Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB)

Mission

The Salmon Recovery Funding Board provides funding for elements necessary to achieve overall salmon recovery, including habitat projects and activities that result in sustainable and measurable benefits for salmon and other fish species.

Board Members

Citizen Members
- Phil Rockefeller, chair, Bainbridge Island
- Jeff Breckel, Longview
- Robert Bugert, Wenatchee
- Chris Endresen Scott, Conconully
- Jeromy Sullivan, Kingston

Agency Members
- Conservation Commission
- Department of Ecology
- Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Department of Natural Resources
- Department of Transportation

Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO)

Director
Kaleen Cottingham
Natural Resources Building
1111 Washington Street S.E.
Olympia, WA 98501
E-mail

Mailing Address
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

Telephone: (360) 902-3000
TDD (800) 833-6388
FAX: (360) 902-3026
Web site

About this Manual

This manual is created under the authority granted to the SRFB. It reflects the requirements of Revised Code of Washington, chapters 77.85 and 79A.25.240; Washington Administrative Codes 420.04 and 420.12, updated in March 2016; and policies of the SRFB and RCO.

Major policy changes to this manual may be adopted or altered solely by a majority vote of the SRFB in a public meeting.
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2019 Grant Schedules

Salmon Grants

Please obtain the lead entity’s schedule from the lead entity coordinator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Due Date: Requests for review panel site visits</td>
<td>Lead entities submit their requests for site visits to RCO staff by this date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February-May 25</td>
<td>Project draft application materials due at least 3 weeks before site visit (required)</td>
<td>At least 3 weeks before the site visit, applicants enter application materials into PRISM Online (See Draft Application Checklist). The lead entity will provide applicants with a project number from the Habitat Work Schedule before work can begin in PRISM Online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February-June 14</td>
<td>Pre-application reviews and site visits (required)</td>
<td>RCO grants managers and review panel members review draft application materials, go on lead entity-organized site visits, and provide technical feedback based on materials and visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Online</td>
<td>Application workshops (on request)</td>
<td>RCO staff holds an online application workshop. RCO can provide additional in-person trainings to lead entities upon request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February-June 27</td>
<td>SRFB Review Panel completes initial project comment forms</td>
<td>About 2 weeks after the site visits, RCO grants managers provide review panel comment forms to lead entities and applicants. Applicants must address review panel comments through revisions to their Appendix C project proposals (using Microsoft Word track changes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8</td>
<td>Due Date: Applications due</td>
<td>Applicants submit final application materials, including attachments, via PRISM Online. See Final Application checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 15</td>
<td>Lead entity submittals due</td>
<td>Lead entities submit draft ranked lists via PRISM Online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9-23</td>
<td>RCO grants managers review</td>
<td>RCO screens all applications for completeness and eligibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 23</td>
<td>Review panel post-application review</td>
<td>RCO grants managers forward project application materials to review panel members for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6</td>
<td><strong>Due Date:</strong> Regional submittal</td>
<td>Regional organizations submit their recommendations for funding, including alternate projects (only those they want the SRFB to consider funding), and their Regional Area Summary and Project Matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17-18</td>
<td>SRFB Review Panel meeting</td>
<td>The review panel meets to discuss projects, prepare comment forms, and determine the status of each project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26</td>
<td>Project comment forms available for applicants</td>
<td>RCO grants managers provide the review panel comment forms to lead entities and applicants. Projects will be identified with a status of <em>Clear, Conditioned, Need More Information (NMI)</em>, or <em>Project of Concern (POC)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10</td>
<td><strong>Due Date:</strong> Response to project comment forms</td>
<td>Applicants with projects labeled <em>Conditioned, NMI</em>, or <em>POC</em> provide responses to review panel comments through revisions to project proposals in PRISM. If the applicant does not respond to comments by this date, RCO will assume the project was withdrawn from funding consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>Review panel list of projects for regional area meeting</td>
<td>The review panel reviews the responses to comments and identifies which projects to clear. It recommends a list of POCs to present at the regional area project meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22-24</td>
<td>Regional area project meetings</td>
<td>Regional organizations, lead entities, and applicants present regional updates and discuss POCs with the review panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>Review panel finalizes project comment forms</td>
<td>The review panel finalizes comment forms by considering application materials, site visits, applicants’ responses to comments, and presentations during the regional area project meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6</td>
<td><strong>Due Date:</strong> Lead entities submit final ranked lists</td>
<td>Lead entities submit ranked project lists in PRISM. RCO will not accept changes to the lists after this date. Updates submitted after this date will not appear in the grant funding report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>Final grant report available for public review</td>
<td>The final funding recommendation report is available online for SRFB and public review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12-13</td>
<td>Board funding meeting</td>
<td>Board awards grants. Public comment period available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regional Monitoring Grants 2019*

*Please obtain the lead entity’s schedule from the lead entity coordinator.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 17</td>
<td><strong>Due Date:</strong> Letter of intent</td>
<td>Regions submit a letter of intent to the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office’s science coordinator identifying potential applications. The letter should include a project title, applicant, and brief (one-two paragraphs) description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8</td>
<td><strong>Due Date:</strong> Applications due</td>
<td>Applicants submit final application materials, including attachments and regional certification, via PRISM Online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Projects identified as requiring clarification will receive questions from the SRFB Monitoring Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office’s science coordinator will provide the regions, lead entities, and applicants with the monitoring panel questions for projects. PLEASE NOTE: questions will be for clarifications ONLY, no major Information requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20</td>
<td><strong>Due Date:</strong> Response to clarification questions</td>
<td>Applicants with projects needing clarification provide responses to monitoring panel questions through revisions to the project proposal. If the applicant does not respond to comments by this date, the project will not be considered for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>Monitoring panel finalizes project comment forms</td>
<td>The monitoring panel finalizes comment forms for regional monitoring applications by this date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>Final comments with conditions if any</td>
<td>Final regional monitoring comments with conditions are given to sponsors, lead entities, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28</td>
<td><strong>Due Date:</strong> Conditions (if any) accepted</td>
<td>Applicants must accept conditions (if any) in writing by this date, or the project will not be considered for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6</td>
<td><strong>Due Date:</strong> Lead entities submit final ranked lists</td>
<td>Lead entities submit ranked project lists in PRISM. RCO will not accept changes to the lists after this date. Updates submitted after this date will not appear in the grant funding report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final grant report available for public review. The final funding recommendation report is available online for SRFB and public review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board funding meeting. Board awards grants. Public comment period available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intensively Monitored Watershed restoration treatment projects are reviewed by the SRFB Review Panel and follow the schedule on page 1.*
Section 1: About Salmon Recovery Funding

In this section, applicants will learn about the following:

✔ The Salmon Recovery Funding Board
✔ Where to get information
✔ The big picture of salmon recovery
✔ Funding allocations

Welcome

Welcome to Washington State’s salmon recovery grant process. Applicants will join a network of individuals and organizations working to ensure that salmon populations return to their once healthy and thriving status.

This manual contains the instructions applicants will need to complete a grant application to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB). Applicants will find information on grant policies, the larger picture of salmon recovery, and the partners helping to make it a reality.

Important Things to Know

First, some important things to know.

- The SRFB funds projects that protect, restore, or monitor salmon habitat.
- Applicants must request at least $5,000.
- There is no maximum funding limit for a grant request.
- Applicants must provide money or resources to match 15 percent or more of the grant (85 percent RCO grant + 15 percent grant recipient match = funding total). Certain design-only projects may not require match and projects on private forestland may require additional match.
- SRFB grants are reimbursement based. Grant recipients must first spend money and then request reimbursements. RCO grant agreements include both the SRFB funding award and the grant recipient match. Each reimbursement request must
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include part of the match, based on the match percentage pledged in the grant application.

- Applicants must demonstrate a commitment to 10 years or more of stewardship for projects.

- Grant recipients must complete projects within 2 to 3 years.

- Applicants should work with their lead entities to learn how to submit applications in their areas. Lead entities, which are watershed-based groups, must score and rank projects by August 15, 2019. Lead entity contact information is in Appendix A.

- Submit applications electronically through PRISM Online. To start applications in PRISM Online, applicants must work with their lead entities to get a project number through the Habitat Work Schedule.

About the Salmon Recovery Funding Board

The Washington State Legislature established the SRFB in 1999\(^1\) to administer state and federal funding and to assist with a broad range of salmon-related activities. The primary goal is to recover salmonids (salmon, trout, and steelhead) by providing grants to local organizations.

The board is composed of five voting members, appointed by the governor, and five non-voting state agency directors. The SRFB believes that scientific information and local citizen review must develop projects. Projects must demonstrate, through an evaluation and a monitoring process, that effective implementation will provide sustained benefit to fish.

The SRFB funds riparian, freshwater, estuarine, nearshore, saltwater, and upland projects that protect existing, high quality habitats for salmon. It also funds projects to restore degraded habitat in order to increase overall habitat health and biological productivity of the fish. Projects may include the actual habitat used by salmon and the land and water that support ecosystem functions and processes important to salmon.

The complete text of the SRFB’s statement of its mission, scope, and funding strategy is available on its Web site.

SRFB Not a Hearings Board

The SRFB’s role is to fund salmon habitat projects. It is not, and is not authorized to be, a hearings panel that resolves land use or permitting issues. The SRFB expects all

\(^1\)Revised Code of Washington 77.85
proposals to resolve land use issues through the permitting process. Projects should be ready to implement when funded.

Where to Get Information

For staff assignments, visit the RCO Web site. RCO provides administrative support, including managing the grants. The following staff members are available to assist:

**Amee Bahr**  
(360) 867-8585

**Tara Galuska**  
(360) 867-8195

**Elizabeth Butler**  
(360) 867-8650

**Alexis Haifley**  
(360) 725-3934

**Kay Caromile**  
(360) 867-8532

**Josh Lambert**  
(360) 867-8781

**Dave Caudill**  
(360) 867-8573

**Kathryn “Kat” Moore**  
(360) 867-8426

**Marc Duboiski**  
(360) 867-8646

**Alice Rubin**  
(360) 867-8584

**Alissa Ferrell**  
(360) 867-8618

Contact RCO

Natural Resources Building  
1111 Washington Street S.E.  
Olympia, WA 98501

Telephone: (360) 902-3000  
FAX: (360) 902-3026  
TTY: (360) 902-1996

E-mail  
Web site

Mailing Address

PO Box 40917  
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

Informational Workshops

On request, RCO staff will conduct in-person or online grant applicant workshops for lead entities and regions. Following board funding, staff are available to offer in-person or online grant management workshops for new grant recipients unfamiliar with SRFB policies and procedures. Reimbursement workshops are available and recommended for
grant recipients and their billing staff. Registration information is posted on the RCO Web site.

**Other Grant Manuals Applicants Will Need**

SRFB uses the policy manuals below for the administration of SRFB grants. Copies are available on the RCO Web site.

- *Manual 3, Acquisition Projects*
- *Manual 5, Restoration Projects*
- *Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations*
- *Manual 8, Reimbursements*

**Federal Program Requirements**

Grant administration for all projects funded with federal or state funds used by RCO or the Puget Sound Partnership as match to a federal grant is governed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Part 200–Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards also called the “omni-circular.” Applicants should review the omni-circular for detailed information on grant administration. Applicants can view trainings from RCO’s fiscal office on indirect costs and other omni-circular issues on RCO’s Web site under “Getting Paid–Reimbursement Information.”

**The Big Picture of Salmon Recovery**

By applying for a SRFB grant, applicants become part of a network dedicated to bringing salmon back from the brink of extinction. That network includes larger watershed groups, regional organizations, state and federal agencies, tribal governments, as well as the Legislature, Governor, and Congress. This network supports salmon recovery, starting on the local level, with people developing plans and projects.

In 1991, the federal government listed some of the Pacific Northwest’s wild salmon as near extinction under the Endangered Species Act. By 1999, wild salmon had disappeared from about 40 percent of their historic breeding ranges in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and California. In Washington, the numbers dwindled so much that salmon and bull trout were listed as threatened or endangered in nearly 75 percent of the state.
Eight Salmon Recovery Regions

The Endangered Species Act requires the federal government to develop recovery plans for salmon species at risk of extinction. The federal government measures the health of fish populations based on Evolutionarily Significant Units or Distinct Population Segments, which are populations or groups of populations of salmon species that are substantially, reproductively isolated from other populations and that contribute to the evolutionary legacy of the species. The federal government determined that each unit or segment listed as at risk of extinction under the act should have a recovery plan. State law directed development of a statewide strategy to recover salmon on an evolutionarily significant basis.

The Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office, together with other state and federal agencies, defined eight geographical salmon recovery regions.

Regional Organizations

To coordinate the work of recovery planning and implementation, seven regional organizations formed within the regional recovery areas.

In September 2001, the SRFB funded six regional groups to develop recovery plans. Each group developed a recovery plan that expanded on previous planning efforts and helped connect local social, cultural, and economic needs and desires with science and the Endangered Species Act goals. The six organizations developed a series of actions necessary to recover salmon and gained regional consensus on measurable fish recovery results and federal approval of their regional recovery plans. Today, the regional organizations implement those actions. A seventh regional organization, for the coastal area, which had no listed species at the time of formation, completed the Washington Coastal Sustainability Plan. The hallmark of this plan protects the region's salmon habitats by bringing together partnerships aimed at safeguarding and enhancing the natural function of the regional ecosystems on which salmon depend.

Recovery plans, or in their absence, lead entity strategies, form the basis for SRFB grants. Grant applicants must demonstrate how projects address the actions defined in the regional recovery plans or lead entity strategies.

---

2Regional organizations must be recognized in statute (Revised Code of Washington 77.85.010), or by the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office.

3Hood Canal, Puget Sound, and the lower, middle, and upper Columbia River regional organizations have final recovery plans accepted by the federal government. The Snake River regional organization has submitted a recovery plan for the Washington portion of its region, which has been accepted by the federal government; however, approval of the full regional recovery plan is pending work to be done in Idaho.
Lead Entities

Other key players in salmon recovery are local lead entities, authorized by the Legislature in 1998\(^4\) to develop habitat restoration and protection strategies and projects to meet those goals. Lead entities are essential partners in Washington’s salmon recovery efforts. Regional organizations incorporated local watershed groups and lead entities’ strategies when writing regional recovery plans.

To create a lead entity, cities, counties, and tribes within a geographic area comprised of one or more watersheds or Water Resource Inventory Areas, develop a mutual agreement. Lead entities establish and support citizen and technical committees, develop strategies, and garner community support for salmon recovery.

Nonprofit organizations, tribes, and local governments are eligible to provide the administrative duties of a lead entity. Together, the administrative body, citizen committee, and technical advisory group form a lead entity. The SRFB provides financial support to lead entities. For questions about the lead entity program, contact the GSRO Program Coordinator, (360) 902-2217, TDD (800) 833-6388.

Lead entities use their strategies and the regional plans to identify a sequence of habitat restoration and protection projects. The lead entity technical advisory groups review projects to ensure scientific validity. Using information from the technical advisory groups as well as social, economic, and cultural values, the citizen committees, composed of people with diverse community interests, adopt ranked lists of projects and submit them to the SRFB for funding consideration.

Lead Entity Review and Ranking Process

The appropriate lead entity must review and rank every project application to ensure consistency with lead entity strategies and regional recovery plans. Lead entity application due dates vary; check with the lead entity for specific dates and requirements. Contact information for both lead entities and RCO staff are in Appendix A.

---

\(^4\)Revised Code of Washington 77.85.050-77.85.060
Funding Allocations

The SRFB allocates funds using a formula based on objective parameters of physical and biological factors within a region. The SRFB allocation percentages and criteria were reviewed in 2016, and the board approved an interim 2017 allocation shown below. The parameters include the following:

- Number of water resource inventory areas.
- Amount of salmonid stream and nearshore habitat.
- Number of listed and non-listed populations.
- Number of Evolutionarily Significant Units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Salmon Recovery Organization</th>
<th>Regional Allocation Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coast Salmon Partnership</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood Canal Coordinating Council*</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Washington</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Partnership</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River Salmon Recovery Board</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board</td>
<td>10.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional Hood Canal lead entity allocation from Puget Sound will be determined by the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council.

The Puget Sound Partnership, which is a state agency, represents the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region. The Partnership, along with the SRFB, administers the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Fund (PSAR). The purpose and intent of these funds is to accelerate implementation of the *Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan* and contribute to Puget Sound recovery. For more information on PSAR and its grant process, please see Appendix B.
Section 2: Eligible Applicants and Projects

In this section, applicants will learn about the following:

✔ Who can apply for grants
✔ What types of projects are eligible
✔ What applicants can’t do with a grant

Eligible Applicants

Only the following are eligible to receive SRFB funding:

• Cities
• Counties
• Conservation districts
• Native American tribes, federally recognized Indian tribe

• Nonprofit organizations—registered with Washington’s Office of the Secretary of State. A nonprofit charter, organizational documents, or corporate purposes must include authority for the protection or enhancement of natural resources, such as salmon or salmon habitat, or related recovery activities. The charter must provide for an equivalent successor organization under the SRFB grant agreement, in case the nonprofit dissolves.

• Private landowners—Eligible when the landowner is a private citizen and the project implementation is on the landowner’s property. Individuals may not acquire land using SRFB grants. Landowner donation of time spent implementing a project may be eligible for non-reimbursable match. When receiving SRFB funding, individuals should consider any potential tax liabilities and may want to consult a tax professional or the Washington Department of Revenue for advice. Each individual situation is different and RCO does not provide any tax guidance.

• Regional fisheries enhancement groups

5Revised Code of Washington 77.85.010 (12)
• Special purpose districts

• State agencies—State agencies must have a local partner that is independently eligible to be a grant applicant. The local partner must be involved in the planning and implementation of the project, and must provide an in-kind or cash contribution to the project. This contribution does not need to be used as match (for example with design-only projects, which don’t require match); however, document this contribution in PRISM upon project completion. A project Partner Contribution Form (Appendix G) must be completed and submitted with the application. Please note that state agencies were not permitted to purchase land using 2013-15 or 2015-17 PSAR funds.

Federal agencies may not apply directly, but may collaborate with eligible applicants. Projects may occur on federal lands. Take into account federal restrictions on using federal money for match when applying for a grant.⁶

### Eligible Projects

The SRFB funds a range of projects, but ALL of them must address habitat condition or watershed processes that are important to salmon recovery. The project may provide other benefits, such as flood control, but those benefits must be secondary.

If the landowner has a legal obligation under local, state, or federal laws to perform the project, the project must comply with Revised Code of Washington 77.85.130 (6).

### Acquisition

Acquisition includes the purchase of land, access, or other property rights in fee title or less than fee, such as conservation easements. Grant applicants interested in acquiring conservation easements must be eligible to hold conservation easements under Revised Code of Washington 64.04.130. Rights or claims may be acquired once the value is established or appraised. Grant recipients must complete all SRFB-funded acquisition projects within 3 years of funding approval unless additional time is necessary, can be justified, and is approved by RCO.

SRFB has very specific due diligence, appraisal, reporting, and timeline requirements for acquisition projects so refer to the requirements and checklists in Manual 3, Acquisition Projects.

⁶When land acquired with a SRFB grant is transferred to a federal agency, the SRFB may change the terms of the grant to remove binding deed-of-right instruments and enter into a memorandum of understanding stating that the property will retain, to the extent feasible, adequate habitat protections, see Revised Code of Washington 77.85.130(7).
Note that any land costs incurred before the board funding date are ineligible for reimbursement of match unless the grant applicant receives a Waiver of Retroactivity before acquiring the property. To preserve eligibility, contact a grants manager if a property will be purchased before the funding award. See Section 3 of RCO Manual 3, Acquisition Projects for more information on applying for a Waiver of Retroactivity.

