocated for shrubs. The overall costs for planting also are not consistent with the cost estimate summary ($95,000). Please provide more details on the planting plan and how cost estimates were generated. This cost estimate is a level of magnitude (from a per acre cost perspective) above typical riparian restoration costs that get funded through SRFB.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**

The $4.4 million grant request for this $5.2 million project would remove seawall and associated armoring, enhance shoreline and stream mouths, and improve riparian vegetation to complete Phase II construction along the Puget Sound shoreline at Seahurst Park in Burien. The beach nourishment and reconnection of feeder bluffs should help to restore more natural beach and shoreline conditions for forage fish and juvenile salmon. The restoration will result in approximately 6 acres of improved estuarine and nearshore habitat conditions.

The U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and Anchor QEA have done an excellent job with the designs for this complex project. Some of the design choices, such as the amount of lawn and irrigation infrastructure, stone veneer, and mortaring of tidepools, add to the overall cost compared to typical restoration projects, but are reasonable given the necessary relocation of playground and park amenities. The design appears to address all of the site constraints, and no technical issues or concerns were identified.

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/17/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The project sponsor has addressed previous comments and is using another funding source for the plantings.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1173
Project Name:	Southern Hood Canal Riparian Enhancement Phase II
Project Sponsor:	Mason Conservation District
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/6/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final	7/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/23/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   The application states that the work will expand existing riparian buffers. Please clarify target riparian buffer widths that are anticipated.
   The project work area expands upon the work completed in Phase I and extends approximately 15 miles upstream from the estuary. Please clarify the strategy for addressing invasive species in the basin. Specifically, with the work focused on the lowermost parts of the river, it does not reflect the top-down approach preferred for controlling noxious weeds such as knotweed because it leaves the potential risk of reinfestation from sources upriver. Have upstream areas been surveyed to ensure the uppermost extents of knotweed are known and controlled?

   Additional information is needed for the cost estimate. Please provide information to support the $406,847 budget for labor. How much of this is allocated to the WCC and for how long a period? Please explain the effort needed to support the cultural resources and A&E cost line items.

   Currently, the version of the budget shown in the Restoration Cost Estimate Summary has a duplicate entry for A&E costs. This will need to be addressed before finalizing the application.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

3. Comments/Questions:

The application is to conduct a second phase of riparian enhancement in the Skokomish River watershed. A WCC crew and potentially private contractors will be used to conduct invasive species control and riparian planting activities. Replantings will entail planting native species with an emphasis on planting conifers in riparian area. Through the first phase of work, the project sponsor has obtained landowner willingness forms that will enable them to work on more than 350 parcels enabling them to control approximately 75 acres of knotweed

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/17/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   Please include the cost justification text in the response to comments document in the proposal. It is the review panel's understanding that the application is for 4 years of knotweed treatment using a WCC crew.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1198
Project Name:	Snow Creek Watershed Acquisition and Restoration
Project Sponsor:	Jefferson Land Trust
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/6/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		
Final	7/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/23/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.

The acquisition of the Irvin parcel includes a large amount of upland or isolated wetlands that would provide little benefit to salmon. The primary value for salmon is located in the northern portion of the parcel, roughly 25% of the proposed acquisition. The project would be improved by increasing the match so that those funds would cover about 75% of the acquisition costs with 25% allocated from SRFB grant funding. Any riparian forest plantings in areas of reed-canary grass will require significant and on-going maintenance efforts- please make sure that the budget is sufficient to complete maintenance work.

While the Jenks parcel is located above summer chum habitat, the majority of the parcel consists of a maturing riparian area and includes a significant length of Snow Creek with generally good habitat conditions. The parcel appears to be a good candidate for a conservation easement.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 07/16/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The project sponsor has addressed the previous Review Panel comments.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1199
Project Name:	East Jefferson Summer Chum Riparian Phase II
Project Sponsor:	North Olympic Salmon Coalition
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/6/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final	7/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/24/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   Please clarify how large an area you plan to conduct invasive vegetation surveys and treatment.

   In preparing planting plans for the site, the sponsor is encouraged to emphasize the re-establishment of conifers.