The SRFB does not fund property acquired through condemnation, only property acquired from willing sellers. All acquisitions must be perpetual, including water right acquisitions.

Acquisition projects must identify specific parcels. However, an applicant may propose purchasing stream reaches, estuaries, or nearshore areas if purchasing any parcel within the specified area will achieve the project’s objectives. In that case, identify a geographic envelope, including all the possible parcels that will provide similar benefits to fish and certainty of success, in the salmon proposal. These parcels should be contiguous or nearly contiguous and include similar conservation values to make them effectively interchangeable when being evaluated for funding. Clearly describe how parcels will be prioritized and pursued for acquisition. Landowner Acknowledgement Forms (Appendix F) are required with application. For multi-site acquisition projects, enter the top priority parcels with Landowner Acknowledgment Forms into PRISM.

It is important to remember that some activities are never allowed on SRFB-funded properties. Refer to the section on ineligible uses in this manual.

**Restoration**

Restoration brings a site back to its original, historic function as part of a natural ecosystem, or improves, or enhances the ecological functionality of a site. Grant recipients must complete all SRFB-funded restoration projects within 3 years of funding approval unless additional time is necessary, can be justified, and is approved by RCO.

RCO expects that restoration projects will go through a planning and design process that generally follows the guidance described in Appendix D. Depending on the scope and complexity of a restoration project, the level of design available at application, the local review process, and review panel comments during application, RCO may require a special condition in the project agreement that the grant recipient submit preliminary designs and a design report for review before developing a final design or starting construction.

An applicant with a large restoration project is required to submit preliminary design deliverables by the final application deadline. RCO defines large restoration projects as those where the applicant is requesting more than $250,000 in funding from the SRFB.

---

7Washington Administrative Code 420
for restoration and design. If RCO funded the planning or design phase of a proposed restoration project, the applicant must submit the completed design deliverables (at a minimum the preliminary designs) by the final application deadline.

Landowner Acknowledgement Forms in Appendix F are required when a project occurs on land not owned by the grant recipient (including publicly owned property). Once funded, landowner agreements (Appendix N) are required before beginning construction on private land or land not owned by the grant recipient. Note that projects on state-owned aquatic or trust lands require approval from the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Please consult Section 6 on state-owned aquatic lands for instructions on this process.

The Washington State Aquatic Habitat Guidelines provides excellent planning and design guidance for a variety of restoration projects. This program is a multi-federal and state agency endeavor to provide consistent guidance for the management, protection, and restoration of Washington’s marine, freshwater, and riparian habitats. Guidelines are online. Please refer to Appendix D for specific design and construction deliverables, based in part on industry standards identified by the aquatic habitat guidelines.

The use of non-natural materials in the construction of SRFB-funded restoration techniques is strongly discouraged. Applications that include these techniques will be highly scrutinized for their restoration of natural processes and benefits to fish. Artificial anchoring and ballasting materials such as concrete blocks, dolos, and steel anchors tend to remain in place long after the habitat enhancement techniques that they anchored have disintegrated naturally, and result in unnatural constraints on channel migration and other long-term, habitat-forming natural processes. Refer to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s 2012 Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines and National Marine Fisheries Service’s 2008 Programmatic Biological Assessment: Restoration Actions in Washington State for detailed discussion of the disadvantages of using unnatural materials in stream restoration and the advantages of using materials and techniques that mimic the conditions found in natural settings.

Restoration projects may include any of the following elements:

- **In-stream Fish Passage**—includes activities that provide or improve fish migration upstream and downstream of road crossings, dams, and other in-stream barriers. Passage projects may include replacing barrier culverts with fish passable culverts or bridges, removing barriers (dams and roads), or constructing fishways.

- **In-stream Diversion**—includes activities that protect fish from the withdrawal and return of surface water, such as screening of fish from a water diversion (dam, head gate), the water conveyance system (both gravity and pressurized pump), and the by-pass of fish back to the stream.
- **In-stream and Floodplain Habitat**—includes activities that enhance freshwater fish habitat in the channel or floodplain, such as adding boulders, gravel, or wood; relocating a channelized stream to a more natural channel configuration; constructing or reconnecting side channels or off-channel habitat; removing or modifying levees; removing bank armor; or removing and controlling nonnative, in-stream plants. Work may occur on the channel bed, bank, or floodplain.

  - Beaver Reintroduction—These projects focus on restoring priority wetland or in-stream habitat within specific sub-watersheds identified as priorities in local watershed or salmon recovery plans.

  Applicants must meet the following criteria:

  - Must have salmon habitat restoration goals and objectives.
  - Must not solely manage nuisance beavers.

  Applicant must consider the following when selecting relocation sites:

  - Prioritize locations where valuable but degraded or inaccessible habitat exists and where beaver reintroduction would benefit salmon habitat functions and values.
  - Potential for risk to existing infrastructure.
  - Prioritize large tracks of land held by willing landowners for relocation sites.

  Applicants should follow guidance of the most current state or regional aquatic habitat guidelines, including *The Beaver Restoration Guidebook*.

- **Riparian Habitat**—includes freshwater, marine nearshore, and estuarine activities that will improve the riparian habitat outside of the ordinary high water mark or in wetlands. Activities may include planting native vegetation, managing invasive species, or controlling livestock, vehicle, and foot traffic within protected areas.

  - Knotweed Control—Applicants proposing knotweed control as an element of their projects should answer the knotweed questions identified in the restoration proposal.

  - Stewardship Projects—To ensure the success of riparian habitat projects, applicants may propose stand-alone stewardship for previously installed riparian habitat projects. Sites may be previously funded SRFB projects or other similar riparian habitat planting sites. Eligible activities in stewardship projects may include managing invasive species, replacing
unsuccessful plantings, supplementing the site with water, or installing fences or other browse-protection methods.

- **Riparian plantings**—Applicants should refer to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s 2012 *Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines* for guidance on riparian buffer widths. Applicants and lead entity evaluators should ensure planted riparian buffer widths are appropriate for the site and represent a clear benefit to salmon recovery as articulated in regional recovery plans.

- **Upland Areas**—includes activities that improve habitat or functions important for fish but occur upslope of the riparian or estuarine area. Activities may affect the timing and delivery of water, sediment, and large wood to streams, or improve water temperature or quality. Upland area projects may include, but are not limited to, upland erosion control, upland plant establishment and management, water conservation, culvert replacement, and road decommissioning.

- **Estuarine and Marine Nearshore**—includes activities that enhance fish habitat within the shoreline riparian zone or below the mean high water mark, such as work conducted in or adjacent to the intertidal area and in sub-tidal areas, beach restoration, bulkhead removal, dike modification or removal, native plant establishment, and tidal channel reconstruction.

Nearshore assessment and restoration projects spanning multiple lead entities are eligible for SRFB funding; however, they must appear on each lead entity funding list, within the target funding allocation for each lead entity. The sum of each lead entity award and corresponding match should equal the total project cost and combine into one project agreement upon funding.

The SRFB urges all Puget Sound lead entities, nearshore project applicants, and the SRFB Review Panel to use the technical resources identified in the *Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan* and by Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership, particularly the following documents:

- **Regional Nearshore and Marine Aspects of Salmon Recovery in Puget Sound** (Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, 2005) as cited in the *Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan*


- **Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound: A Research Plan in Support of the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership** (Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership Report No. 2006-1)
Intensively Monitored Watersheds Restoration Treatment Projects

Sponsors apply for Intensively Monitored Watershed restoration treatment projects through the regular grant round. Projects must be submitted on ranked lead entity project lists. The SRFB Review Panel will review Intensively Monitored Watershed restoration treatment projects with the same evaluation criteria as all other proposed projects. There is no dedicated funding for Intensively Monitored Watershed restoration treatment projects.

An Intensively Monitored Watershed is a sophisticated approach to validating whether habitat restoration actions actually create more salmon. The following regions and watersheds have monitoring funded by the SRFB:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salmon Recovery Region or Watershed</th>
<th>Stream with Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region</td>
<td>Big Beef Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Anderson Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seabeck Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stavis Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region</td>
<td>Abernathy Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region</td>
<td>Skagit River, Skagit River Estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River Salmon Recovery Region</td>
<td>Asotin Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait of Juan De Fuca</td>
<td>Deep Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Twin Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Twin Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All applications will follow the same timeline and requirements as all other SRFB applications with the following differences:

- There is no match required for Intensively Monitored Watershed restoration treatment projects.
- The sponsor must submit a certification from the lead scientists of the Intensively Monitored Watershed and the region indicating that the project will not negatively affect the study. RCO staff can provide applicants with the contact information for the lead scientist.
Applicants should include the words “IMW” or “IMW restoration treatment” in their project names for easy tracking.

Streambank Stabilization

As described by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s 2012 *Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines*, streambank stabilization may include a number of techniques to deflect flows away from a bank, decrease bank height, increase the strength of bank material, or directly armor or reinforce a bank for the specific purpose of decreasing bank erosion. Streambank stabilization is eligible for SRFB funding only under limited circumstances. The project must meet all of the following criteria:

- The streambank stabilization and protection must be a secondary element of the project. The landowner must support the larger restoration project activities that will occur on the property beyond the bank stabilization efforts.
- The need for streambank protection and stabilization must be justified in the project proposal as the only means to accomplish the larger habitat restoration objective (e.g. to protect infrastructure that cannot be replaced or relocated).
- The need for streambank stabilization and protection must be identified as important in addressing an identified limiting factor in the relevant watershed or species recovery plan.

Projects on Forestland (Fish Passage and Sediment Reduction)

A Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) is a forest road inventory and schedule for repair work needed to bring logging roads up to state standards. The plans are a component of the *Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan* completed in December 2005 and later approved by the federal services. The state’s forest practice rules, developed to conform to the habitat conservation plan, require large forest landowners to develop and implement road maintenance and abandonment plans for roads within their ownership. Large forest landowners were required to have all roads within their ownership covered under a Washington State Department of Natural Resources-approved RMAP by July 1, 2006 and to bring all roads into compliance with forest practices standards by July 1, 2016. In 2011, the Forest Practices Board amended

---

8U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Marine Fisheries Service
9Washington Administrative Code 222-24-050
its administrative code to allow forest landowners to extend the deadline for completing the road work scheduled in their RMAP for up to 5 years, or until October 31, 2021.

Small forest landowners must submit a simplified RMAP checklist to the Washington State Department of Natural Resources for only those roads in their ownership that forest practices applications affect. Small forest landowners are exempt from the annual RMAP reporting requirement.

RMAP-related projects in both small and large forests are eligible for funding. To be eligible, the grant applicant must complete the following:

- Complete the lead entity and SRFB Review Panel processes described in this manual.
- Provide documentation that the landowner has received an extension from the Department of Natural Resources for the road work proposed.
- Answer additional questions in the salmon project proposal related to the priority of the RMAP project.

In addition, projects in large forests must meet the following criteria as identified in Revised Code of Washington 77.85.130(6):

- Project is not solely mitigation (i.e. not exclusively compensation for unavoidable, environmental impacts of specific forestry projects or actions).
- Project is an expedited action ahead of the Department of Natural Resources-approved RMAP schedule. Expedited actions do not include RMAP projects that might be delayed beyond their originally scheduled completion dates.
- Project must provide a clear benefit to salmon recovery.
- There will be harm to salmon recovery if the project is delayed (i.e. not completed earlier than the scheduled RMAP completion date).

Large landowners must provide **35 percent match for RMAP-related fish passage projects** and **50 percent for RMAP-related sediment reduction projects**. Design-only or assessment projects addressing RMAP projects are not eligible for SRFB funding.

When a lead entity knows of a proposed RMAP-related project, the lead entity will work with the applicant and RCO staff to ensure the project meets the criteria, before the local technical advisory group and citizen review. Forestland applicants must describe in their proposals how the projects fit within their RMAPs.
Planning Projects: Designs

Good designs are a key precursor to implementing successful habitat restoration projects, particularly if large in scale. Eligible design projects produce conceptual, preliminary, or final design deliverables. See Appendix D of this manual for definitions and expected outcomes for each of these phases of project development. All design projects must address a limiting factor at a specific location.

Design-Only Projects with No Required Match

Design-only projects with no match are eligible for funding under the conditions below. Applicants with design projects that do not meet the following conditions must provide 15 percent match:

- The project must result in either preliminary design or final project design. See Appendix D for definitions and required deliverables for each of these phases of project development.

- The project addresses a particular problem at a specific location. The project cannot include a general reach or watershed assessment or feasibility study to both identify and design a project.

- Maximum request is $200,000.

- The project is not considered a Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan obligation.

- **The project must be completed within 18 months of SRFB funding approval.** This requirement will be included in the SRFB project agreement. **Design-only projects without match will not be eligible for a time extension.**

- Although no match is required, state agencies still must have a local partner that is independently eligible to be an applicant. The local partner must be involved in the design project.

Submit completed design deliverables, or at a minimum preliminary designs, with the final application for the next phase of a project. Projects only producing conceptual designs must submit those with the application for the next phase.
Planning Projects: Assessments and Inventories

Most planning projects funded through the SRFB must produce site specific project designs. However, limited funding is available to assessment projects that address limiting factors identified in salmon recovery plans. Due to restrictions on the use of federal funds and state funds that match federal funds, the SRFB has placed limitations on how much funding may be used for general assessments.

Each year, the Columbia River, Snake River, Northeast, and Coast salmon recovery regions may, at their discretion, make up to $200,000 of their SRFB allocation available for assessments that do not produce site-specific project designs. These type of projects must receive state funding (not federal), and will not be used by Washington State to match its federal award.

Lead entities in the Puget Sound and Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Regions may include these types of projects on their ranked lists, but must fund them with PSAR funds.

Lead entities and project sponsors in all salmon recovery regions must coordinate with their salmon recovery region on general assessments, and the relevant region must provide a letter of support for the project with the application.

Planning projects that do not produce a site-specific design include habitat assessments and surveys; habitat scoping and feasibility studies; culvert inventories and in-stream surveys; and landowner willingness inventories. These projects must provide a minimum of 15 percent match and must be completed in 2 years. All assessments and inventories must be necessary precursors to implementing on-the-ground habitat projects identified in a recovery plan. Such projects may document and evaluate habitat quality and use; identify the extent and nature of problems and habitat deficiencies; identify and prioritize habitat restoration and protection activities to address these issues; or evaluate landowner willingness to participate in restoration and protection activities.

If a planning project produces an assessment (sometimes called a reach or watershed assessment) and conceptual, preliminary, or final designs, the project may not necessarily be restricted to the $200,000 regional cap. However, the site-specific design portion of project must be the majority of the project, not the assessment elements.

Planning projects intended only for research or general knowledge and understanding of watershed conditions and functions, although important, are not eligible for SRFB or PSAR funding. For monitoring projects, review the eligibility requirements of the regional monitoring projects discussed later in this manual.

Planning projects that do not produce a site-specific design must meet the following criteria:
• The project fills a data gap identified as a high priority (as opposed to a medium or low priority) in a regional salmon recovery plan or lead entity strategy.

• The project fills a data gap that clearly limits subsequent project identification or development.

• The regional organization or lead entity and applicant can demonstrate how the project fits in the larger context, such as its fit with a regional recovery-related, scientific research agenda or work plan, and how it will address the identified high priority data void. The region must provide a letter of support for the project. The project will not be eligible to apply without a letter from the region.

• The region and applicant can demonstrate why SRFB funds are necessary, rather than other sources of funding.

• The results must clearly determine criteria and options for subsequent projects and show the schedule for implementing such projects, if funded.

• Projects in the Puget Sound and Hood Canal regions must be funded with Puget Sound Restoration and Acquisition funds.

• Projects in the Lower Columbia, Snake River, Upper Columbia, Middle Columbia, Northeast, and Washington Coast Salmon Recovery Regions must be funded with state funding (not federal) and may not be used as match to RCO’s Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund award.

Assessments and inventories must closely coordinate with other assessments and data collection efforts in the watershed and with federal, tribal, state, regional, and local organizations, and landowners to prevent duplication and ensure the use of appropriate methods and protocols. To improve coordination, lead entities and applicants are encouraged to collaborate with one another.

Grant recipients must **complete planning projects within 2 years** of funding approval unless additional time is necessary, can be justified, and is approved by RCO.

For barrier inventories, use the methodologies and protocols described in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s *Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Diversion Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual* to collect barrier inventory data. Contact the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Fish Passage Inventory and Assessment Unit’s **Section Supervisor Christy Rains**, (360) 902-2574, to schedule training on the protocols described in this manual, and for data submission procedures. Upon completion of a barrier inventory project and a passage barrier correction project, delivery of the inventory or correction data to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife must be added to the **Fish Passage Barrier Database** before final reimbursement is approved.
Combination Projects

Combination projects include both acquisition and restoration elements OR acquisition and planning. This type of grant allows for complex projects that otherwise would not be possible. For example, acquired land may need some immediate restoration to make the habitat suitable to fish. Likewise, some potential acquisitions may need an initial assessment of the landowners' willingness to sell in order to identify the most beneficial parcels of habitat. Grant recipients must complete all SRFB-funded combination projects within 3 years of funding approval unless additional time is necessary, can be justified, and is approved by RCO.

To help ensure timely completion of combination projects, acquire properties within 18 months of SRFB funding approval.

Phased Projects

Large projects can be complex, multi-year, multi-partner, and require extensive analysis, coordination, and implementation. Consider the potential complexity that large-scale or multi-million dollar projects may create and discuss phasing with RCO staff and the lead entity coordinator. Phased projects are subject to all of the following:

- Each phase must stand on its own merits as a viable salmon recovery project.
- Each phase must have a scope of work the applicant can afford and complete given the amount of SRFB funding requested, plus match.
- Submit each phase as a separate application.
- Funding approval of any single phase is limited to that phase (no endorsement or approval is given or implied toward future phases).
- The SRFB may consider progress on earlier phases when making decisions on current proposals. Applicants must submit planning and design deliverables of previously funded phases by the final application deadline.

Monitoring

Grant recipients must monitor project implementation to ensure project completion as planned, and address any post-construction issues in the SRFB project agreement. This is referred to as implementation monitoring.

The SRFB does not fund project-specific, effectiveness monitoring, but conducts a statewide, reach-scale monitoring program to determine which types of projects are most effective. An independent contractor conducts the monitoring. Information on this program is available on the RCO Web site.
Regional Monitoring Projects

A regional salmon recovery organization, at its discretion, may make up to 10 percent of its annual SRFB project allocation available for regional monitoring projects. Regional monitoring projects have a separate salmon project proposal found in Appendix C. Projects lacking a well-developed study plan will not be considered for funding.

Sponsors will apply for regional monitoring projects following similar application procedures and timeline as other SRFB applications; however, the SRFB Monitoring Panel, not the review panel, will review regional monitoring projects. The review process for regional monitoring projects is streamlined. There is no site visit and no dialogue with monitoring panel members about the project. The monitoring panel will send questions to sponsors for applications needing minor clarifications only. Otherwise, projects will receive a single comment form with a status assigned of “Clear,” “Conditioned,” or “Project of Concern.” Note that the deadline for sponsors to accept any conditions in writing is earlier than for other SRFB projects; see the calendar for details. Lead entities must include regional monitoring projects in their ranked lists in order to be considered for funding. Sponsors must contact RCO for project numbers in order to apply for a regional monitoring project.