   Currently, the version of the budget shown in the Restoration Cost Estimate Summary has a duplicate entry for A&E costs. This will need to be addressed before finalizing the application

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**
   The proposal is for a second phase of riparian vegetation enhancement in several Hood Canal watersheds. The sponsor will inventory and control invasive vegetation on salmon-bearing streams, maintain 200 acres of riparian plantings, and plant 50 acres of riparian vegetation. The work is targeted for 9 watersheds. The sponsor generally targets 100 foot wide buffers on either side of the stream channels.

4. **Staff Comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/17/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The sponsor has satisfactorily addressed earlier comments.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1204
Project Name:	Lower Skabob Creek Restoration Preliminary Design
Project Sponsor:	Mason Conservation District
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/6/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final	7/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/24/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   Please provide more information about the problem the proposed project will address. While the alignment is shortened from the historic configuration, the site appears to offer functioning habitat for juvenile salmonids. During the site visit, the project sponsor described changes to conditions in the reach we were able to view, but it was unclear whether the changes were due to beaver activity or other stressors in the area. Please provide additional information on fish use in the lower creek and the entire Skakob Creek system.

   Please provide the referenced Skokomish GI analysis of the site and please clarify the project's inclusion in the 3-year work plan. Does the 3-year work plan include the relocation or the other possible instream enhancements if relocation is not determined to be feasible?

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**
   Question #1 Problem Statement was not completed in the application.

   The fish use information requested in #1 should be added to 3B in the application.

3. **Comments/Questions:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

The proposal is to evaluate the feasibility of restoring lower Skabob Creek to its historic location in the Skokomish River estuary. Based on the outcomes of this feasibility analysis, preliminary designs will be prepared for the realignment of the creek or other instream/riparian enhancements.

If the relocation is found to be feasible and advanced to the design stage, it is recommended that a portion of the existing lower creek remain as a blind channel habitat in the estuary.

4. Staff Comments:

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)

2. Why?

3. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

4. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

5. Other comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/17/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The sponsor has satisfactorily addressed earlier comments.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1209
Project Name:	Lower Biq Quilcene River Master Plan Design
Project Sponsor:	Hood Canal SEG
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/6/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final	7/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/24/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   Pre-application materials were incomplete, so these comments are based on the information that was available in the pre-application and presented during the site visit. As a result, additional questions may arise after the sponsor completes the final application, which will provide the sponsor little time to address.

   The level of effort allocated for community meetings and input from TNC (32 hours) appears to significantly underestimate the time necessary for community, stakeholder, and tribal input. Please clarify the assumptions applied in developing that portion of the scope of work. The project sponor should also consider having an outside facilitator for community meetings. The amount of time budgeted for preliminary appraisals (192 hours) is excessive. Assumptions based upon assessed values would likely be sufficient for this feasibility stage.

   Please describe how many alternatives are expected to be analyzed and your current thinking on the evaluation criteria that will be used.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**
   Application is incomplete.

3. **Comments/Questions:**

The proposal is to conduct a master planning development project for the lower 1 mile of the Big Quilcene River to identify a restoration approach for the area. This planning and feasibility stage is clearly the desired next step in promoting landscape and process-based restoration.

Project exceeds the maximum funding amount to be eligible for design only. Given the amount of work proposed and the significant need for community and tribal input, the sponsor may want to consider a typical design grant which will allow the work to extend beyond the 18-month timeframe limitation on design-only grants.

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   T

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/16/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The applicant has addressed all previous comments.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1215
Project Name:	Lower Big Beef Creek Restoration- Construction
Project Sponsor:	Hood Canal SEG
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/6/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		
Final	7/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/23/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**

This proposed restoration project will abandon a 2,500-foot well access road, remove 3,300 cubic yards of fill, reinforce 13 exisiting wood structures, and install 10 log jams to improve habitat complexity and allow for more natural channel migration and sediment transport in a key reach of Big Beef Creek that will benefit summer chum salmon. The project has a high level of match assuming NOAA Coastal grant is secured. Partnering with the Little Anderson IMW project on the helicopter work should provide for important cost savings that helps to justify its significant expense.