Regional monitoring projects must address high priority information needs or data gaps identified within a recovery plan; associated regional research, monitoring, and evaluation plan; or lead entity strategy.

Regional monitoring projects should complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts.

Regional monitoring projects must be consistent or compatible with data collection, analysis, and management methods and protocols being used in the region, and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be consistent or compatible with methods and protocols in common use throughout the state.

Applicants must ask the regions to complete a Regional Monitoring Project Certification Form found in Appendix H for each project submitted and attach the completed forms to PRISM with their final applications.

Data collected and reports analyzing the data shall be made available to RCO, the public, and the SRFB Monitoring Panel.

Monitoring projects shall not exceed 3 years. If the need for the monitoring extends beyond the 3-year agreement period, then the grant recipient would need to submit a new application to continue the project.

Recipients of funded regional monitoring projects need to provide annual reports to describe progress made during each year of the project agreement. The annual report
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should highlight the past year’s accomplishments along with lessons learned. The grant recipient should provide sufficient detail to demonstrate they are meeting project objectives, dealing with problems, keeping data analyses on track, and using new information to adjust the project’s scope of activity appropriately.

Puget Sound Projects

State law requires RCO to align SRFB grants with the *Action Agenda for Puget Sound*. Revised Code of Washington 77.85.130 and 77.85.240 require the SRFB to do the following:

- Prohibit funding for any proposed design or restoration project in Puget Sound that conflicts with the *Action Agenda for Puget Sound*.
- Give preference to projects referenced in the *Action Agenda for Puget Sound*.
- Give preference to Puget Sound partners without giving less preferential treatment to entities that are not eligible to be Puget Sound partners.

The Puget Sound Partnership defines the Puget Sound basin as the geographic areas within Water Resource Inventory Areas 1 through 19, inclusive.

The Puget Sound Partnership will certify whether projects submitted in Puget Sound for SRFB or PSAR funding are consistent, and not in conflict, with the *Action Agenda for Puget Sound*. The Partnership will include a certification letter when submitting the Puget Sound regional package to RCO. Refer to Appendix B for information on projects in the Puget Sound funded with the PSAR funds, including large capital projects.

Ineligible Projects Elements

Some projects or elements that do not directly foster the SRFB’s mission or do not meet cost or public policy constraints are ineligible as match or for reimbursement. Activities that are ineligible for reimbursement or match include the following:

- Property acquisition through eminent domain.
- Property acquired before the project start date of the project agreement without a Waiver of Retroactivity (see Section 3 of RCO Manual 3, Acquisition Projects).
- Restoration activities before the project start date of the project agreement.
- Construction material purchased before the project start date of the project agreement, unless approved as a pre-agreement cost (see Section 6 of this manual for more information).
Section 2: Eligible Applicants and Projects

- Land leases, except for those projects on state-owned aquatic lands.

- Mitigation projects, activities, or funds (see Section 3 Matching Share for details on eligible ways to coordinate restoration with mitigation activities). This prohibition includes cost over-runs for mitigation projects that do not have enough money for implementation. SRFB funds may not supplement or supplant the cost of a mitigation project.

- Maintenance as stand-alone projects. This does not include riparian stewardship projects.

- Effectiveness monitoring costs associated with a project, including purchase of equipment to monitor a SRFB restoration or acquisition project.

- Purchase of existing structures that are not essential to the functions or operation and maintenance of the funded site. Non-essential structures must be removed or demolished (see Section 6 of this manual for more information).

- Building or indoor facility construction.

- Capital facilities, public works projects, projects with a PRIMARY PURPOSE of flood mitigation works,\(^\text{10}\) and infrastructure elements, such as sewer treatment facilities, surface and stormwater management systems, flood management structures, and water supply systems are not eligible as stand-alone projects.

- If infrastructure is included as a secondary purpose of the project, the infrastructure must be included in the design documents. Providing this information allows for a comprehensive review of the project by the SRFB Review Panel early in the process to resolve any potential issues. RCO highly recommends early review in these cases.

- Converting from septic to sewage treatment systems.

- Operation or construction of fish hatcheries.

- Net pens, artificial rearing facilities, remote site incubation systems, and supplementation.

- Operation of hydropower facilities.

- Fish harvest and harvest management activities.

\(^{10}\)Flood mitigation works defined as levees, floodway schemes, drains, floodgates, riverbank stabilization, pumping facilities, flood-free mounds, diversions, dams, and dredging. From Dictionary of Environment and Sustainable Development, by Alan Gilpin. 1996.
• Fishing license buy-back.

• Lobbying or legislative activities.

• Costs to apply for SRFB or other grants.

• Projects that do not address an important habitat condition or watershed process, or that focus mainly on supplying a secondary need.

• Planning projects intended only for research purposes or general knowledge and understanding of watershed conditions and functions.

• Environmental cleanup of soils or materials above levels in the Model Toxics Control Act.
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In this section, you’ll learn about the following:

✔ The application process
✔ Matching share
✔ Waiver of Retroactivity for acquisitions
✔ Application checklist

The Application Process

The grant cycle consists of steps required both by the local lead entity and RCO. The following outlines the basic expectations of RCO’s process and what applicants can expect from the local lead entity process.

Step 1: Work with the Local Lead Entity

Lead entities rank and score projects. Lead entities initiate, coordinate, and facilitate the local technical and citizen committee meetings to assemble ranked lists of proposed projects from their areas. Lead entities establish their own schedules for required grant cycle steps including site visits, rating, and ranking. Applications will not be accepted from areas without a lead entity. Consult the lead entity coordinators to learn their deadlines and requirements. See Appendix A for lead entity contacts.

Step 2: Complete Draft Application Materials Using PRISM Online

To create an application, work with your lead entity coordinator and enter project information into the Habitat Work Schedule. By using the Habitat Work Schedule to create new applications in PRISM, the project is linked to both systems. Contact the lead entity coordinator to begin an application in the Habitat Work Schedule.11

11Grant applicants in the Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region must use SalmonPORT. The lead entity will work with RCO staff to migrate the information to Habitat Work Schedule for grant applicants.
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Provide the lead entity with the following six pieces of information to enter into the Habitat Work Schedule:

- Project name
- Habitat Work Schedule identification number if the project is already in the Habitat Work Schedule.
- Project cost
- Project type and category
- Project applicant
- Start and end dates

Once the project information has been entered and submitted through Habitat Work Schedule, a PRISM project number is created. Use that project number to find the project in PRISM to complete the application in PRISM Online.

**NOTE:** After coordinating with the regional organization, contact an RCO grants manager to start an application for a regional monitoring project in PRISM. Regional monitoring project applications cannot be started in Habitat Work Schedule.

**Using PRISM Online**

All applicants must use PRISM Online to complete applications. To use PRISM Online, visit RCO’s Web site to obtain a user name and password.

Open PRISM Online and enter the project number from the Habitat Work Schedule in the “Go to Project” field—that will open the “Application Wizard” for the project.

If you cannot find the project in PRISM, please contact the lead entity coordinator or a RCO grants manager. Contact information is listed in Appendix A.

The application will open to the “Project Description” page. Complete the required information on each screen, and click the “Next” button. This process will walk the applicant through the entire application page by page. Be sure to save work often.
After completing all of the application information and requirements, applicants should check the application for errors on the “Submit Application” screen. Pages indicated with a red explanation mark in the navigation table on the left of the screen are not complete.

The applicant may need to attach other materials to complete the application. See the requirements for each project type in the Project Checklist online.

Required Draft Application Materials

The SRFB Review Panel is required to visit every project (see Step 3 below) considered for funding by the SRFB by the end of June, unless deemed not necessary by the review panel (e.g. assessments, feasibility studies, or project sites previously visited in other grant rounds). The lead entity and RCO will schedule visits in February.

Draft application materials must be completed and available in PRISM at least 3 weeks before the scheduled review panel site visit or the application may be considered ineligible for funding consideration. RCO will reschedule site visits for the entire lead entity.

RCO requires the following minimum level of information entered or attached into PRISM Online for draft review. Consult the local lead entity for any additional information required.

- Complete the PRISM application “Project Details,” “Metrics,” and “Costs” screens through the PRISM Online.

- All applications must be mapped on the “Worksite Map & Description” page in PRISM Online.

- Attach a complete draft salmon project proposal. Every applicant must fill out one of three project proposals and attach it in PRISM. Each project proposal pertains to a different project type. They are as follows:
  - Restoration, Acquisition, or Combination Restoration and Acquisition Projects.
  - Planning (Assessment, Design, and Study) or Combination Planning and Acquisition Projects
  - Barrier Inventory Projects: Please select the project proposal that best fits the project. Find project proposals in Appendix C.

- Attach a project location or vicinity map. An acquisition project map should depict the project site as well as nearby land that is publically owned or has protection status. Maps should show nearby towns and major roads.
• Attach a **detailed site or parcel map.**

• Attach **site or aerial photographs,** if available.

• Attach **design plans or sketches** that clearly convey the intent of the proposed restoration project. Applicants should provide all available, relevant design information (detailed construction plans, specifications, planting plans, and design reports). Grant applicants with minimal available information should include example photographs, designs, and conceptual sketches to convey their intents.

• **Barrier Evaluation Form** (fish passage construction and design projects only): These forms document fish passage barrier conditions. Many barriers have been evaluated. Contact the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife technical support member Daniel Barrett, (360) 902-240574, to learn if a completed Barrier Evaluation Form is available. If not completed already, please fill out the Barrier Evaluation Form in **Appendix E.** A local inventory summary may substitute for this if it includes all information requested on the Barrier Evaluation Form.

• Attach a **draft detailed cost estimate:** Please provide a detailed cost estimate to supplement the general cost information required by PRISM. Use the template provided on the RCO Web site, or a cost estimate with a similar amount of detail. The level of detail required in PRISM Online for acquisition projects is sufficient to not need a separate attached cost estimate. However, depending on the level of complexity of the acquisition project, the review panel may ask for more information.

  Clearly label the attachment in PRISM “Cost Estimate.” Applicants may use their own formats, but, in general, restoration and design project cost estimates should separate costs for individual construction, design, and project administration elements and tasks (e.g. survey, design, permits, cultural resources, materials, labor, and equipment). DO NOT include contingency costs as a separate line item in the cost estimate.

• **Initiate consultation with Washington Department of Natural Resources:** Applicants with restoration or design projects that include shoreline, in-water work, over-water work, or public water access should contact the Washington Department of Natural Resources in the draft application process to determine whether their projects are on state-owned aquatic lands, which could affect project scoping.

  See the map to find the contact information for the department’s aquatics land manager in the applicant’s area, or call the department at (360) 902-1100. See Section 6 of this manual for more information on managing projects that are on state-owned aquatic lands.
**Initiate consultation with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife:** The department’s State Lands Division manager is the only authorized person to sign standard RCO control and tenure documents and access permits. To ensure there are no delays with your project application or implementation, make sure all project control and tenure documents have been reviewed and signed appropriately and budget time for this review. These documents include RCO’s Landowner Acknowledgement and Landowner Agreement Forms (Appendix N), and right of entry permits, as required by your project type. Project sponsors should be prepared to work with the department’s regional staff to meet these guidelines. Regional staff contact information can be found online.

Applicants should not click “submit” on their applications in PRISM Online, unless directed by the lead entity to do so. Applications only need to be submitted by the final application deadline.

**Step 3: Review Panel Site Visits and Draft Review**

Each region or lead entity will have a small team of SRFB Review Panel members assigned to review draft application materials and visit project sites. After reviewing materials and conducting site visits, the review panel team will complete project comment forms with directions on how applicants can improve their projects before the final application deadline. Applicants must address review panel comments in their final applications. Responses to all comments should be addressed in the designated section at the end of the salmon project proposal form. All revisions made to the draft salmon project proposals must use the Microsoft Word “track changes” feature.

**Step 4: Use PRISM Online to Complete a Final Application**

Submit complete applications by 5 p.m., August 8, 2019 in PRISM Online. Incomplete applications received by the application deadline will not advance. Applications submitted after this deadline will not advance. Note, lead entities may set an earlier date for final application submission in order to rate and rank final projects. Applications should be completed by the earliest date between SRFB and the lead entity.

In addition to updating and completing all of the screens in PRISM Online, attach several other items. Required attachments are listed in the application checklist available on the RCO Web site and described below.

**Required Attachments**

- **Final Detailed Cost Estimate:** Update the draft detailed cost estimate, as needed, and attach in PRISM. If no updates are needed, please rename the draft cost estimate file in PRISM to indicate that it is final. Identify the amount of indirect on the line item in the cost estimate template.
• **Final Salmon Project Proposal with Completed Response to Review Panel Comments:** Update the draft salmon project proposal, to address review panel comments. Using the Microsoft Word “track changes” feature, respond directly to review panel comments in the “Response to Site Visit Comments” section at the end of the project proposal and re-attach the proposal in PRISM. Using “track changes” will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes. For assistance in using “track changes,” see the Microsoft help page.

• **Landowner Acknowledgement Form (Appendix F):** A Landowner Acknowledgement Form is required for all projects proposed to occur on property not owned by the applicant. Include a signed Landowner Acknowledgement Form from each landowner acknowledging that his/her property is proposed for SRFB funding consideration. Exceptions:
  
  o Assessments, inventories, and studies that cover a large area and encompass numerous properties do not require Landowner Acknowledgement Forms.
  
  o Multi-site acquisition projects that involve a large group of landowners, require (at minimum) signed Landowner Acknowledgement Forms for priority parcels.

If the Washington Department of Natural Resources determines that the project is on state-owned aquatic lands, then the applicant must submit a Landowner Acknowledgment Form signed by the Washington Department of Natural Resources.

Note that a Landowner Acknowledgement Form (Appendix F) differs from a Landowner Agreement (Appendix N), which is required for restoration projects occurring on non-applicant-owned land before construction. Refer to Section 6 for further information on landowner agreements.

• **Project Partnership Contribution Form (Appendix G):** State agencies are required to have a local partner and must attach a signed Partner Contribution Form. RCO recommends, but does not require, a Partner Contribution Form for other eligible applicants where a third party provides a funding match.

• **Maps:** The following three maps must be attached in PRISM Online:
  
  o A general vicinity map.
  
  o A more detailed worksite map for planning and restoration projects or a parcel map for acquisitions.
A map showing the project’s Area of Potential Effect. This map should show the location of all proposed ground-disturbing activities, including access and staging areas. The map must include a polygon of the entire project area and **must include section, township, and range information**. A U.S. Geological Survey quad map is the preferred base map, though the applicant may use an aerial base map, as long as section, township, and range information are included on the map. Section lines and numbers must be clearly visible in the map. Note that small-scale projects may need to attach more than one map—one zoomed out far enough to depict section lines and numbers, and another zoomed in close enough to clearly depict the boundaries of all proposed ground-disturbing activities. Applicants will be asked to revise maps if sufficient information is not provided for the purposes of cultural resources review. Attach multiple Area of Potential Effect maps if needed.

For applicants who do not have access to mapping software to create the Area of Potential Effect map, the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation has developed a free mapping tool that allows users to draw polygons and create PDF maps. Users can turn on important features such as section, township, range, county, etc. The mapping tool automatically inserts a scale and allows the addition of text boxes to note the project number and name.

- **Site Photographs:** Attach at least two photographs in PRISM Online. Photographs should illustrate current site conditions and be in .JPG file format.

- **RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet (Appendix I):** is required for all projects. Applicants must complete the fillable PDF form and attach it to each application. This form collects information about an organization’s indirect rate as well as other financial information.

- **SRFB Application Authorization (Appendix J):** is required for all projects. The applicant’s governing body must pass a resolution that authorizes submission of the application for funding. This resolution will identify who can sign a contract and amendments on behalf of the organization. The format of the authorization may change, but the text may not change. Only one form is required per applicant, so long as each project name and number is included in the resolution. Forms filled out incorrectly, or unsigned, are not valid and will require revisions. If you need help, contact a RCO grants manager before signing the form.

- **Barrier Evaluation Form (Fish passage construction and design projects only):** This form documents fish passage barrier conditions. Many barriers have been evaluated. Contact Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife technical support staff member Daniel Barrett, (360) 902-2405, to learn if a completed
Barrier Evaluation Form is available. If not completed already, please fill out the Barrier Evaluation Form in Appendix E or go to the RCO Web site. A local inventory summary may substitute for this if it includes all information requested on the Barrier Evaluation Form.

- **Correction Analysis Form (Fish passage construction projects only):** Use this form to document how a fish passage barrier will be corrected. See Appendix E or go to the RCO Web site. This form is not required if the barrier is removed entirely and not replaced with another structure.

- **Proposed Project Design (Restoration projects only):** Please provide as much design information (plans, specifications, design report) as possible to clearly illustrate the project intent. Submit concept sketches, example photographs, or designs of proposed restoration techniques if detailed site designs are not prepared. Note that **Preliminary designs are REQUIRED for large projects.** For funding requests of $250,000 or more, a preliminary design is required by the final application deadline. Large projects without a preliminary design will be considered ineligible for funding.

- **Intensively Monitored Watershed Certification:** The sponsor must submit a certification from the lead scientists of the Intensively Monitored Watershed that states that the project will not negatively affect the study. This must be done for any project in the following watersheds:
  - Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity: Anderson Creek, Big Beef Creek, Seabeck Creek
  - Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity: Abernathy Creek, Germany Creek, Mill Creek
  - Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity: Skagit River Estuary
  - Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity: Asotin Creek
  - North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon: Deep Creek, East Twin Creek, West Twin Creek

  Consult a grants manager to get contact information for the lead scientist of the Intensively Monitored Watershed.

- **Waiver of Retroactivity (Acquisition projects):** is required if a land acquisition will occur before project agreement. Waivers of Retroactivity are discussed in more detail later in this section. Note, the Waiver must be secured BEFORE closing on the property.
• **Regional Monitoring Project Certification** *(Appendix H)*: is required for regional monitoring projects.

• **Deliverables from Prior Phases**: If previous phases of a project were funded by the SRFB, then the deliverables from those projects must be included in the final application. For example, if SRFB funded the assessment, preliminary design, or final design for the project then attach those project deliverables to the final application. For proposed restoration projects with an active SRFB-funded design grant, at a minimum the preliminary design deliverables must be attached.

• **Other Materials (Optional)**: Submit other relevant application material (graphs, letters of support, additional maps or photographs, etc.) as needed.

**Tips and Resources for Completing the Final Application in PRISM Online**

The checklist of all required application materials at the end of this section will help applicants keep track of what they completed. Download the checklist from the [RCO Web site](#). If the applicant has any questions about required application materials or how to enter items into [PRISM Online](#), please contact the local lead entity coordinator or RCO grants manager.

**Review Panel Consultation**

The review panel is available year-round for consultation. To request assistance, lead entity coordinators must complete a [Review Panel Request Form](#) available online. Lead entities should fill out the top portion of the request form and hit the “Submit by e-mail” button.

Review panel time will be scheduled on a first come, first served basis.

**Tips to Avoid Common Mistakes**

• **Scope of the project.** Be sure the project description, proposal, and other application materials reflect the entire project. Include tasks covered by proposed SRFB funds and tasks covered by matching funds.

• **Match.** Include only eligible sources of match (see “Matching Share” later in this section). Use match only for activities identified in Section 2 as eligible for SRFB funding.