The Review Panel is supportive of the process-based restoration design, but the stakeholders should understand that once the channel avulses into the wetland area, it could be decades before the area aggrades sufficiently to reconnect with the current location of the channel due to the historical accumulation of sediment and the differences in elevation.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **NMI**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 07/16/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1218
Project Name:	Lower Union River Assessment and Design
Project Sponsor:	Hood Canal SEG
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/6/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		
Final	7/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/23/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   The application would be improved by including a map showing the boundaries of the proposed assessment area (ideally including aerial photographs and Lidar bare-earth imagery). Does the project area extend above and below the North Shore Road crossing? Will the influence of the road crossing also be evaluated? Please provide more detail in the cost estimate for the $85,000 of professional services. The proposal would be improved by providing more description about the number of wood structures expected to be designed for the project reach.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**
   Landowner acknowledgement forms from private landowners.

3. **Comments/Questions:**
   The proposed Union River assessment would evaluate the lower mile of the river to identify areas for wood placement and complete preliminary designs to improve short-term channel complexity. The Union River has had a lengthy history of wood removal, and the project reach is heavily used by summer chum.

4. **Staff Comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/16/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The project sponsor has addressed the previous Review Panel comments.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1220
Project Name:	Skokomish Confluence Levee Design and Acquisition
Project Sponsor:	Hood Canal SEG
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/6/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		
Final	7/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/21/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   The application would be improved by providing a map that outlines the conceptual design more clearly and clarifying the suite of restoration actions that will be addressed by the preliminary design (anticipated ELJ types, planting plan, etc.). The overall cost for cultural resources review and stewardship plans seem high and probably don't need to be done on a per parcel basis.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**
   This project would acquire parcels and complete the design for removing at least 3,500 feet of dike (i.e., the car-body levee) along with other restoration actions within the confluence area of the North and South Fork Skokomish Rivers. The greatest uncertainty for this project is acquiring a potential "Floodways By Design" grant from the State legislature. Uncertainties also remain about acquiring all of the necessary parcels in the floodplain, but the liimited development potential and floodway status may help to promote landowner willingness for conservation easements, if not fee simple acquisition.

   The project addresses priority actions of maintaining fish passage during late summer spawning and reducing flooding and fish stranding for Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal summer chum salmon. The USACE Skokomish GI is advancing but not close to ready. This provides an opportunity to advance restoration of natural processes in a key area at the confluence of both forks

of the Skokomish River. The design work will utilize USACE analysis to inform this project design and should be consistent with the Skokomish GI recommendations.

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/16/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The project sponsor has addressed the previous Review Panel comments.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Lake Washington, Cedar, Sammamish Watershed (WRIA
Project Number:	13-1103
Project Name:	Royal Arch Reach Protection - Selland Acquisition
Project Sponsor:	Seattle Public Utilities
Grant Manager:	**Elizabeth Butler**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/22/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 5/24/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Tom Slocum And Steve Toth

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.

This project seeks retroactive funding for the sponsor's planned July 2013 acquisition of fee simple ownership of a 1.65 acre parcel along the Cedar River floodplain. The parcel is located within the "Royal Arch" reach, which contains productive Chinook spawning and rearing habitat. Seattle Public Utilities has purchased 8 other riparian and/or floodplain parcels in this reach in recent years, and intends to eventually acquire all of the land, so that it can then complete restoration work such as removal of bank armoring and riparian forest replanting.

Considered in isolation, the Selland property is a weak candidate for SRFB protection funding. The parcel has no river frontage, and only about 20 percent of it is the active floodway. But in the bigger picture, acquisition of the parcel strongly supports SPU's long-term strategy for protecting and restoring riparian conditions along the entire reach, and is appropriate for SRFB retroactive funding. The review panel does not have any suggestions for strengthening the proposal.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Review Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 07/16/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1144
Project Name:	Lower Ohop Valley Restoration - Phase III
Project Sponsor:	Nisqually Land Trust
Grant Manager:	**Elizabeth Butler**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	5/1/2013	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**NMI**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 05/17/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Paul Schlenger And Kelley Jorgensen

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   The proposed project continues highly noteworthy reach-scale in-channel and floodplain restoration work in the Ohop Creek valley. Please describe any lessons learned from the prior two phases and how you plan to incorporate that into the next phase(s).

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**
   The proposed project is to construct a 3rd phase of landscape-scale restoration in the Ohop River Valley. The proposal is to continue significant restoration activities that have been completed with support of a remarkable assortment of contributors and funding sources.