• **Contingency.** Do not include a line item for contingency in cost estimates. Ensure that each of the budget line items accounts for inflation and contingencies.
• **Architecture and Engineering.** Include architecture and engineering costs in the cost estimate for restoration projects. Architecture and engineering costs include project administration, engineering, and design. “Architecture and engineering” is a separate work type in PRISM and must be selected to enter an associated cost. Note that architecture and engineering costs are tracked separately from construction costs for each worksite billed. Refer to *Manual 5, Restoration Projects* for guidance on what activities represent architecture and engineering expenses, and what activities represent construction expenses—the difference is not always obvious. The maximum allowable total architecture and engineering expense is 30 percent of construction costs.

• **Administrative Costs.** Include administrative costs in the cost estimate in acquisition projects. Administration costs are a separate line item in the property cost estimate in PRISM. Administrative costs are tracked separately from land and incidental costs for each property billed to RCO. Refer to *Manual 3, Acquisition Projects* for guidance on what activities represent administrative costs. The maximum allowable total administrative expense is 5 percent of land plus incidental costs.

• **Indirect Costs.** RCO allows agency indirect costs for all projects that receive federal funding, or are used by RCO or the Puget Sound Partnership as programmatic match to a federal grant. Applicants are required to attach a RCO *Fiscal Data Collection Sheet*, which indicates the indirect rate the applicant plans to charge to the project, before submitting the application. Start filling out this form early and work with accounting staff to estimate the indirect costs.

• **Permitting and Cultural Resources.** Include permitting and cultural resources expenses in acquisition, planning, restoration, and combination projects, as appropriate. Select both permits and cultural resources as separate PRISM work type categories. Permitting and cultural resources expenses in a restoration project are factored into the PRISM construction costs of the project.

Please refer to Section 6 of this manual for more information concerning permit requirements, expedited permit options, available permitting assistance, and the cultural resources review process.

• **Pre-agreement costs.** Certain pre-agreement costs are eligible for reimbursement (see *Manual 8, Reimbursements*), but reimbursement is not allowed for land acquisition or construction that occurs before the agreement start date. Exceptions to these restrictions include planning costs, purchase of construction materials, and land acquisition that occurs before project agreement, but after RCO secures a Waiver of Retroactivity. Waivers of Retroactivity are discussed in more detail later in this section. Secure waivers BEFORE closing on the property.
• **Worksites and properties.** RCO billing practices require tracking restoration project expenses separately for each worksite and tracking acquisition projects by property. Limit the number of worksites to those required and fiscally tracked for a restoration project. Acquisition projects should add a property for each transaction, i.e. multiple property transactions will require multiple properties. For restoration and planning projects, it is allowable to have multiple, non-continuous properties associated with one worksite.

**RCO Policy and Procedure Manuals**

SRFB uses the manuals below for the administration of SRFB grants. To understand expectations regarding a grant award and the roles of RCO, become familiar with RCO policies and procedures during the application process. Find copies of the manuals on the RCO Web site:

- *Manual 3, Acquisition Projects*
- *Manual 5, Restoration Projects*
- *Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations*
- *Manual 8, Reimbursements*

**Step 5: Project Evaluation**

Project evaluation happens in three, sometimes concurrent, phases. First, the local lead entity, coordinating with its regional organization, evaluates and ranks applications. The lead entity and region may use locally developed information and criteria to prioritize projects, including criteria that address social, economic, and cultural values.

Second, RCO staff will review all projects for eligibility. Applicants and their lead entities are encouraged to consult with RCO staff early to determine any questions of eligibility. The assigned RCO grants manager reviews decisions about eligibility and confirms with the Salmon Section manager. When eligibility is questioned, the director shall provide a final review. The director may request assistance from the SRFB Review Panel as well.

Third, the SRFB Review Panel will evaluate each project proposal (except monitoring projects) for technical merits and will identify specific concerns about the benefits to salmon and certainty of success. Please refer to Section 4 of this manual for a detailed discussion of the SRFB evaluation process. The SRFB Monitoring Panel will review regional monitoring projects.
Step 6: Funding

The SRFB holds a public meeting to award funding in December. The SRFB considers projects recommended to regions by lead entities (or by lead entities directly where there is no regional organization). RCO prefers, but does not require, that regions create one prioritized project list. At a minimum, the region must provide a recommendation for funding its lead entity lists.

Matching Share

Applicants must provide a minimum of 15 percent of the project value, known as “match,” from non-SRFB funds. The SRFB believes that a match demonstrates local commitment and support of the project. Exceptions to this requirement include the following:

- No match is required for certain design-only projects that meet the specific criteria listed in Section 2, “Eligible Projects,” and “Design-Only Projects with No Required Match.”

- For Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) projects that occur on large forest landowner properties, a 35 percent match is required for fish passage projects and 50 percent match is required for sediment reduction projects. (See Section 2, “Eligible Projects,” and “Projects on Forestland.”)

The SRFB will not provide special consideration or preference in its evaluation process for projects with match greater than 15 percent, although lead entities may do so in their evaluation processes.

Match may include cash, bond funds, grants (unless prohibited by the funding entity), labor, equipment and equipment use, materials, staff time, and donations. All match must be an integral and necessary part of the approved project, must be eligible SRFB elements for the project, and must be committed to the project.

No funds administered by the SRFB, including the PSAR fund, may act as match for a SRFB grant. Funds from the Family Forest Fish Passage Project fund may not act as match.

Other funds administered by RCO may be used as match; consult with the RCO grants manager to determine whether a specific grant may be used as match for the SRFB project.

The SRFB encourages organizations to coordinate salmon recovery efforts with other efforts and funding sources to increase benefits to salmon and to help make the state’s dollars go further.
Valuing Donations

Valuing donations of equipment, labor (including prison inmate labor), and property is discussed in Manual 8, Reimbursements.

Donations are eligible only as matching funds and are not reimbursable. This means RCO will not pay more than the grant recipient’s out-of-pocket expenses.

Record force account values and donated contributions on a separate project financial ledger maintained by the grant recipient in a way that is readily identifiable in federal and state audits. Refer to Manual 8, Reimbursements for instructions about audits, record retention, and documents required for reimbursement.

Mitigation

The SRFB encourages coordinating salmon recovery with mitigation activities, which are not eligible for funding or used as match. (See ineligible project costs section). The SRFB will allow use of mitigation cash payments, such as money from a fund established as a mitigation requirement, as a match if the money passed from the mitigating entity, either directly or through an intermediary agent, to an eligible applicant, and the SRFB grant does not replace mitigation money, repay the mitigation fund, or in any way supplant the obligation of the mitigating entity. Applicants who plan to use mitigation dollars on projects for which they seek SRFB funds should notify their grants managers and should demonstrate in their proposals that SRFB funds will not be used for mitigation.

Projects with additional benefit above mitigation requirements may be eligible for SRFB funding if the applicant can adequately demonstrate the additional benefit separate from the mitigation requirement. For example, a mitigation requirement may be to create 10 acres of salmon habitat and the SRFB project may provide an additional 20 acres of salmon habitat for a total of 30 acres of salmon habitat. The salmon habitat benefits provided by the additional 20 acres are the subject of the SRFB application. The 10 acres of mitigation are not allowed in the SRFB application.

Waiver of Retroactivity for Acquisitions

In most situations, RCO will reimburse only for land costs incurred after executing a project agreement. To receive payment for land costs expended before a grant award, the applicant must submit a written letter, with supporting documentation requesting a Waiver of Retroactivity before purchasing the property. Such a waiver allows the acquisition costs to be eligible for reimbursement through the next two consecutive SRFB grant cycles. Information on waivers is found in RCO’s Manual 3, Acquisition Projects.
Final Application Checklist

In PRISM Online, select “check page for errors” on each page, or “selection application for errors” on the “Submit Application” page to make sure all fields are complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRISM Online Attachment Checklist Items</th>
<th>Template / Form Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Cost Estimate.</strong> RCO recommends using its template or similar format. Attach in PRISM and clearly label “Cost Estimate.” Include agency indirect in the estimate.</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salmon Project Proposal</strong></td>
<td>Appendices C-1, C-2, C-3, or C-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner Acknowledgement Form</strong> (required for projects occurring on land not owned by applicant or on state-owned aquatic lands)</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Partnership Contribution Form.</strong> State agencies are required to have a local partner; also suggested for organizations other than the applicant (third party) providing match.</td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maps</strong></td>
<td>Applicant Creates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General vicinity map for all projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area of potential effect map for all projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site plan for restoration projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parcel map for acquisition projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Materials for Restoration Projects.</strong> NOTE that preliminary designs ARE REQUIRED for projects requesting $250,000 or more in SRFB funds.</td>
<td>Applicant Creates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to Review Panel Draft Application Comments.</strong> Applicants must respond to review panel comments by updating their project proposals and PRISM.</td>
<td>Update Project Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Photographs.</strong> At least two photographs of site conditions before project implementation are required in .jpg file format.</td>
<td>Applicant Creates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier Evaluation Forms and Correction Analysis Forms</strong> (fish passage projects only)</td>
<td>Appendix E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensively Monitored Watershed Certification, if relevant.</strong></td>
<td>Region or Lead Entity Creates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverables from Previous Phases of Work</strong> (for phased projects)</td>
<td>Applicant Creates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Materials (optional)</strong> Waiver of Retroactivity, graphs, parcel maps, letters of support, etc.</td>
<td>Applicant Creates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Monitoring Project Certification</strong> (for regional monitoring projects)</td>
<td>Appendix H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRFB Application Authorization</strong></td>
<td>Appendix J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet</strong></td>
<td>Appendix I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: SRFB Evaluation Process

In this section, the applicant will learn about the following:

✔ The role of the review panel
✔ SRFB funding decision

Review Panel

Purpose

The SRFB Review Panel reviews proposed projects developed in each lead entity area and ensures that SRFB-funded projects create actual benefits to salmon, have costs that do not outweigh the anticipated benefits, and have a high likelihood of being successful.

The SRFB Review Panel does not rate, score, rank, or advocate for projects, rather it assesses the technical merits of proposed projects statewide. To do so, review panel members review project applications, conduct site visits, and provide feedback to lead entities and applicants on proposed projects. Projects are considered in light of regional recovery plans and lead entity strategies where no regional recovery plans exist. Technical feedback provided by the review panel is designed to improve project concepts and overall benefits to fish and to achieve the greatest results for SRFB dollars invested.

The SRFB’s Review Panel is composed of up to nine members. The technical members are experts in salmon recovery with a broad range of knowledge in salmon habitat restoration, watershed processes, ecosystem approaches to protection, and strategic planning. Members have expertise in a number of different project types (passage, nearshore, assessments, acquisition, in-stream, etc.). The review panel includes at least one member with expertise in the Puget Sound marine nearshore ecosystem and familiarity with the technical products developed by Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Partnership and Puget Sound Partnership.

The panel is independent in the sense that members do not represent an agency or constituency. Additionally, members should not have a role in current regional or lead entity activities. If a review panel member is engaged in any element of a specific project or a regional or lead entity process, the member must recuse him/herself from any project review in that particular lead entity area.
Application Review

Lead entities and regions, as appropriate, are expected to provide the primary technical review of projects, having the most detailed knowledge of local conditions, design, and construction approaches. However, to provide for statewide consistency and to help ensure that proposals are technically sound, the review panel conducts a technical review of all projects.

The review panel reviews draft application materials and visits project sites. After which, the review panel completes project comment forms with directions on how applicants could improve their projects before the final application deadline. Grant applicants must update their applications to respond to review panel comments in PRISM Online by **August 8, 2019**. Applicants should use the Microsoft Word “track changes” feature when updating their salmon project proposals so reviewers may find their changes easily in the application. Microsoft provides [online help](https://support.office.com) for using the “track changes“ feature.

The review panel will review final application materials and designate each project as one of the following statuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Clear for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioned</td>
<td>Clear for funding, provided that applicant accepts the conditions recommended by the review panel. The review panel may recommend conditions based on its judgment of the level of benefit to salmon, cost-effectiveness, and certainty of success, as defined by the evaluation criteria in Appendix K, and considering relevant technical best practices as have been applied in the SRFB projects throughout the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need More Information</td>
<td>The applicant needs to provide additional information before the review panel can clear it for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project of Concern</td>
<td>Project has elements that remain unclear to the review panel or project is expected to provide low benefit to salmon, has low likelihood of being successful, or has costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The review panel will use the definitions for benefit and certainty as provided in Appendix K and will document its comments on the comment form.

Applicants of projects with a status of “Conditioned,” “Need More Information,” or “Project of Concern” must respond to review panel comments by updating their project proposals, using “track changes,” as needed, and answering the section at the end of the proposals titled “Response to Review Panel Comments.” Applicants may need to update their PRISM applications or other attachments. Updated materials are due in PRISM by October 10, 2019. The review panel will review the responses to comments and updated
materials and will identify cleared projects. It will recommend a list of projects to present at the regional area project meeting.

**Regional Area Project Meetings**

The review panel will meet with each region and its lead entities at a regional area project meeting to consider the region’s project list. At this meeting, regional organizations, lead entities, and grant applicants present projects identified by the review panel. If time allows, regional organizations may provide a presentation of strategies and/or recovery goals and objectives and discuss how their lists of projects will achieve these goals. Regions can provide information on the following:

- Overview maps of all the projects’ locations and discuss how they fit into the regional priorities.
- Maps of regional priority areas (and overlap with first item).
- Any third party reviews of project lists and fit to recovery strategy.
- Other funding sources significantly contributing to recovery in the regions and how they all fit together.
- Any science demonstrating effectiveness of regional recovery efforts.
- Noteworthy considerations of other factors influencing recovery: hydropower, hatcheries, and harvest.
- Challenges to implementation that they would like to highlight.

Regions and lead entities are encouraged to have grant applicants available to discuss “Projects of Concern” in detail. RCO staff will make available, upon request, the option of an online meeting to communicate information on “Projects of Concern.”

Following the regional area meeting, the review panel will finalize project comment forms by October 30, 2019. “Projects of Concern” will remain on project lists and continue to the SRFB for funding consideration unless the lead entity withdraws the project.

**Review Panel Recommendations to the SRFB**

The review panel will compile individual project comments resulting from the site visits, application review, and project presentations. It will provide comments to applicants, lead entities, and regions. Applicants, lead entities, and regions may provide responses to comments for consideration by the review panel before the panel finalizes the recommendations to the SRFB.
To develop final recommendations for the SRFB, the review panel will use the following:

- Written and graphic information submitted by project applicants, lead entities, and regions.
- Results of meetings with the applicants, lead entities, and regions.
- Responses to follow-up questions.

The recommendations of the panel to the SRFB will consist of the following:

- Identification of “Projects of Concern” including a narrative of the technical concerns with each project.
- Identification of noteworthy projects by category, if applicable. The review panel has no rigid criteria for noteworthy projects, other than to consider projects that, to the greatest extent, have the potential to protect or restore natural watershed processes for a significant amount of high priority habitat in the most cost-effective manner.
- Revisions to project review procedures or project evaluation criteria, need for additional project information (such as changes to the supplemental questions), or other elements needed for technical project review.

Panel members will not reorder lead entity lists or remove projects from lists.

A review panel chair (or RCO staff, should a chair not be selected) will facilitate panel discussions, but RCO staff will not be part of the panel’s decision-making.

**Review Panel and Staff Report**

The review panel will collate its comments and observations in a final report submitted annually to staff.

Staff will submit a grant funding report to the board annually that documents the process of the grant round and serves as a foundation for the board in making project funding determinations. Staff will incorporate the review panel report and will develop all other sections of the grant funding report, including a description of the grant round process, identification of policy issues important for SRFB consideration, and a description of regional and local project development processes derived largely from the information provided by regions and lead entities.
**Funding Decisions**

The SRFB expects to make the funding decisions at the December 12-13, 2019 meeting. The SRFB will review the project lists, lead entity strategy summaries, regional input, reports from the review panel and staff, and public comments, including testimony at the funding meeting. The SRFB may or may not choose to fund “Projects of Concern.” If the applicant appeals a “Projects of Concern” to the SRFB and the project is not approved for funding, then the dollar amount will not remain in the target allocation for the lead entity. If the “Project of Concern” was anticipated to be funded with PSAR funds, then those funds would be returned to the region. If lead entities withdraw projects of concern before the deadline to submit the final lead entity ranked list then alternates may be considered for funding.
Section 5: Lead Entity and Recovery Region Instructions

In this section, the applicant will learn about the following:

✔ Application submission requirements
✔ Lead entity responsibilities
✔ Alternate projects
✔ Habitat Work Schedule
✔ Biennial option

Submission Requirements

Regional Area Submission Requirements

Regional areas must submit their Regional Area Summary Information, Appendix M, by September 6, 2019.

Lead Entity Submission Requirements

Lead entities are required to submit an annual ranked list via PRISM Online. After logging on to PRISM Online, click the “Salmon Ranked List” link under “My Options.” Only users identified as lead entity contacts will have this option in PRISM.

Select the appropriate lead entity and funding meeting date from the drop down list, and click “Show Project List.”
Applications that are in application status (not already funded), have been mapped, and are in the selected lead entity area, and should show automatically on the ranked list. Add projects to the list by using the “Add Project to List” button. Enter the project’s rank, as well as the amount of funding the lead entity would like to give to the project. In Puget Sound there will be separate columns for PSAR and SRFB funds. If the project will be an alternate, enter “0” in the proposed funding column. The Puget Sound Partnership will submit the ranked list for PSAR large capital projects. Only submit a project list with a PSAR large capital project on it if your lead entity is requesting SRFB or regular PSAR funding for the project.

Lead entities submit their ranked lists twice during the application process. Draft ranked lists are due August 15, 2019, and final ranked lists are due November 6, 2019. The final ranked lists are due after the SRFB Review Panel has reviewed projects, regional meetings have occurred, and the review panel has given each project a final status. Both the draft and final ranked lists should be entered under the December board meeting date in PRISM.

RCO will not accept changes to lead entities’ lists after November 6, 2019. The grant funding report will not incorporate any updates submitted after this date.

Lead entities must complete the following actions by August 15, 2019:

- Submit draft lead entity ranked lists via PRISM Online.
- Ensure all application data and attachments are entered into PRISM Online, and applications are submitted.
- Submit answers to Questions 4-5 of the Regional Area Summary Information (Appendix M) to the regional organization.

### Lead Entity Responsibilities

The SRFB is committed to providing the best possible investment in salmon recovery projects. It believes projects prioritized by citizen committees, aided by technical experts, and based on an understanding of watershed conditions and fish status, will provide the greatest benefits to salmon. Lead entity responsibilities in completing the SRFB grant
process are itemized throughout this manual. For a quick and easy reference, a summary of lead entity responsibilities is presented below.

- In collaboration with the regional organization (as applicable), coordinate technical and citizen committee meetings to assemble a ranked list of proposed projects from its area.

- Ensure all aspects of each project’s draft application and final application are complete, free of mathematical errors, and contain all *Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants* required attachments.

- Ensure that each project has a valid match, meets lead entity grant program criteria and guidelines, is consistent with the lead entity habitat strategy, is technically sound and complete, and meets SRFB eligibility requirements.

- Submit all completed draft application materials online via the Habitat Work Schedule/PRISM gateway at least 3 weeks before the SRFB Review Panel site visit.

- Schedule and coordinate site visits with SRFB staff, review panel, and project applicants.

- Ensure timely responses to SRFB Review Panel comments.