4. **Staff Comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/17/13

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Paul Schlenger And Kelley Jorgensen

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**
   Please provide any information from biological or effectiveness monitoring efforts that demonstrate salmonid use, and especially any demonstration of use by or benefits to Chinook salmon. Fish use data is preferred but downstream habitat benefits if they have been documented are also helpful to know.

5. **Other comments:**
   The sponsor has satisfactorily addressed earlier comments.

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

"Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon
Project Number:	13-1062
Project Name:	Pysht Floodplain Acquisition Phase IV
Project Sponsor:	North Olympic Land Trust
Grant Manager:	**Tara Galuska**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	4/12/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 04/12/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Slocum, Cramer

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   The project proposal is to acquire a 9.5 acre parcel along the Pysht River and includes floodplain and the channel migration zone. If acquired, NOLT would own 68 contiguous acres and approximately 3,500 feet of frontage on the Pysht River. Some restoration work is needed to get full salmon habitat benefit from this acquisition, including replanting and/or interplanting native confiers on as much of the site as possible (on both sides of the river). The application would be strengthened by identifiying if the property is in fact eligible for enroling in the CREP buffer program and what the constraints are under CREP for planting trees under the power lines that cross the site. Please also discuss the opporunities for expanding the LEKT's LWD installation project that is planned at a downstream site to eventaully include the property that will be acquired under this proposal.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**

4. **Staff Comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/18/13

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/18/13

Panel Member(s) Name: review panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon
Project Number:	13-1066
Project Name:	Dungeness Riparian Habitat Protection
Project Sponsor:	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Grant Manager:	**Tara Galuska**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	4/12/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 04/13/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Slocum, Cramer

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   This project would acquire 13 acres of high quality habitat adjacent to the Dungeness River and Spring Creek. During the site visit, the Sponsor mentioned ownership of this parcel will allow for future restoration actions upstream on property owned by the Tribe. The acquisition of these parcels needs to be discussed within the context of future restoration strategies for this reach of the Dungeness River, noting in particular the severe constraints on restoration of fluvial processes posed by the residential development on the left bank of the river across from the acquisition site.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**
   Include a parcel map showing landownership of parcels upstream and downstream from the proposed acquisition.

3. **Comments/Questions:**

4. **Staff Comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7-18-13

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7-18-13

Panel Member(s) Name: review panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon
Project Number:	13-1094
Project Name:	Lyre Estuary and Nelson Creek Project
Project Sponsor:	North Olympic Land Trust
Grant Manager:	**Tara Galuska**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	4/12/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 04/12/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Slocum, Cramer

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.

Acquisition of the Lyre Estuary and Nelson Creek offers a unique opportunity to protect vital estuary and critical nearshore salmon migration corridor habitat. The amount of uplands is approximately 46% of the total project acreage (279 acres); a substantial amount for a SRFB acquisition project proposal. The Supplemental Questions, Section E needs to provide additional detail about why the uplands are essential for protecting salmonid habitat.

Please provide additional information if match funds can be used to fund the uplands, and if so, approximately how many acres of uplands can be funded with match. DNR owns an adjacent parcel and may be interested in partnering to acquire key parcels (perhaps uplands) to extend their campground. Please also briefly discuss the potential for future protection of the several private parcels on the right bank of the Lyre (north of the DNR campground) and the large parcel east of the site, which Nelson Creek crosses. The eventual protection of these areas would strengthen the overall benefit of the project for protecting habitat and habitat forming processes.

Active logging has recently occurred and additional logging of mature forest is likely if the parcel(s) are not protected.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/18/13

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   For this expensive acquistion to achieve its full potential for protecting salmon habitat, it is the review panel's expectation that the sponsor and/or partner organizations will continue efforts to expand the protection of the riparian zone of both Lyre River and Nelson Creek on adjacent properties.

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

"Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/18/13

Panel Member(s) Name: review panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   For this expensive acquistion to achieve its full potential for protecting salmon habitat, it is the review panel's expectation that the sponsor and/or partner organizations will continue efforts to expand the protection of the riparian zone of both Lyre River and Nelson Creek on adjacent properties.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Pierce County Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1423
Project Name:	Puyallup River S Fork Setback 2013
Project Sponsor:	Pierce Co Water Programs Div
Grant Manager:	**Kay Caromile**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	6/11/13	**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 06/25/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Marnie Tyler and Steve Toth

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**
   This grant proposal is for a cost increase to address higher than expected bids for the construction contract to excavate side channel habitat along the Puyallup River. The project has been reviewed previously by the Review Panel and no additional technical concerns have been identified.