- Submit draft ranked list of projects and supporting application materials via PRISM by August 15, 2019. This list should be as close to the target allocation as possible. It may be useful to include alternate projects on the list, exceeding the target allocation (See “Project Alternates” below). A lead entity may identify longer lists to show the context of its work but should only enter into PRISM Online the projects it wants the SRFB to consider for funding.

- Submit final ranked list of projects via PRISM on or before November 6, 2019. No changes to the list will be accepted after this date. The grant funding report will not incorporate any updates submitted after this date.

- Work with the regional organization (as applicable) and RCO staff to develop regional summaries and respond to SRFB inquires.

- Work on post-funding awards with project sponsors and RCO staff to ensure timely transition from project application to project grant agreement.

- Work with sponsors, RCO, and regional organizations on amendments to funded (active) projects when necessary.

- If a project is not ready or the lead entity is unclear about the project’s benefits and certainty, the lead entity must resolve those issues with the applicant before submitting the application.
• After the application deadline, project scope changes may be made to meet final allocation targets. The local committees must consider whether significant scope changes would affect funding priorities and adjust project ranking as necessary. Lead entities should work with applicants and the grants manager to determine whether significant project scope changes require review by the regional area and the SRFB Review Panel.

# Project Alternates

A lead entity is encouraged to identify alternate projects on its funding list to receive additional dollars, should SRFB funds become available within a year of the board funding decision. These alternate projects must go through the entire lead entity, region, and SRFB review process.

Occasionally within a year of the original SRFB funding decision, portions of the lead entity allocation become available when funded projects are withdrawn or need fewer dollars (e.g. additional funding is received from other sources or a scope change causes costs to decrease). Within 1 year of the SRFB’s original funding decision, the RCO director is authorized to enter into project agreements for alternate projects or approve cost increase amendments that advance salmon recovery projects already reviewed by the SRFB Review Panel, and approved for funding by the SRFB.

If SRFB funds do become available within 1 year of the board funding decision, the lead entity shall work through its local funding approval process to identify and approve the projects to receive the available funding. The lead entity must submit its request to reallocate funds before the following SRFB funding meeting (i.e. 1 year from original funding date). When requesting reallocation of available funds, the lead entity shall submit a memo to its grants manager including the following information:

• Identify the project that originally was awarded SRFB funding and note how much funding is becoming available and why.

• Identify the projects and amount of available funding proposed for each. Options include the following:
  
  o Fully Fund: Fully fund projects partially funded by the SRFB, as long as the project agreement has not expired.
  
  o New Project Agreement: Fully fund alternate projects approved by the SRFB. Alternate projects do not necessarily need to be funded in ranked order.
  
  o Cost Increase: Propose a scope of work and cost estimate to add funds to an active project. The scope of work must be within the original scope of the project application reviewed by the SRFB Review Panel. For example, a
multi-site acquisition project uses additional funding to protect more habitat within the geographic envelope, a design project is able to use funds to advance design work beyond the original proposal, or a phased restoration project is able to expand construction of the current phase to include more river miles or additional riparian planting area.

The RCO grants manager will work with the lead entity and project sponsors to complete the necessary cost change amendments and/or prepare the new project agreement.

**Habitat Work Schedule**

The Habitat Work Schedule is an online database specifically designed for lead entities to manage salmon recovery information. It is a useful project management tool for project sponsors to track project implementation and for the public and other funders to learn about salmon recovery projects statewide.

RCO developed an interface between PRISM and the Habitat Work Schedule. The interface was created to simplify data entry in the two systems for the same project.

All PRISM project applications must be initiated from Habitat Work Schedule by the lead entity or applicant, as determined by each lead entity. When a PRISM application is created through the Habitat Work Schedule interface, a link is established between the two databases for that project. Then, the applicant completes the application in PRISM Online. Only projects considered for 2019 funding should be entered in PRISM.

For linked projects, both the Habitat Work Schedule and PRISM provide a quick view of select project summary data (status, funding, metrics, etc.) in the other system, without having to login. Data will be read-only unless viewed in the source system, and data protected by the user in either system cannot be viewed (i.e. private landowner information) in the other system.

Lead entities, regional salmon recovery organizations, and applicants are encouraged to attend Habitat Work Schedule training sessions.

**Shared Attachments: A Note of Caution**

RCO is responsible for documents associated with SRFB grant applications and funded projects. Attach all documents related to SRFB grants in PRISM, not the Habitat Work Schedule to prevent accidental deletion.

**Biennial Option**

A lead entity may conduct a “biennial grant round.” The 2018 Lean study identified this option as an opportunity to create efficiencies for the lead entity and review panel.
If a lead entity chooses to conduct a biennial grant round, it must approve a project list that includes projects intended to be funded with 2-year’s worth of funding. In year one, the lead entity would submit a ranked list that identifies the projects intended to be funded in the second year as “alternates.” In year two, the lead entity would re-submit its approved project list only showing the ranking and proposed funding for the remaining projects. The lead entity should notify RCO if its project list includes alternates that will apply towards 2 years of funding. In both years, the lead entity must submit responses to questions in Appendix M to the regions to explain their process.
Section 6: Managing SRFB Projects

In this section, the sponsor will learn about the following:

✓ Successful applicant workshops
✓ Understanding and amending the project agreement
✓ Being ready to go
✓ Sponsor resources
✓ Required control and tenure of project site
✓ Civil liability for landowners
✓ Restoration and design projects on state-owned aquatic land
✓ Grant reimbursement
✓ Reporting
✓ Permits and Endangered Species Act consultations
✓ Cultural resources review
✓ Project compliance inspections
✓ Project area stewardship and ongoing obligations
✓ Other requirements

Successful Applicant Workshops

RCO provides Web-based Successful Applicant Workshops to review project contracts, grant management responsibilities, and billing procedures. Contact RCO staff or visit the agency’s Web site.

Project Agreement

Board Approval Provisional

After approving a grant, the SRFB will enter into a contract, called a project agreement, implemented through RCO. SRFB approval of individual grants is provisional until execution of a formal project agreement. If for any reason the grant recipient is unable to implement the project in whole or part, the funds return to the SRFB for reallocation. For projects funded through the PSAR fund, the returned funds policy can be seen online.
Section 6: Managing a SRFB Grant

Project Agreement

After SRFB funding approval and before issuing a project agreement, successful project applicants are required to provide the following information to their RCO grants manager:

- A completed milestone worksheet (worksheet provided by RCO)
- A preliminary title report and Preliminary Title Report and Commitment Checklist (Manual 3, Acquisition Projects, Appendix K) for all properties planned for acquisition (acquisition projects only). Reach-scale, multi-property acquisition projects should provide material for their known priority parcels.
- A signed Landownership Certification Form (Appendix N) for all properties upon which design or implementation and construction of restoration projects are proposed. This form ensures that the applicant reviewed property information and that no existing deed restrictions, liens, easements, or other encumbrances would impede construction, operation, or maintenance of the project. RCO will waive this requirement if the applicant has not identified the property affected by the design.
- On receipt of the information, RCO staff prepares the project agreement and sends it to the applicant. Upon signature of the project agreement, an applicant becomes a project sponsor. RCO staff periodically verifies each project agreement for contractual compliance (Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations).

Applicants have up to 90 days after the SRFB approves a project to provide the required materials for staff to develop a project agreement, or the project may be terminated. Applicants then have no more than 90 days to sign the agreement, or the project may be terminated.

The agreement usually consists of the following:

- Application materials.
- Project start and end dates and key milestone dates (“Period of Performance”).
- Contractual issues–default, responsibilities, liability, etc.
- Special conditions, if applicable.

Sponsors must complete all deliverables described in their project agreements, as amended, within their agreement periods. RCO staff may consult with the SRFB Review Panel when reviewing compliance with grant agreement conditions.
For more information on the project agreement and a copy of a sample agreement, please refer to Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations.

**Conditioned Projects**

The sponsor must work with the grants manager to resolve the condition before completing the project or project phase, as described by the condition. The sponsor will provide any required submittals to the grants manager. RCO will assign appropriate review panel members to evaluate the sponsor’s submittals and apply relevant technical standards of practice to determine whether the sponsor adequately addressed the purpose of the condition. The grants manager will document the review panel’s acceptance of the sponsor’s response in the project file, and will communicate with the sponsor when they may proceed with the project.

**Open Public Records**

State law requires recipients of SRFB grants to agree contractually to disclose information about how they spend their grants. Sponsors must agree to disclose any information subject to the state’s Public Records Act.


**Project Agreement Amendments**

The project agreement may change with an amendment. RCO may authorize amendments for minor changes in scope and extensions to the project period. The RCO director or SRFB may authorize major changes in scope for acquisition, restoration, and planning projects. Make all amendment requests in writing and include detailed justification. Refer to Appendix O for more details. Please note that for most amendment requests the lead entity must obtain a decision from its technical and citizen committees. Some lead entities or regions may have a template required for amendment requests. In the absence of a lead entity required template, RCO has an amendment request template, which sponsors may use.

Refer to Manual 3, Acquisition Projects or Manual 5, Restoration Projects for a detailed description of information the sponsor must provide to the grants manager in the amendment request depending on the project type.

---

12 Any project sponsor receiving funding from the salmon recovery funding board that is not subject to disclosure under chapter 42.56 RCW must, as a mandatory contractual prerequisite to receiving the funding, agree to disclose any information in regards to the expenditure of that funding as if the project sponsor was subject to the requirements of chapter 42.56 RCW." [Revised Code of Washington 77.85.130(8)]
RCO staff may consult with the SRFB Review Panel when considering project amendment requests. Staff will seek review panel consultation in select cases to ensure that the amendment request meets the technical criteria for benefit to fish and certainty of success.

**Be Ready to Go**

All projects must be completed on time. RCO staff will work with sponsors to set progress milestones. The SRFB may terminate the grant or reduce the amount awarded if the sponsor does not meet key milestone dates or finish on time.

The SRFB cannot guarantee funding for projects that last longer than 2 years because re-appropriation of unspent funds requires legislative approval. Such re-appropriation requests will require evidence of progress.

**Time Extension Requests**

Notify the RCO grants manager and lead entity coordinator of any projected delays in meeting project milestones as soon as possible. Delays that affect the expected date of project completion require a time extension amendment to the contract. Extension requests must be in writing and provided to RCO no less than 60 days before expiration of the project’s completion date. Note that funded design projects with no match are not eligible for time extensions and must be complete within 18 months of funding date.

**Sponsor Resources**

Sponsors must abide by all RCO policies when implementing their projects. Please refer to Manual 3, Acquisition Projects, Manual 5, Restoration Projects, and Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations. Use Manual 8, Reimbursements for all billing instructions and forms. Download these forms from the RCO Web site or request them through the RCO grants manager.

An Acquisition Project Toolkit for Grant Sponsors is available to help sponsors manage their acquisition projects. The toolkit contains checklists, template letters and forms, and example documents.

**Checklists of project deliverables** for each project type are available on the RCO Web site to help the sponsor keep track of the status of required project deliverables.

Other important sponsor resources include the RCO Web site, where sponsors can find and download all grant manuals and relevant documents. The Web site also provides information on workshop trainings, the SRFB, schedules, and meeting materials.
RCO provides reimbursement trainings online. Successful Applicant Workshops are online or available on request.

**Required Control and Tenure of Project Site**

The SRFB intends that restoration and acquisition projects funded with its grants maintain their habitat value, integrity, and functionality over time. To help ensure this, the SRFB requires sponsors to have sufficient control and tenure of the project site and to review title information on the property to make sure that no encumbrances exist that would adversely affect the ability to implement and maintain the project as intended.

**Restoration Projects**

**Sponsor-Owned Property**

Sponsors of restoration projects on sponsor-owned property must provide the following:

- **Stewardship Plan.** Provide a stewardship plan with the final documentation at the close of the project. A plan ensures meeting the project objectives by maintaining and monitoring the site for at least 10 years from the project agreement completion date. Use the stewardship plan outline found in Appendix N.

- Invasive weed control projects also require a stewardship plan that outlines the long-term plans to ensure there is a plan in place that will meet the long-term goals of the project.

**Property Owned by Someone Else**

Sponsors of restoration projects on property owned by someone else must provide the following:

- **Washington Department of Natural Resource’s authorization to use state-owned aquatic lands,** if relevant. Please see the “Restoration and Design Projects on State-Owned Aquatic Lands” section below for more information. The Land Use License takes the place of the required landowner agreement for the project.

- **Landowner Agreement.** A signed landowner agreement must be provided to RCO before construction or before a sponsor is reimbursed for any construction expenses. The agreement is a document between the sponsor and the landowner that, at a minimum, allows the sponsor and RCO staff access to the site for project implementation, inspection, maintenance, and monitoring; clearly states that the landowner will not intentionally compromise the integrity of the project; and clearly describes and assigns all project monitoring and maintenance responsibilities. A landowner agreement remains in effect for a
minimum of 10 years from the date of final payment to the project sponsor. Use the SRFB’s Landowner Agreement (Appendix N) or other approved agreement formats (Note that other agreement formats must include all required elements and be approved by RCO before starting construction).

**Acquisition Projects**

Sponsors of acquisition projects must provide a stewardship plan in addition to those requirements described in Manual 3, Acquisition Projects. Provide the stewardship plan with the final documentation at the close of the project. A plan is necessary to ensure meeting the project objectives by maintaining and monitoring the site in perpetuity. Use the stewardship plan outline found in Appendix N.

**Civil Liability for Landowners**

In 2013, state law exempted landowners from civil liability for property damages resulting from habitat projects on their land. The law amends Revised Code of Washington 77.85.050, which is the salmon recovery law. The law provides specific information on what steps project sponsors and landowners must take to be covered by the exemption. See RCO’s salmon liability fact sheet on the new law.

**Restoration and Design Projects on State-Owned Aquatic Lands**

During the application process, applicants should consult with the Washington Department of Natural Resources to determine if the project is on state-owned aquatic lands. All marine waters are, by definition, navigable, as are portions of rivers influenced by tides. Navigable rivers and lakes are those determined by the judiciary, those bounded by meander lines, or those that could have been used for commerce at the time of statehood. The Department of Natural Resources’ aquatic land managers will help determine if the project is on state-owned aquatic lands and provide more information on the department’s authorization process. See the land manager coverage map online for the contact information of the department’s aquatics land manager in the area.

The Department of Natural Resources will review the full list of projects proposed for funding to ensure that all applicants with projects on state-owned aquatic lands consulted with the Department of Natural Resources and submitted a Landowner Acknowledgement Form.

Once funded, the Department of Natural Resources will work with sponsors on a potential authorization to use state-owned aquatic lands. This authorization may be a lease, an easement, or a right of entry. Whatever the form, the authorization is not a permit but a contract to use the land. The Department of Natural Resources is not a regulatory agency. The agency represents the owner of the lands, the State of
Washington, so the sponsor relationship with the department will be like any landowner impacted by the project. To apply for an authorization, complete the Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA) and JARPA Attachment E and forward the entire application to the Department of Natural Resources. It is best to submit the application early in the process so the Department of Natural Resources can work to address any design issues early.

Please note that the project may occur on trust lands managed by the Department of Natural Resources, which will require the sponsor to work with other divisions in the agency.

The following resources may be helpful to review:

- **Grant Projects on State-owned Aquatic Lands**
- Washington Department of Natural Resources PowerPoint: Working with WDNR on Implementing Restoration Projects on State-Owned Aquatic Lands
- **Leasing State-owned Aquatic Lands**
- **Boundaries of State-owned Aquatic Lands**
- **Caring for Washington’s Nearshore Environments**

### Grant Reimbursement

RCO pays sponsors through a reimbursement process. This means that sponsors will not receive a lump sum grant in advance. Sponsors must provide documentation for all expenditures before receiving compensation. RCO requires a minimum of one billing a year and a maximum of one a month. RCO Manual 8, Reimbursements describes RCO reimbursement policies and procedures. Reimbursement workshops are available online on the RCO Web site. Sponsors may download cash advance request forms, and view current reimbursement policies, audit information, current labor and mileage rates, and other financial information at RCO’s Getting Paid section of its Web site.

### Eligible Costs

All project costs and donations submitted for reimbursement or match must directly relate to the work identified in the grant agreement and be considered reasonable, necessary, and eligible. Itemized lists of eligible expenses can be found in Manual 3, Acquisition Projects, Manual 5, Restoration Projects, and Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations. Additional costs that may be eligible for SRFB-funded projects are described below.
Pre-Agreement Costs

Generally, RCO will not reimburse costs incurred before the project start date of the grant’s project agreement. However, certain pre-agreement costs within the project scope are eligible for reimbursement if approved by the grants manager in writing. Eligible pre-agreement costs include the following:

- Engineering and design costs for restoration projects (i.e. construction).
- Engineering and design costs (e.g. surveying, geotechnical, other data gathering) for planning projects.
- Costs necessary to determine control and tenure of the restoration site (e.g. preliminary title report).
- Costs necessary to establish land values for acquisition or conservation easement projects (e.g. survey, appraisals, title report).
- Acquisition projects granted a Waiver of Retroactivity.
- If cost-effective (i.e. materials are available at a reduced cost), the construction materials below and any associated transportation costs. RCO requires advance approval by the grants manager to reimburse pre-grant purchase of any of the construction materials listed below.
  - Large woody materials
  - Culverts
  - Bridges

The SRFB will not pay for purchases of land, construction materials and associated costs, or installation costs except those noted above, incurred before the project start date of the grant’s project agreement.

Attorney Fees

Reasonable attorney fees associated with restoration, planning, and combination projects may be an eligible administrative expense. Advance approval by the grants manager is required. Attorney fees will be considered in light of project type, transaction complexity, and demonstrated need. RCO will consider reimbursement of attorney fees when they relate to complicated landowner agreements. Provide justification for the expense in writing and receive approval from the RCO grants manager in advance of the expenditure. Eligibility will be determined case-by-case.
Liability Insurance

Liability insurance is a reimbursable administrative expense for salmon recovery restoration, planning, and combination projects. Sponsors may bill proportionally the cost of liability insurance to the project. Liability insurance expenses must directly relate to the completion of the SRFB-funded project.

Salmon Recovery Grant Cash Advance Policy

RCO recognizes that some sponsors may not have the cash flow needed to implement parts of approved projects. Short-term cash advances are available. Cash advances apply to planning (assessment/feasibility/design), restoration, and acquisition incidental expenses only. Follow the escrow process in PRISM Online for land purchases (fee simple or easement).

To comply with federal rules and state law, RCO established an advance policy for private entities and one for public/quasi-public entities. A public/quasi-public entity is defined as an entity established or authorized by law that would not constitute a private service provider under Revised Code of Washington 43.88.160(5)(e).

Please refer to Manual 8, Reimbursements for detailed information on cash advances.

Reporting

PRISM Metrics

RCO receives funding from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Marine Fisheres Service from the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund. RCO reports annually to NOAA Fisheries on the projects it funds with the information that sponsors provide through PRISM. Sponsors are required to provide project cost and scope metrics information at application, provide updates as the project is implemented, and verify or update all project metrics before project closing and receiving final reimbursement. Updating metrics is facilitated through the PRISM progress reports and final report for the project.

Progress Reporting

Sponsors are required to enter two progress reports a year for all funded projects using the PRISM online progress reporting tool. Progress reports are identified in the project agreement milestone dates. The progress report must answer the following five questions:

- Are there any significant challenges that might hinder progress on meeting the project milestones?
• What work was accomplished during the reporting period?

• Does the sponsor anticipate any changes to the project?

• What work is planned for the next reporting period?

• Does the sponsor anticipate the need to request an amendment to the project agreement in the next 6 months?

Progress reports for acquisition projects include questions about where the acquisition process stands for properties not yet acquired.

For restoration projects, sponsors must provide progress metrics on the work completed to date.

PRISM automatically e-mails the sponsor when a report is due. RCO staff can provide feedback on the report or ask for clarification of submitted information. The PRISM module tracks the progress reporting history and is available to lead entities and regions. For more information and training on the new PRISM online reporting tools see the RCO Web site.

**Final Report**

Sponsors are required to submit final reports in PRISM at the completion of their projects. Sponsors complete final reports in PRISM Online. Sponsors provide a final project description, narrative, and information about the scope and costs of the project. Sponsors will verify or update metrics reported through earlier progress reports and billings.

RCO staff can return a report to provide feedback or ask for clarification of the information submitted. RCO staff will determine whether any amendments will be required before closing a project.

The project agreement includes milestones for the PRISM final report due date. PRISM will automatically e-mail sponsors when the report is due. For more information and training on the new PRISM online reporting tools see the RCO Web site.

**Permits and Endangered Species Act Consultations**

Local, state, and federal permits are likely required for any activity that takes place in or around waters of the state, including habitat restoration projects. Sponsors must obtain all necessary local, state, and federal approvals and permits before construction and final payment. RCO may terminate a grant if the sponsor cannot, or does not, obtain necessary permits and land use approvals.
The type of project impacts generated and the location determine which permits are required. The Governor’s Office of Regulatory Assistance can help determine which permits are required. Its Web site provides access to an online project questionnaire and the Regulatory Handbook, which offers detailed information about environmental permits in Washington State. Staff at the office’s Information Center are available to help and can be reached at 1-800-917-0043 or help@oria.wa.gov. Contact the city or county in which the project is located for further information on required local permits. Appendix H of the Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines provides a broad overview of typical permits required for work in and around water.

Contact permitting agencies early in the project planning process to ensure that all necessary permits are obtained before work is scheduled to begin. This is especially important for large, complex, or higher risk projects and those using novel techniques. Early agency coordination decreases the likelihood of costly design modifications, construction delays, or project rejection, and can result in a more effective and less expensive project.

All permits require a review process that takes time to complete. Some reviews are relatively fast (less than a month) while others may take several months. Sponsors should carefully consider the time needed to complete the required permit process when developing project planning, design, and construction schedules, especially given the relatively short allowable work period for many types of in-stream construction projects. Besides time, many permits require fees. Fees may be either a flat rate or a percentage of the project’s total cost.

The most commonly required permit applications for stream habitat restoration projects are the Hydraulic Project Approval and the Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA). The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife accepts applications for Hydraulic Project Approvals through its online Aquatic Protection Permitting System. The JARPA is used to apply for select permits from other state, federal, and local agencies. Using the Aquatic Protection Permitting System, sponsors may submit Hydraulic Project Approval application materials, pay the application fee, and view the status of their submitted applications. In addition, sponsors can convert their Aquatic Protection Permitting System application into a draft JARPA with one click, then complete the JARPA outside of Aquatic Protection Permitting System and submit it to other permitting agencies that use the JARPA. Note that fish habitat enhancement projects that meet the criteria of Revised Code of Washington 77.55.181 may qualify for a streamlined Hydraulic Project Approval that exempts the project from local government permits and associated fees. Contact a Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife habitat biologist to verify the project qualifies.
Expedited Federal Endangered Species Act Consultations

The Endangered Species Act requires prior authorization of activities that may “take” (harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, collect, or attempt to do these things) threatened or endangered species listed under the Act. Recognizing that some projects are unlikely to “take” a significant level of at-risk species, federal agencies allow some SRFB grant recipients to follow an expedited process that meets Endangered Species Act review requirements and reduces cost, uncertainty, time, and permitting. Grant recipients may satisfy Endangered Species Act requirements via two pathways: Limit 8 or a Fish Passage and Restoration Programmatic Consultation. Sponsors may use these two pathways individually or in combination. The Streamlining Endangered Species Act Consultation fact sheet explains the process in detail, a brief description is listed below. For additional information on eligibility or process requirements, please contact RCO staff or Curtis McFeron, NOAA Fisheries, (360) 534-9309.

- **Limit 8.** This pathway only applies to threatened (not endangered) marine and anadromous species under the jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries. It does not cover freshwater (e.g. bull trout) or land species under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Limit 8, named for section 4(d) under which it was approved in the Endangered Species Act, requires sponsors to submit a one-page Self-Certification Form to their RCO grants managers (via PRISM) and to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (if a Corps permit is required). The Self-Certification Form certifies the project meets eligibility requirements of the state’s Habitat Restoration Program.

- **Fish Passage and Restoration Programmatic Consultation.** This pathway applies to all threatened and endangered species, but only applies to projects that require a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit (i.e. a Section 404 or Section 10 authorization). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and NOAA Fisheries each have an agreement with the U.S, Army Corps of Engineers that provides a mechanism for expedited consultation for qualifying fish passage and habitat restoration projects in Washington State. The two agreements have a similar purpose, but the covered categories of restoration actions and the required conservation measures in each agreement differ. Sponsors should carefully review the category descriptions, exclusions, and required conservation measures of the NOAA Fisheries Biological Opinion and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion during the project design phase to ensure they qualify. Qualifying sponsors must submit to the Corps detailed information describing their projects, their environments, and how their proposals meet the requirements of the

---

13 NOAA Fisheries manages marine and anadromous species, while the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service manages land and freshwater species. A list of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service-listed species that may occur near your project and some information on other species, including NOAA Fisheries-listed species, can be obtained at: https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/.
Biological Opinions, along with other permit application materials. Refer to the Corps’ permitting Web site for more detailed information on how to apply.

Note that projects that receive funding from Bonneville Power Administration, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or directly from NOAA Fisheries may qualify for additional expedited Endangered Species Act consultation pathways known as the Habitat Improvement Program and the Programmatic Restoration Opinion for Joint Ecosystem Conservation by the Services. Contact those other funding sources for more information.

Sponsors of projects that may affect a federally threatened or endangered species or their designated critical habitat, but do not qualify for expedited Endangered Species Act consultation, may require individual consultation. Contact the local U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service office and the NOAA Fisheries Geographical Branch Chief for more information and technical assistance to avoidtake.

### Cultural Resources Review

**Governor’s Executive Order 05-05.** Archaeological and Cultural Resources, directs state agencies to review certain acquisition and construction projects for potential impacts to cultural resources to ensure that reasonable action is taken to avoid adverse impacts to these resources. The federal government, through Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, requires the same compliance for projects with federal involvement, for example, projects on federal lands, with federal funds, or those that require a federal permit.

RCO facilitates review under the Governor’s executive order. The appropriate lead federal agency facilitates review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. If the federal review covers the entire RCO project area, there is no additional review required to meet state requirements. Both processes require review, analysis, and consultation with the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and affected Native American tribes for archaeological and cultural resources.

**Important Note:** Ground-disturbing activities for any project, regardless of project type, that occur before the completion of the cultural resources review process are not eligible for reimbursement. If the sponsor has a planning or acquisition project that will involve ground disturbance (such as geotechnical excavation, demolition, fencing installation, etc.) be sure to indicate these activities in the grant application and that the grants manager is aware of this work before going under agreement. This will help ensure the appropriate review is conducted for the project.

---

14Projects with no federal nexus (i.e. funding, permitting, occurring on federal land, or having other significant federal involvement) do not require Endangered Species Act consultation.

15Cultural resources means archeological and historical sites and artifacts, and traditional areas or items of religious, ceremonial, and social uses to affected tribes.
Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

If federal review is required to comply with Section 106 through federal land ownership, permitting, or funding, the sponsor must provide the grants manager with documentation that the review is completed before construction begins.

The Section 106 “Area of Potential Effect” must include all ground-disturbing activities subject to the project agreement, including the restoration staging area. The sponsor is encouraged to work with the federal permitting agency to align the Section 106 “Area of Potential Effect” with the scope of work in the project agreement. The sponsor should submit copies of cultural resources reports and federal permits indicating compliance with applicable laws.

If there are any activities or areas in the SRFB-funded project that are not covered by the Section 106 process, RCO must conduct cultural resources review for those items or areas to meet the review requirements in the executive order.

Other tribal coordination may be required outside of the Section 106 process; sponsors will need to work with their respective federal agencies.

05-05 Review Process

Using materials from the grant application, RCO consults with the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and affected Native American tribes. The materials provided include the Area of Potential Effect Map, which shows the geographic areas where a project may change directly or indirectly the character or use of historic properties or archaeological resources.

Sponsors may not disturb the ground within the project area until after receiving a notice to proceed from RCO, which sometimes might be in the project agreement with RCO.

All consultation through Executive Order 05-05 for SRFB projects is initiated by RCO and will involve the applicant, Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and affected tribes. The outcome of the initial consultation step may require an applicant to complete a cultural resources survey and then consultation continues. RCO must complete consultation before any ground-disturbing activities may occur.

The costs for cultural resources review and survey are eligible for reimbursement and may be included in the grant agreement.

State Agencies

State agency sponsors have the responsibility to ensure compliance with cultural resources requirements, either through Section 106 or as lead through Executive Order
05-05. RCO will not initiate review or consultation for projects sponsored by another state agency. Before initiating any ground-disturbing activities, the state agency sponsor must submit evidence of completion of the appropriate cultural resource review process to RCO. RCO will provide a notice to proceed.

**Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife-Managed Lands**

For projects that are carried out on land managed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the department replaces RCO as the lead agency for cultural resource consultation. The department is required to manage cultural resources consistent with state and federal laws, and has developed its own guidelines for meeting these requirements and ensuring appropriate management of cultural resources.

Project sponsors must work within the Restoration Pathway to initiate their projects. The Restoration Pathway outlines a process to guide decisions and interactions with internal and external stakeholders when conducting restoration projects. Project sponsors should be prepared to work with the department’s regional staff to meet these guidelines. Regional staff contact information can be found online.

The department’s manager of the State Lands Division is the only person authorized to sign standard RCO control and tenure documents and access permits. To ensure there are no delays with your project, make sure all project control and tenure documents have been reviewed and signed appropriately and budget time for this review. These documents include RCO’s Landowner Acknowledgement and Landowner Agreement Forms, and right of entry permits, as required by your project type.

**Amendments Triggering Cultural Resources Review**

During the progress of the project, the sponsor may request a scope change, which could change the project work site or project activities. If the worksite expands or if the new work proposed adds (rather than reduces) the amount of construction required to implement the project, these new elements must undergo cultural resources review before implementation. Failure to get cultural resources review for these items will make those activities ineligible for reimbursement.

**If Cultural Resources are Discovered during Construction**

If archaeological or historic materials are discovered after ground-disturbing activities begin, stop work immediately where the item is found, secure the area, and notify the following tribal governments and state agencies:

- RCO

- Concerned Native American tribes’ cultural resources staff and cultural committees
• Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

If human remains are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, immediately stop work in the vicinity of the finding, secure the area, and notify the groups listed below in the most expeditious manner possible, in compliance with state law.16

• RCO
• Concerned Native American tribes’ cultural resources staff and cultural committees
• Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
• County coroner
• Local law enforcement

Section 8 of the RCO grant contract includes Inadvertent Discovery Protocol language. Refer to the contract for specific instructions. Work likely may be able to continue in other areas on the project site if a discovery has been made. Work with the grants manager to determine the best course of action.

**Project Compliance Inspections**

RCO staff may visit each project one or more times as follows:

• Before the grant is awarded (made during the application phase, normally with the sponsor).

• While the project is underway.

• When the project is completed.

• Any time after the project is complete. Periodic inspections ensure the site is as described in the project agreement.

**Project Area Stewardship and Ongoing Obligations**

An RCO grant comes with long-term obligations to maintain and protect the project area after a project is complete. “Project area” means the area consistent with the geographic limits of the scope of work of the project. For restoration projects, the project area must include the physical limits of the project’s final site plans or final design plans. For

---

16Inadvertent Discovery of Human Skeletal Remains on Non-Federal and Non-Tribal Land in the State of Washington (Revised Codes of Washington 68.50.645, 27.44.055, and 68.60.055)
acquisition projects, the project area must include the area described by the legal description of the properties acquired in the project. The long-term obligations for the salmon program are in Washington Administrative Code 420-12-085 for restoration projects, Washington Administrative Code 420-12-080 for acquisition projects, Section 23 of the project agreement, and Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations. A template of the project agreement can be found in Manual 7.

RCO recognizes that changes occur over time and that some acquisitions may become obsolete or the land needed for something else. The law discourages casual discards of land and facilities by ensuring that grant recipients replace the lost value when changes or conversions of use take place.

In general, the project area funded with an RCO grant must remain dedicated to the use as originally funded, such as for salmon recovery purposes, for as long as defined in the project agreement. For acquisition projects, that period is perpetual. For restoration projects, the ongoing obligation is a minimum of 10 years from the date of project closure or more as specified in the landowner agreement (or stewardship plan for sponsor-owned project areas).

A conversion occurs when the project area acquired, developed, or restored with RCO grants is used for purposes other than what it was funded for originally. See RCO Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations for a discussion of conversions and the process required for replacement of the public investment. Non-compliance with the long-term obligations for an RCO grant may jeopardize an organization’s ability to obtain future RCO grants.

**Prohibited Uses on SRFB-funded Properties**

Some activities on properties purchased with SRFB funds may not be allowed throughout the life of a project even after funding has been reimbursed or after a project is complete. Check with RCO staff if any of the activities identified below, are being considered now or in the future.

- Construction of new buildings, structures, or indoor facilities.
- Operation of fish hatcheries or hydropower facilities.
- Installation of permanent net pens, artificial rearing facilities, remote site incubation systems, and supplementation.
- Use of existing structures that are not essential to the functions or operation and maintenance of the funded site. Non-essential structures must be removed or demolished.

Other activities not listed above **must be reviewed under RCO’s Allowable Uses Framework** in Manual 7, Long-Term Obligations.
Specific Allowed Uses on SRFB-Funded Properties

Fish Acclimation

Acclimation ponds for rearing juvenile fish species are not eligible for SRFB funds or match, but may be allowed on SRFB-funded properties under the following conditions:

- Fish acclimation occurs in a natural pond, wetland, or stream channel (off-channel or side channel).
- No earth moving, water diversion, or substantial alteration to the existing habitat conditions is conducted. Efforts are taken to use the least impactful methods to achieve project goals; any impacts are mitigated post-project.
- Proposed use is consistent with the terms of existing SRFB conservation easement between the sponsor and landowner and approved by the conservation easement holder, where applicable.
- The salmon recovery region or lead entity reviewed and approved the supplementation proposal for consistency with the salmon recovery plan.
- Listed species are not harmed or negatively affected.
- Use of the project site will not impair stream, riparian, or wetland habitat.
- The acclimation period is short-term (typically less than 90 days) and all acclimation-related infrastructure is removed after juveniles are released each season.
- RCO grants manager has approved specific acclimation activities.

Requests for acclimation ponds that do not meet the criteria above must be reviewed under RCO’s Allowable Uses Framework.

Land Conveyances to the Federal Government

At times, land purchased with a SRFB grant may transfer to the federal government for free or in exchange for similar property. In these instances, RCO will use the following process:17

17Revised Code of Washington 77.85.130(7) states that: (7) Property acquired or improved by a project sponsor may be conveyed to a federal agency if: (a) The agency agrees to comply with all terms of the grant or loan to which the project sponsor was obligated; or (b) the board approves: (i) Changes in the terms of the grant or loan, and the revision or removal of binding deed of right instruments; and (ii) a memorandum of understanding or similar document ensuring that the facility or property will retain, to the extent feasible,
1. Sponsor notifies RCO of the intent to convey land to a federal agency.

2. The RCO grants manager assists in the development of an agreement mechanism to ensure parties consider the appropriate level and scope of habitat protections.

3. Sponsor submits a draft agreement to RCO.

4. SRFB Review Panel conducts a technical review and assessment of the proposed substitute habitat protections.

5. RCO grants manager and policy staff review the agreement to determine if all criteria were addressed and if the agreement is ready to present to the SRFB.

6. Staff presents the conveyance request to the SRFB at a public meeting with opportunity for public comment.

7. The SRFB may take the following actions:
   - Approve the conveyance and associated habitat protections as presented.
   - Provide additional guidance and request a revised proposal.
   - Deny the proposed conveyance.

If the terms of the original grant were revised, the following criteria must be met to meet the statutory requirement of Revised Code of Washington 77.85.130(7)(ii):

1. The SRFB-funded property must be conveyed in its entirety.

2. The sponsor cannot receive compensation in any form for the conveyance, unless receiving a property of equal or greater conservation value, including species and habitat, (than the conveyed property) that will remain protected in perpetuity.

3. The conveyance agreement must include the original grant conditions except where those conditions are contrary to federal law or policy. In those instances, as directed by the statute, the draft agreement must identify substitute habitat protections.

4. Substitute protections must fully meet or exceed goals and objectives of the original project and result in the outcomes intended in the original grant. If substitute protections cannot be ensured to fully meet or exceed the goals and objectives of the original grant, other benefits to the targeted species, habitat, or adequate habitat protections; and (c) the appropriate legislative authority of the county or city with jurisdiction over the project area approves the transfer and provides notification to the board.
ecosystem functions must be provided that outweigh the potential loss of protection.

5. Substitute protections or other intended benefits of the conveyance must support salmon recovery and produce sustainable and measurable benefits for fish and their habitat.

6. Substitute habitat protections must do the following:
   - Apply to the full parcel of land funded by the SRFB.
   - Be long term or in perpetuity, if possible under federal law and policy.
   - Support those habitat and other ecosystem functions necessary to survival and health of the target species identified in the original grant.
   - Be legally enforceable.

7. There must be a low likelihood that future uses on the land will not be conservation-oriented or contrary to the original grant conditions. Measures of future uses include but are not limited to commercial value and resource extraction value.

8. The proposed management plan should provide equal or greater stewardship of conservation values than that intended in the original grant.

9. Agreement must clearly identify remedies in law, statute, and contract terms.

10. Agreement mechanism must be legally enforceable with known remedies.

Other Things to Know

Veterans Conservation Corps

The Department of Veterans Affairs created the Veterans Conservation Corps and maintains a list of veterans with an interest in working on environmental restoration projects. RCO encourages sponsors to incorporate veterans into projects when possible. For additional information about this program, contact the Veterans Conservation Corps coordinator, (360) 725-2224.

Signs

Unless waived by RCO, post signs or appropriate media acknowledging the SRFB funding contribution during the project period and at future entrances. Projects receiving funding from the PSAR should acknowledge that source as well. Projects in which posting is
impossible due to circumstances out of the control of the sponsor, like restoration, are exempt from this requirement. RCO provides small signs with the SRFB logo for sponsors to use on project sites. The Puget Sound Partnership provides those receiving PSAR grants with communication materials. Additional materials may be available. Please contact the PSAR program manager or an ecosystem recovery coordinator, see Appendix A for contact information.

**Invasive Species**

The Washington Invasive Species Council developed protocols for preventing the spread of invasive species while working in the field. The SRFB encourages grant recipients to consider how their projects may spread invasive species, and work to reduce that possibility. Invasive species can be spread unintentionally during restoration activities. Here is how it could happen:

Here is how it could happen:

- Driving a car or truck to a field site and moving soil embedded with seeds or fragments of invasive plants in the vehicle's tires to another site. New infestations can begin miles away as the seeds and fragments drop off the tires and the undercarriage of the vehicle.