4. **Staff Comments:**
   Please address staff comments provided in 6/24/13 email. Note that final application is due within 2 weeks of receiving these review panel comments in order to qualify for early PSAR funds.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/16/2013

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Toth, Tyler

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

Final Project Status:

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1354
Project Name:	Reid Harbor Conservation Easement
Project Sponsor:	San Juan Preservation Trust
Grant Manager:	**Mike Ramsey**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit	6/5/2013	**Reviewed**
Post Application	07/16/2013	**Clear**
Final	07/16/2013	**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 6/5/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Marnie Tyler And Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   To strengthen the proposal, please clarify the fate of the remaining development right for the property that is not currently in use, but could be in the future. Please explain the process the landowner would need to go through to use the development right in the future. Please confirm that the landowner has been informed of this process.

   Please clearly identify the priority of the known project sites based on PIAT landscape region fish use and shoreform fish use. Please clearly identify the project site's fit to strategy.

   Please clarify budget details. If administrative costs are expected, they should be included in the proposal. Consult Manual 18 or talk with your grants manager to understand eligible costs.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**

This acquisition project will protect the target property through purchase of a Conservation Easement to ensure permanent protection and extinguishment of up to 10 development rights on approximately 61 acres and over 3800 feet of natural shoreline which is located in a high priority salmon recovery region in the San Juan Islands. This shoreline has eelgrass beds and habitat suitable for forage fish spawning. In addition to being identified as a high priority location for salmon recovery, the San Juan Preservation Trust has designated the area around Reid Harbor as a priority for conservation and Washington State Parks has already protected over 355 acres in close proximity to this project, including much of the watershed surrounding the harbor. With adjacent and nearby parks and conservation land already set aside, this project would extend total protection along the shores of Reid Harbor to over 13,800 feet of shoreline (approximately 60% of the entire harbor).

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/16/2013

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Full Review Panel

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No.

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   Sponsor has adequately addressed previous comments.

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/16/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Full Review Panel

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	West Sound Watersheds Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1140
Project Name:	West Bainbridge Shoreline Protection PSAR
Project Sponsor:	Bainbridge Island Land Trust
Grant Manager:	**Elizabeth Butler**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit		**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 4/18/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Paul Schlenger and Marnie Tyler

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   This project would acquire 5.06 acres of 550' of shoreline and 7.43 acres of uplands. The property was identified as a "highest conservation priority" for supplying sediment sources on Bainbridge Island; it was identified in a feasibility study funded by the SRFB in 2010.

   To enhance the proposal, please clarify demolition costs of $91K. The proposal currently lists no structures on site. Is this cost for repair or replacement of stairs, or for the abandoned well or cistern?

   Relative to the possibility that the stairs could be replaced at a future date or a parking lot added for public access, the following points should be addressed: infrastructure that could be proposed in future, how future infrastructure modifications would affect conservation value of the property, roles and responsibilities of BILT in affecting those infrastructure changes, and potential impacts to adjacent landowners. Adding a parking at a later time could constitute a property conversion if it is not included in the current proposal.

   Finally, on one of the parcel maps it would be useful to clearly note the location of the WDNR tideland parcel that is "nearly contiguous" and describe any use that WDNR currently allows on that parcel.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**
   The application is complete.

3. Comments/Questions:

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/17/13

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Marnie Tyler And Paul Schlenger

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The sponsor has satisfactorily addressed earlier comments.

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	West Sound Watersheds Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1142
Project Name:	Whiteman Cove Estuary Restoration- Design
Project Sponsor:	South Puget Sound SEG
Grant Manager:	**Elizabeth Butler**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit		**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 4/18/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Marnie Tyler

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.**
   The Review Panel strongly recommends that the range of alternatives investigated include a design option of road removal from the top of the spit. Removing the roadway from the proposed opening and spit would allow for natural sediment processes to act on the spit and opening. At a minimum, the removal of the roadway across the proposed opening and some of the spit should be evaluated. The recreational value of the spit could also be incorporated within the restoration alternatives.