- Sampling streams and moving water or sediment infested with invasive plants, animals, or pathogens via boots, nets, sampling equipment, or boats from one stream to another.

- Moving weed-infested hay, gravel, or dirt to a new site, carrying the weed seeds along with it, during restoration and construction activities. Before long, the seeds germinate, and infest the new site.

The key to minimizing the spread of new invasive species into a restoration site or existing invasive species beyond the restoration site is twofold: Use materials that are known to be uninfested with invasive plants or animals in the restoration project and ensure equipment is cleaned both before and after construction and restoration. Equipment to clean should include, but not be limited to, footwear, gloves, fishing equipment, sampling equipment, boats and their trailers, and vehicles and tires.
Appendix A: Salmon Recovery Contacts

This information is current as of February 2019. For the most recent contact information for SRFB staff, regional organizations, and lead entities visit the [RCO Web site](#).

### Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region
Regional Organization: Hood Canal Coordinating Council  
Executive Director: **Scott Brewer**  
(360) 531-0575  
17791 Fjord Drive, Suite 122  
Poulsbo, WA 98370-8481  
[Web site](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Lead Entity Contact</th>
<th>RCO Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hood Canal Coordinating Council | 14*, 15*, 16, 17* | **Alicia Olivas**  
(360) 271-4722 | **Josh Lambert**  
(360) 867-8781 |
| North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon** | 17*, 18, 19 | **Cheryl Baumann**  
(360) 417-2326 | **Kat Moore**  
(360) 867-8426 |

### Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region
Regional Organization: Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board  
Executive Director: **Steve Manlow**  
mailto:jbreckel@lcfrb.gen.wa.us  
(360) 425-1553  
2127 8th Avenue  
Longview WA 98632  
[Web site](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Lead Entity Contact</th>
<th>RCO Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Klickitat County** | 29* | **Jacob Anderson**  
(509) 773-2353 | **Dave Caudill**  
(360) 867-8573 |
| Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board | 24*, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29* | **Steve Manlow**  
(360) 425-1553 | **Josh Lambert**  
(360) 867-8781 |

### Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region
Regional Organization: Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board  
Executive Director: **Alex Conley**  
(509) 453-4104  
1200 Chesterly Drive, Suite 280  
Yakima, WA 98902  
[Web site](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Lead Entity Contact</th>
<th>RCO Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Klickitat County** | 29*, 30, 31 | **Jacob Anderson**  
mailto:davem@co.klickitat.wa.us  
(509) 773-2353 | **Dave Caudill**  
(360) 867-8573 |
| Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board | 37*, 38, 39 | **Tricia Snyder**  
(509) 453-4104 | **Kay Caromile**  
(360) 867-8532 |
### Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region

Regional Organization: Kalispel Tribe  
Lead Entity Coordinator: Mike Lithgow  
(509) 447-7245  
P.O. Box 39  
Usk, WA 99180

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Lead Entity Contact</th>
<th>RCO Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Mike Lithgow</td>
<td>Dave Caudill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Entity</td>
<td></td>
<td>509-447-7435</td>
<td>(360) 867-8573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region

Regional Organization: Puget Sound Partnership  
Salmon Recovery Program Manager: Laura Blackmore, (360) 628-7707  
P.O. Box 40900  
Olympia, WA 98504-0900  

Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Program Manager: Suzanna Stoike, (360) 701-4604  
P.O. Box 40900  
Olympia, WA 98504-0900  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Lead Entity Contact</th>
<th>RCO Staff</th>
<th>Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Suzanna Smith</td>
<td>Elizabeth Butler</td>
<td>Laura Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Entity</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 477-4641</td>
<td>(360) 902-3009</td>
<td>(360) 819-3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood Canal Coordinating Council</td>
<td>14*, 15*, 16, 17*</td>
<td>Alicia Olivas</td>
<td>Josh Lambert</td>
<td>Erin Ryan-Penuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dawn Pucci</td>
<td>Marc Dubois</td>
<td>Laura Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(360) 678-7916</td>
<td>(360) 302-3137</td>
<td>(360) 819-3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington/ Cedar/ Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8)</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>Jason Wilkinson</td>
<td>Elizabeth Butler</td>
<td>Laura Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Entity</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 477-4786</td>
<td>(360) 902-3009</td>
<td>(360) 819-3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ashley Von Essen</td>
<td>Ame Pほう</td>
<td>Dan Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(360) 456-5221 Ext. 2145</td>
<td>(360) 725-3943</td>
<td>(360) 789-3165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon</td>
<td>17*, 18, 19</td>
<td>Cheryl Baumann</td>
<td>Kat Moore</td>
<td>Erin Ryan-Penuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>10*, 12</td>
<td>Lisa Spurrier</td>
<td>Dave Caudill</td>
<td>Dan Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(253) 798-6158</td>
<td>(360) 902-2649</td>
<td>(360) 789-3165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan County Salmon Recovery Lead Entity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sam Whitridge</td>
<td>Kat Moore</td>
<td>Laura Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(360) 370-7593</td>
<td>(360) 902-0210</td>
<td>(360) 819-3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Watershed Council</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>Richard Brocksmith</td>
<td>Marc Dubois</td>
<td>Erin Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(360) 419-9326</td>
<td>(360) 902-3137</td>
<td>(360) 819-0420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Lead Entity Contact</th>
<th>RCO Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish Basin Lead Entity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gretchen Glaub (425) 330-0311</td>
<td>Erin Murray (360) 819-0420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillaguamish River</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kit Crump (425) 388-3464 Ext. 4658</td>
<td>Erin Murray (360) 819-0420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aime Bahr (360) 725-3943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sound Watersheds Council</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>Kirvie Mesebelu-Yobech (360) 337-7014</td>
<td>Laura Ferguson (360) 819-3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIA 1 Watershed Management Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lisa Wilson (360) 312-2298</td>
<td>Marc Dubois (360) 902-3137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Amy Hatch-Winecka (360) 741-2524</td>
<td>Dan Calvert (360) 789-3165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>Daniel Bauder (360) 427-9436 Ext. 110</td>
<td>Dan Calvert (360) 789-3165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIA 1 Watershed Management Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lisa Wilson (360) 312-2298</td>
<td>Marc Dubois (360) 902-3137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Amy Hatch-Winecka (360) 741-2524</td>
<td>Dan Calvert (360) 789-3165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>Daniel Bauder (360) 427-9436 Ext. 110</td>
<td>Dan Calvert (360) 789-3165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Organization: Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Executive Director: Melody Kreimes (509) 888-0321</th>
<th>415 King Street Wenatchee, WA 98801 Web site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Entity WRIA Lead Entity Contact RCO Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board</td>
<td>44, 45, 46, 48, 50 Pete Teigen 509-662-4710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Snake River Salmon Recovery Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Organization: Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Executive Director: John Foltz (509) 382-4115</th>
<th>410B East Main Street Dayton, WA 99328 Web site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Entity WRIA Lead Entity Contact RCO Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River Salmon Recovery Board</td>
<td>32, 33, 35 Ali Fitzgerald (509) 382-4115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Washington Coast Salmon Recovery Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Lead Entity Contact</th>
<th>RCO Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chehalis Basin Lead Entity</td>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>Kirsten Harma (360) 488-3232</td>
<td>Alissa Ferrell (360) 867-8618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pacific Coast Lead Entity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Frank Hanson (360) 374-4560</td>
<td>Alice Rubin (360) 867-8584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willapa Bay Lead Entity</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>Tom Kollasch (360) 875-6735</td>
<td>Alice Rubin (360) 867-8584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinault Indian Nation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bill Armstrong (360) 276-8215 Ext. 240</td>
<td>Alice Rubin (360) 867-8584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates a partial Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA)

**Indicates the lead entity is part of the salmon recovery region, but not part of the regional organization
Appendix B: Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Fund

The Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) program was created in 2007 to help implement the most important habitat protection and restoration priorities for Puget Sound. Funding is appropriated by the Legislature, allocated through the SRFB, and jointly managed by the Puget Sound Partnership and RCO. Since inception, it has supported more than $167 million of projects and has helped develop and sustain a system of partners working towards recovery targets within their communities. The Partnership works with local lead entities to identify and prioritize projects.

2019-2021 Funds

It is anticipated that the Legislature will fund PSAR in 2019-21. The purpose and intent of these funds is to accelerate implementation of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan and contribute to Puget Sound recovery.

For the 2019-21 biennium the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council will award the first $30 million in PSAR funds to watersheds using a strategic allocation formula to advance projects that ensure that every watershed in Puget Sound makes significant progress toward recovery. This first $30 million in funding is referred to as “PSAR regular round” funding. The projects funded with PSAR regular round funding were submitted and reviewed through the 2018 SRFB grant round and pre-approved by the SRFB in December 2018.

The recovery council will award any funding in excess of $30 million to its list of strategic, high-priority, large capital projects in rank order. This funding is referred to as “PSAR large capital” funding. Puget Sound lead entities proposed these large capital projects through the same process as PSAR regular round and SRFB projects in 2018. Lead entities and the SRFB Review Panel evaluate the large capital projects, a panel of experts rank and prioritize the projects, and the recovery council reviews and recommends approval, and the Puget Sound Leadership Council approves the ranked list. SRFB pre-approved the final list of PSAR large capital projects in December 2018 for 2019-21 biennium funding.
A project may have PSAR funding and state or federal (Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund) funding as long as they are not used to match each other. PRISM will track each fund separately to ensure the SRFB and partners can account for the use of the money.

**Process**

The 2019 grant round will not include projects proposed for new PSAR funding. The PSAR program runs on even years every biennium. The next grant round to submit applications for PSAR funding is 2020. RCO and the Partnership anticipate changes to the 2020 grant round based on results from the 2018 Lean study. These changes will be outlined in the 2020 version of Manual 18 anticipated later in 2019.

**Role of the SRFB Review Panel**

PSAR projects, both regular and large capital, will be technically reviewed following the same process used to review SRFB projects.

**Allocation Method**

Before each biennium, the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council recommends and the Puget Sound Leadership Council approves allocation percentages that prioritize watersheds based on the NOAA delisting criteria in the *Puget Sound Chinook Recovery Plan*. In 2018, the council asked lead entities to develop their proposed ranked project lists with an assumption, as a starting point, that the base amount for the regular round will be $30 million. Lead entities were encouraged to add a reasonable number of alternate projects to their lists if they have additional high priority projects in their strategies that are ready to move forward.

If a lead entity does not have enough projects to fully obligate its entire allocation, it may contribute funding to projects in other lead entities in Puget Sound. The project which receives the contribution must be included on both lead entity’s project lists (both the lead entity receiving the funding and the lead entity providing the funding). This ensures funding goes to those areas in need and responds to the yearly variations in project lists. RCO and the Partnership will not adjust a lead entity’s allocation based on these contributions to other lead entities as has been done in the past. Instead, a lead entity must include the project(s) it would like to contribute funding toward on its own approved ranked list.

Provided in the table below is the allocation percentage by lead entity approved by the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council and Puget Sound Leadership Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Recovery Units</th>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>Allocation %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nooksack</td>
<td>WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Fund

### Project Eligibility: Design Requirements and Phased Projects

PSAR projects must meet the same eligibility requirements as SRFB projects described in Section 2 of this manual. PSAR large capital projects also must meet the same eligibility requirements as SRFB projects, in addition to the Request for Proposal criteria listed below. PSAR funding must directly support implementing capital projects.

For larger restoration projects (where sponsors request $250,000 or more in funding) applicants are required to submit preliminary designs as part of their final applications.

For detailed information on the large capital program, see the Puget Sound Partnership’s Web site.

### Match

There is a 15 percent match required for PSAR regular projects except for design-only projects that request $200,000 or less and are completed in 18 months. There is no set match level requirement for PSAR large capital projects; however, projects that have...
match receive additional points during the scoring and ranking process dependent upon the amount of match provided. A project may be funded with both SRFB and PSAR funds; however those funds may not be used as match to each other.

**Funding Timeline**

PSAR funds approved by the Legislature in 2019 must be spent by June 30, 2023. All projects must be under agreement within 180 days from the funding date. Construction should commence within 1 year of the funding date or the next available fish window.

**Returned Funds**

**Regional Funds**

If an approved PSAR regular project cannot be implemented due to a change in circumstances or is completed under budget within the allowable timeframe, funds will return as PSAR funds (not Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funds) and used as follows:

- Within the same lead entity to another approved PSAR project, if it can be expended within the allowable timeframe (before funding expires). This reallocation of funds must be approved through the lead entity approval process.

- Returned to the region to fund another lead entity requesting funds to complete an approved PSAR project if it can be implemented within the allowable timeframe.

Returned funds are made available to other lead entity projects on a first come, first served basis. If the funds are not immediately needed by the project, an approved request will be placed on hold and other requests will receive priority. Any changes to scope or budget from the original returned fund request will require additional approval from the Partnership and RCO and will move the request to the bottom of the list.

For sponsors seeking returned funds, see the section below titled “Process for Cost Increases Using Returned Funds” to ensure project eligibility.

**PSAR Large Capital Funds**

If an approved large capital project cannot be implemented due to a change in circumstances or is completed under budget within the allowable timeframe, funds will return as PSAR funds (not SRFB or Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funds) and used as follows:

1. For SRFB-approved PSAR large capital projects that still need additional funding or that have unanticipated cost increases.
A. All cost increase requests will need to go through the standard SRFB cost increase request process (see SRFB Amendment Request Authority Matrix).

B. Return funds will be awarded to projects that can demonstrate the need for additional funds beginning with the highest ranked project in the approved PSAR large capital project list from the same biennium the return funds were generated from.

2. If all SRFB-approved large capital projects from the same biennium that the return funds came from do not need additional funds for completion, the return funds can then be applied as follows:

A. If the recovery council and Leadership Council have approved the next biennium’s PSAR large capital project list, then the funds will be applied to those projects in rank order. Funds can be used to defray cost increases to those approved projects or to fund projects below the original funding line.

B. If the recovery council and Leadership Council have not yet approved the next biennium’s large capital project list, then the funds may be applied to an approved PSAR regular project that is a high priority and urgently in need of additional funds.

In certain cases, the recovery council and Leadership Council may make an exception to this policy and also approve the use of large capital return funds for unanticipated cost increases to an approved PSAR regular project that is a high priority and urgently in need of additional funds or for a large capital project from a previous biennium.

Puget Sound Partnership staff will seek approval from the recovery council and Leadership Council about a proposed use of return funds. If any recovery council or Leadership Council member cannot accept the proposal, they may block it. If this occurs, Puget Sound Partnership staff will convene a meeting quickly to resolve the decision.

**Process for Cost Increases using Returned Funds**

Cost overruns must receive Puget Sound Partnership and RCO approval and are subject to criteria outlined above. Project requests use the cost amendment process outlined in Appendix O. The recovery council may recommend that the Leadership Council make any significant policy decisions regarding management of funds for the large capital list, similar to a lead entity citizen’s committee decision-making authority for managing regular round funds in a lead entity prioritized project list.

If a lead entity cannot use returned funds within the allowable timeframe (see table below), these funds may pool into a Puget Sound regional fund to address cost increases for PSAR projects in areas where lead entities have no PSAR funds available to complete
those projects. These regional funds will be limited to completing projects within their existing scopes, via a process described in detail below.

In all cases, cost increase requests must adhere to the SRFB amendment process and will use Appendix O. Funding for cost increases for projects in Puget Sound lead entities will come from the following sources in the following order:

1. Unobligated PSAR funds from a lead entity. If the lead entity does not have any unobligated funds then,

2. Returned PSAR funds, which the Puget Sound Partnership controls. If the Puget Sound Partnership does not have any returned funds to disperse, then,

3. The sponsor may wait until returned funds are available or request a cost increase through the regular grant round process.

**To request returned funds from the region, please complete the Amendment Template and provide it to the Partnership and your lead entity coordinator.**

Projects that have any combination of PSAR funds must use PSAR funding for cost increases, and are not eligible for cost increases from SRFB (i.e. salmon state funding or salmon federal funding).

RCO developed a database tool in PRISM that allows lead entities, the region, and others to track the disposition of PSAR funds in each watershed in real time. This tool will assist lead entities in determining the availability of returned funds and whether those funds can be applied to other PSAR projects in their watersheds.

All funds must be expended within 4 years of the date on which the funds were appropriated; the 2017-19 allocation, for example, must be expended by June 30, 2021 (see table below). Time extensions will be allowed on a case-by-case basis and must be approved by the Puget Sound Partnership and RCO. Funds not expended by lead entities within the allowable timeframe and via the processes described above will pool into a regional fund allocated by the Puget Sound Partnership, in coordination with RCO, for cost increases. The Partnership will allocate regional return funds to projects that meet the following criteria:

- On the watershed’s 4-year work plan.
- Reviewed and approved by the SRFB and the lead entity.
- Accompanied with a detailed justification for cost increase (following standard SRFB amendment process).
- Time sensitive.
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- Unable to pull funds from elsewhere to make up the difference.
- Lead entity has no additional money from the PSAR fund available.

Approved policies from the Puget Sound Partnership can be found on its Web site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of Returned Funds</td>
<td>Regular Funds: PSP</td>
<td>Regular Funds: PSP</td>
<td>Regular Funds: Lead Entity</td>
<td>Regular Funds: Lead Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned Funds: PSP</td>
<td>Large Capital Funds: PSP</td>
<td>Large Capital Funds: PSP</td>
<td>Large Capital Funds: PSP</td>
<td>Large Capital Funds: PSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expire June 30 of</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All funds carrying over to subsequent biennia are subject to legislative approval.

Process for Requesting a Time Extension (PSAR Only)

Projects funded through the PSAR needing time extensions, notify your RCO grants manager of any projected delays in meeting project milestones as soon as possible. Delays that affect your expected date of project completion require a time extension amendment to your contract. Extension requests must be in writing and provided to RCO no less than 60 days before expiration of the project’s completion date. Only projects seeking time extensions beyond the 4 year timeframe of funding require approval by Partnership staff. Note that design projects with no match are not eligible for time extensions and must be complete within 18 months of funding date.

Rapid Response Fund

The Puget Sound Partnership has created a fund for urgent and essential strategic habitat acquisitions within the Puget Sound. Please note, this funding source is NOT to support cost overruns or projects that could be considered in upcoming grant rounds.

View the Partnership’s Web site for more information on the Rapid Response Fund.
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Applicants must submit projects from the Habitat Work Schedule to PRISM to start the application process. Once the projects are in PRISM, applicants will need to complete their online applications and attach required documents for their project types.

All projects are required to have a project proposal, templates of which follow. To download a form where the sponsor may enter information, visit the RCO Web site.
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List all related projects previously funded or reviewed by RCO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project # or Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status of Prior Phase Deliverables and Relationship to Current Proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the previous project did not receive funding, describe how the current proposal differs from the original.

Please respond to each question individually. Do not summarize answers collectively in essay format. Local citizen and technical advisory groups will use this information to evaluate the project. **Limit your response to ten pages (single-sided)**. The sponsor may delete the italicized portion of the questions and inapplicable supplemental questions to shorten the proposal.

Submit this proposal as a PRISM attachment titled “Project Proposal.”

NOTE: Applicants submitting fish barrier inventory projects should read the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Diversion Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual to understand data collection methods and protocols, and to assist with preparation of this project proposal.

1. **Project brief.** In one or two sentences, what do you propose to do?

2. **Project location.** Describe the geographic location, water bodies, and the location of the project in the watershed, i.e. nearshore, tributary, main stem, off-channel, etc.