   The feasibility study should plan to investigate cultural resources and utilities along the spit and proposed opening.

   Under 4B of the proposal (Project Description), please add documentation of the landowner and stakeholder process and issues as a project deliverable. It is identified in the Task 8, but not included in the list of deliverables. Stakeholder involvement will be critical in project implementation success and there are several competing interests at this site. Landowners of the tidelands should be included early in the process and planning.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**
   A vicinity map is needed. Sponsor should contact WDNR to confirm presence or absence of state-owned aquatic lands. Tideland ownership is unclear.

3. **Comments/Questions:**

This project would restore tidal connection in this barrier estuary by removing sheet metal and fill. Site specific data would be collected and incorporated into restoration designs to restore fish passage, improve tidal flow and sediment transport, enhance forage fish spawning habitat, and enhance salt marsh vegetation.

This project was identified in a prior SRFB-funded WRIA 15 habitat assessment (RCO 06-2271). It was also targeted as one of six near-term restoration projects.

The project offers positive benefits in estuarine habitat and restoring natural processes. To achieve success, it will be essential to initiate landowner and stakeholder discussions as early as possible and have a clear strategy for engaging stakeholders. There are many competing interests in the area, most notably, the YMCA objectives of keeping impounded water, the commercial interest by Seattle Shellfish in reducing sediment flow, and diverse views of adjacent residents. The project sponsor is aware of this need and plans to involve State Parks and the Greater Seattle YMCA to engage adjacent landowners in design evaluation.

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/16/2013

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Marnie Tyler

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**
   No.

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**
   In the application, please clarify ownership of the culvert.

   Tidal ownership remains unclear in the application. The map of ownership attached on 7/10/2013 is difficult to interpret and Section 4(D)(iii)of the proposal still indicates "NA" in response to the question of whether state-owned aquatic lands are located within the project area. Please make the tideland ownership clear in the application.

   A vicinity map that indicates the location of Whiteman Cove within the watershed would be useful to SRFB members unfamiliar with the general location of the project.

5. **Other comments:**
   The sponsor has satisfactorily addressed other comments.

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	West Sound Watersheds Lead Entity
Project Number:	13-1143
Project Name:	West Sound Water Type Assessment Phase 3
Project Sponsor:	Wild Fish Conservancy
Grant Manager:	**Elizabeth Butler**

	Date	Status
Early Application Review/Site Visit		**Reviewed**
Post Application		**Clear**
Final		**Clear**

Early Application Status Option	
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.
Post-Application & Final Status Options	
NMI	Need More Information
POC	Project of Concern
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 4/18/2013

Panel Member(s) Name: Paul Schlenger, Marnie Tyler

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.

This project would correct water typing in West Sound basins, extending previous water typing work by Wild Fish Conservancy. Additionally, the project would provide data on fish habitat, distribution, and barrier conditions to further restoration efforts, and will identify and prioritize five on-the-ground restoration and protection projects. The project area proposed was identified by the local Technical Advisory Group.

The review panel recommends three enhancements to strengthen the proposal: 1) within the cost estimate, link expenditures to tasks rather than to the individuals associated with expenditures. 2) in the schedule, identify when the geographic scope of the work will be finalized. This is currently unclear in the proposal; will that happen before final application or only if the project is funded? 3) clearly show how past phases of this work have resulted in restoration projects completed, or use of data in conservation planning by land trusts.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

Application is complete.

3. Comments/Questions:

Sponsor has completed similar surveys at locations around Puget Sound. The additional information corrects important errors that affect proper application of existing regulations. This type of project would best be implemented as a statewide program

with input from state agencies, but in lieu of that happening, the sponsor is making progress filling information gaps on a grant by grant basis.

4. Staff Comments:

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Early Review Comments" form and attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Early Review Comments."

Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/17/13

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Marnie Tyler And Paul Schlenger

Application Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a Project of Concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The sponsor has satisfactorily addressed earlier comments.

POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 23-26 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2013. **By October 17**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM application and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the "Response to Post-Application Review Comments" form, attach the form in PRISM labeled "Response to Post-Application Review Comments," and send your grant manger an e-mail that your response is complete.

Appendix G: Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

Final Project Status: **Clear**

1. **Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No)**

2. **Why?**

3. **If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

4. **If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**