3. **Problem statement.** What are the problems your project seeks to address? Include the source and scale of each problem. Describe the site, reach, and watershed
conditions. Describe how those conditions impact salmon populations. Include current and historic factors important to understand the problems.

4. **List the fish resources present at the site and targeted by the project.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Life History Present (egg, juvenile, adult)</th>
<th>Current Population Trend (decline, stable, rising)</th>
<th>Endangered Species Act Coverage (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Describe the limiting factors and limiting life stages (by fish species) that the project expects to address.**

6. **Project goals and objectives.** When answering the questions below please refer to Chapter 4 of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines for more information on goals and objectives.

   **A. What are the project goals?** The goal of the project should be to remedy observed problems, ideally by addressing the problems’ root causes. Goal statements should articulate desired biological outcomes (vision for desired future condition) and what species, life stages, and time of year (if pertinent) will benefit from those outcomes.

   **Goal example:** Improve juvenile and adult fish passage in the Salmon Creek watershed.

   **B. What are the project objectives?** Objectives support and refine goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve stated goals. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound).

   **Objective example:** Improve information to help select priority fish passage projects that have a high certainty and benefit by updating and prioritizing fish barriers at public and private road crossings within two years of funding.

   **C. What are the assumptions and constraints that could impact whether the sponsor achieves the objectives?** Assumptions and constraints are external conditions that are not under the direct control of the project, but directly influence the outcome of the project. These may include subsequent availability of funding, public acceptance of the project, land use constraints, geomorphic factors, additional expenses, delays, etc. How will the sponsor address these issues if they arise?
7. **Project details.** Please answer the questions below and all pertinent supplemental questions at the end of the application form.

   A. **Using the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s *Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Diversion Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual*** provide the following information:

      i. Inventory scope (road-based, stream-based).
      ii. Methodology used for estimating potential habitat gain.
      iii. Geographic area to be covered.
      iv. Inventory equipment.
      v. What types of landowners will be targeted (state, private, etc.)
      vi. Data management (i.e. what type of database will be used).
      vii. Products to be produced.

   B. **Provide a scope of work and detailed list of project deliverables.** Provide a detailed description of the proposed project tasks, who will be responsible for each, what the project deliverables will be, and a schedule for accomplishing them.

   C. **Describe any previous or ongoing barrier inventories** within your project’s geographic area and how this project will build upon, rather than duplicate, completed work.

   D. **Explain how the results of the inventory will directly lead to projects that benefit salmonids.**

   E. **Explain how the sponsor determined cost estimates.**

8. **Explain why it is important to do this project now instead of later.** Consider its sequence relative to other needs in the watershed and the current level and imminence of risk to habitat.

9. **Describe the project manager and field personnel’s experience in conducting barrier inventories.** NOTE that field personnel and the project manager must attend the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s *Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Diversion Screening Assessment Training* before initiating site assessment of barriers. The sponsor must collect data using the methodologies and protocols described in Washington Department of Fish and
Wildlife’s “Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Diversion Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual.”

10. **List project partners and their roles and contributions to the project.** Attach a Partner Contribution Form (Manual 18, Appendix G) from each partner in PRISM. Refer to Section 3, Manual 18 for when this is required.

**Comments**

Use this section to respond to the comments received after the initial site visits and after submitting the final application.

**Response to Site Visit Comments**

Please describe how the sponsor responded to the review panel’s initial site visit comments. *List each of the review panel’s comments and questions and identify the response. Use this space to respond directly to their comments or refer to changes in the proposal.*

**Response to Post-Application Comments**

Please describe how the sponsor responded to the review panel’s post-application comments. *List each of the review panel’s comments and questions and identify the response. Use this space to respond directly to their comments or refer to changes in the proposal.*
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List all related projects previously funded or reviewed by RCO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status of Prior Phase Deliverables and Relationship to Current Proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If previous project did not receive funding, describe how the current proposal differs from the original.

Please respond to each question individually. Do not summarize the answers collectively in essay format. Local citizen and technical advisory groups will use this information to evaluate the project. **Limit the response to ten pages (single-sided)**. The sponsor may delete the italicized portion of the questions and inapplicable supplemental questions to shorten the proposal.

Submit this proposal as a PRISM attachment titled “Project Proposal.”

**NOTE:** Sponsors of barrier inventory projects should NOT fill out this proposal. They instead should use the Barrier Inventory Project Proposal.

1. **Project brief.** In one or two sentences, what do you propose to do?

2. **Project location.** Describe the geographic location, water bodies, and the location of the project in the watershed (i.e. nearshore, tributary, main stem, off-channel, etc.)

3. **Problem statement.** What are the problems the project seeks to address? Include the source and scale of each problem. Describe the site, reach, and watershed conditions. Describe how those conditions impact salmon populations. Include current and historic factors important to understand the problems.
4. List the fish resources present at the site and targeted by the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Life History Present (egg, juvenile, adult)</th>
<th>Current Population Trend (decline, stable, rising)</th>
<th>Endangered Species Act Coverage (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Describe the limiting factors, and limiting life stages (by fish species) that the project expects to address.

6. **Project goals and objectives.** When answering the questions below please refer to Chapter 4 of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s *Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines* for more information on goals and objectives.

   **A. What are the project goals?** The goal of the project should be to remedy observed problems, ideally by addressing the problems’ root causes. The sponsors goal statements should articulate desired biological outcomes (vision for desired future condition). The statement should include which species and life stages will benefit from those outcomes and the time of year (if pertinent) those benefits will be realized (e.g. will high flow refuge be available when juveniles are outmigrating or rearing in the project area?).

   Goal examples:

   i. *(Assessment project).* Assess the feasibility of acquiring high priority shoreline parcels to support juvenile Chinook rearing and ecological function.

   ii. *(Design project).* Increase the quantity and quality of accessible off-channel rearing and over-wintering habitat for juvenile Coho Salmon in Salmon Creek.

   **B. What are the project objectives?** Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound).
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Objective examples to support Example Goal (i):

i. Identify ecological and land use criteria to use for prioritizing and selecting parcels within 6 months of funding.

ii. Within 2 years of funding, use the above criteria to identify up to five high priority properties where it is feasible to remove shoreline armoring to enhance forage fish spawning habitat.

Objective example to support Example Goal (ii):

i. The objective of this project is to provide a set of construction-ready designs within 2 years of funding that adequately details restoration actions. Based upon our understanding of the project reach we anticipate the design to incorporate these specific objectives:

a. Upon implementation of the design, remove 500 feet of bank armor from the left bank to restore channel migration potential.

b. Upon implementation of the design, improve connection to at least two acres of off-channel, cool-water refugia habitat during summer low flow periods.

c. Upon implementation of the design, remove, breach or setback about 3,700 feet of levee to inundate about 16 acres of floodplain at the 2-year reoccurrence flow.

d. Upon implementation of the design, provide two key pieces of wood per channel width in the main channel and side channels to provide cover.

7. What are the assumptions and constraints that could impact whether the sponsor achieves the objectives? Assumptions and constraints are external conditions not under the direct control of the project, but directly influence the outcome of the project. These may include subsequent availability of funding, public acceptance of the project, land use constraints, geomorphic factors, additional expenses, delays, etc. How will the sponsor address these issues if they arise?

8. Project details. Please answer the questions below and all pertinent supplemental questions at the end of the application form.

A. Provide a narrative description of the proposed project. Describe the specific project elements and explain how they will lead to the project’s objectives. For assessment projects, describe the design and methodology.
B. **Provide a scope of work and detailed list of project deliverables.** Provide a detailed description of the proposed project tasks, who will be responsible for each, what the project deliverables will be, and a schedule for accomplishing them. If the project will produce a design, please specify the level of design developed (conceptual, preliminary, or final); design deliverables must comply with those described in RCO “Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants,” Appendix D-1 (conceptual design), D-2 (preliminary design), and D-3 (final design). Complete planning projects within 2 years of funding.

C. **Explain how the sponsor determined cost estimates.**

D. **How have lessons learned from completed projects or monitoring studies informed the project?** Sources of results may be from Project Scale Effectiveness Monitoring from TetraTech, individual sponsors, lessons learned from previously implemented projects, Intensively Monitored Watershed results, or other sources.

9. **If the project includes an assessment or inventory** (NOTE: project may extend across a wide area and cover multiple properties).

   A. Describe any previous or ongoing assessment or inventory work in your project’s geographic area and how this project will build upon, rather than duplicate, the completed work.

   B. If a design is NOT a deliverable of this grant, please describe how this project meets the data gap criteria from Section 2 of Manual 18:

      i. Is the project identified as a high priority (as opposed to a medium or low priority) in a regional salmon recovery plan or lead entity strategy?

      ii. How does the project fill a data gap that clearly limits subsequent project identification or development?

      iii. How does the project fit in the larger context—such as its fit with a regional recovery-related, scientific research agenda or workplan—and how will it address the identified high priority data void?

      iv. Why are SRFB (or PSAR) funds necessary for the project, rather than other sources of funding?

      v. How will the results of the project clearly determine criteria and options for subsequent projects? What is the schedule for implementing such subsequent projects?
10. If the project includes developing a design or a feasibility study:

A. Will a licensed professional engineer design the project?
   Choose an answer
   
   i. If not, please describe the qualifications of the design team.

B. If the project includes a fish passage or screening design, has the project received a Priority Index (PI) or Screening Priority Index (SPI) number? If so, provide the PI or SPI number and describe how it was generated. (i.e. physical survey, reduced sample full survey, expanded threshold determination, or Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife generated. Refer to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual for guidance).

C. Will you apply for permits as part of this project’s scope?
   Choose an answer
   
   i. If not, please explain why and when the sponsor will submit permits.

D. For fish passage design projects:
   
   i. If you are proposing a culvert or arch, will you use stream simulation, no slope, hydrologic, or other design method? Please describe.

   ii. Describe the amount and quality of habitat made accessible if the barrier is corrected.

   iii. List additional upstream or downstream fish passage barriers, if any.

11. Explain why it is important to do this project now instead of later. (Consider its sequence relative to other needs in the watershed and the current level and imminence of risk to habitat).

12. If the project is a part of a larger overall project or strategy, describe the goal of the overall strategy, explain individual sequencing steps, and which of these steps is included in this application for funding. Attach a map in PRISM that illustrates how this project fits into the overall strategy, if relevant.

13. Describe the sponsor’s experience managing this type of project. Please describe other projects where the sponsor successfully used a similar approach.

14. List all landowner names. If the project will occur on land not owned by the organization, attach a Landowner Acknowledgement Form (Manual 18,
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Appendix F) in PRISM from each landowner acknowledging that his/her property is proposed for SRFB funding consideration. Refer to Manual 18, Section 3 for possible exceptions to this requirement.

15. List project partners and their roles and contributions to the project. Attach a Partner Contribution Form (Manual 18, Appendix G) from each partner in PRISM. Refer to Manual 18, Section 3 for when this is required.

16. Stakeholder outreach. Discuss whether this project has any opposition or barriers to completion besides funding. Describe the sponsors public outreach and feedback received. Are there any public safety concerns with the project? How will the sponsor address those concerns?

Supplemental Questions

For acquisition and planning combination projects, applicants will need to answer the acquisition supplemental questions found in the “Restoration, Acquisition, and Combination Proposal.”

Comments

Use this section to respond to the comments received after the initial site visits and after submitting the final application.

Response to Site Visit Comments

Please describe how the sponsor responded to the review panel’s initial site visit comments. List each of the review panel’s comments and questions and identify the response. Use this space to respond directly to the comments or refer to changes in the proposal.

Response to Post-Application Comments

Please describe how the sponsor responded to the review panel’s post-application comments. List each of the review panel’s comments and questions and identify the response. Use this space to respond directly to the comments or refer to changes in the proposal.
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List all related projects previously funded or reviewed by RCO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If previous project was not funded, describe how the current proposal differs from the original.

Please respond to each question individually. Do not summarize answers collectively in essay format. Local citizen and technical advisory groups will use this information to evaluate your project. Limit the response to ten pages (single-sided), excluding supplemental questions. The sponsor may delete the italicized portion of the questions and inapplicable supplemental questions to shorten the proposal.

Submit this proposal as a PRISM attachment titled “Project Proposal.”

1. **Project brief.** In one or two sentences, what do you propose to do?

2. **Project location.** Describe the geographic location, water bodies, and the location of the project in the watershed, i.e. nearshore, tributary, main stem, off-channel, etc.

3. **Problem statement.** What are the problems your project seeks to address? Include the source and scale of each problem. Describe the site, reach, and watershed conditions. Describe how those conditions impact salmon populations. Include current and historic factors important to understand the problems.
4. List the fish resources present at the site and targeted by this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Life History Present (egg, juvenile, adult)</th>
<th>Current Population Trend (decline, stable, rising)</th>
<th>Endangered Species Act Coverage (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Describe the limiting factors, and limiting life stages (by fish species) that your project expects to address.

6. Project goals and objectives. When answering the questions below please refer to Chapter 4 of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines for more information on goals and objectives.

A. What are the project goals? The goal of the project should be to remedy observed problems, ideally by addressing the problems’ root causes. The sponsors goal statements should articulate desired biological outcomes (the vision for desired future condition). The statement should include which species and life stages will benefit from those outcomes and the time of year (if pertinent) those benefits will be realized (e.g. will high flow refuge be available when juveniles are outmigrating or rearing in the project area?).

Goal examples:

i. (Screening project) Decrease irrigation-related juvenile Chinook Salmon mortality in the lower Yakima River caused by water withdrawal.

ii. (Acquisition project) Protect Tier 1 Chinook Salmon rearing habitat and habitat-forming natural processes.

iii. (Riparian project) Increase the amount of fully functioning riparian habitat in South Prairie Creek to support Puyallup River Chinook Salmon recovery goals.

iv. (Restoration project) Reduce impacts of elevated summer water temperatures on fall Chinook Salmon migration in the South Fork Nooksack River.
Appendix C-3: Restoration, Acquisition, and Combination Project Proposal

B. What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound).

Objective examples:

i. (Screening) Eliminate stranding fish at diversions by installing National Marine Fisheries Service-approved fish screens at 13 agricultural diversions in the lower Yakima River by 2017.

ii. (Acquisition) Acquire fee simple titled or permanent conservation easements on at least 20 acres of intact riparian forestland in the Tier 1 reach of Finney Creek by 2018.

iii. (Riparian) Increase stream shading by at least 30 percent in the treated areas by re-establishing at least 10 acres of native riparian forest habitat adjacent to salmon rearing habitat along South Prairie Creek within 5 years of funding.

iv. (Restoration) Construct historic-scale, in-stream logjams sufficient to create at least two sustainable colder-water pools at each of three documented hyporheic upwelling locations along the lower South Fork by 2018.

C. What are the assumptions and constraints that could impact whether you achieve your objectives? Assumptions and constraints are external conditions that are not under the direct control of the project, but directly impact the outcome of the project. These may include subsequent availability of funding, public acceptance of the project, land use constraints, geomorphic factors, additional expenses, delays, etc. How will you address these issues if they arise?

7. Project details. Please answer the questions below and all pertinent supplemental questions at the end of the application form.

A. Provide a narrative description of the proposed project. Describe the specific project elements and explain how they will lead to the project’s objectives. Include relevant existing project documentation (if any) as attachments in PRISM.

B. Provide a scope of work and detailed list of project deliverables. Provide a detailed description of the proposed project tasks, who will be responsible for
each, what the project deliverables will be, and a schedule for accomplishing them.

C. **Explain how the sponsor determined cost estimates.**

D. **Describe the design or acquisition alternatives considered to achieve the project’s objectives.** Why did the sponsor choose the preferred alternative?

E. **How have lessons learned from completed projects or monitoring studies informed this project?** Sources of results may be from Project Scale Effectiveness Monitoring from TetraTech, individual sponsors, lessons learned from previously implemented projects, Intensively Monitored Watershed results, or other sources.

F. **Describe the long-term stewardship and maintenance obligations for the project or acquired land.** For acquisition and combination projects, identify any planned use of the property, including upland areas.

8. **Explain why it is important to do this project now instead of later.** (Consider its sequence relative to other needs in the watershed and the current level and imminence of risk to habitat).

9. **If the project is a part of a larger overall project or strategy, describe the goal of the overall strategy, explain individual sequencing steps, and which of these steps is included in this application for funding.** Attach a map in PRISM that illustrates how this project fits into the overall strategy, if relevant.

10. **Describe the sponsor’s experience managing this type of project.** Please describe other projects where the sponsor successfully used a similar approach.

11. **List all landowner names.** If the project will occur on land not owned by the organization, attach a Landowner Acknowledgement Form (Manual 18, Appendix F) in PRISM from each landowner acknowledging that his/her property is proposed for SRFB funding consideration. Multi-site acquisition projects need only attach a Landowner Acknowledgement Form for priority parcels.

12. **List project partners and their role and contribution to the project.** Attach a Partner Contribution Form (Manual 18, Appendix G) from each partner in PRISM. Refer to Manual 18, Section 3 for when this is required.

13. **Stakeholder outreach.** Discuss whether this project has any opposition or barriers to completion, besides funding. Describe the sponsor’s public outreach and feedback received. Are there any public safety concerns with the project? How will the sponsor address those concerns?
Supplemental Questions

Restoration Project Supplemental Questions

Answer the following supplemental questions:

A. Will the sponsor complete, or already completed, a preliminary design, final design, and design report (per Appendix D) before construction? Choose an answer
   i. If no, please describe the design process and list all pre-construction deliverables submitted to RCO for review. Including riparian planting plans.

B. Will a licensed professional engineer design the project? Choose an answer If not, please describe the qualifications of the design team.

C. If this project includes measures to stabilize an eroding stream bank, explain why bank stabilization there is necessary to accomplish habitat recovery. Bank stabilization criteria required to meet SRFB eligibility is in Section 2 of Manual 18.

D. Describe the steps the sponsor will take to minimize the introduction and spread of invasive species during construction and restoration. Specifically consider how the sponsor will use un-infested materials and clean equipment entering and leaving the project area.

Acquisition Project Supplemental Questions

Applies to both acquisition-only and combination projects. Answer the following supplemental questions (these are not included in the ten-page limit):

A. Provide a detailed description of the property. (Describe the habitat types, size, and quality on site (forested riparian, floodplain, wetlands, tributary, main stem, off-channel, bluff-backed beach, barrier beach, open coastal inlet, estuarine delta, pocket estuary, uplands, etc.), critical areas on site, and any other features that make the site unique. Describe existing land use.

B. List type (fee title or conservation easement) and acreage of acquisitions proposed.

C. Does the sponsor hold an option or purchase and sale agreement for the property?
D. Describe adjacent land uses. Describe the property’s proximity to publically owned or protected properties in the vicinity. Attach a map in PRISM that illustrates this relationship.

E. If uplands are included on the property, state their size and explain why they are essential for protecting salmonid habitat. (When describing uplands, do not include floodplains)

F. What percentage of the total project area is intact and fully functioning habitat?

G. Is the site in need of restoration that is not part of this grant application? If yes, describe the restoration need and planned timeframe for implementation.

H. List structures (home, barn, outbuildings, fence, levees, bank armoring, or other infrastructure) on the property and any proposed modifications. If possible, please attach a map showing these structures. Note: In general, remove structures on SRFB-assisted acquisitions. Refer to “Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants,” Section 2 for information about ineligible project elements.

I. Describe the long-term stewardship and maintenance obligations for the acquired property. Identify any planned use of the property, including upland areas. If answered above, please skip.

J. Describe the following:
   i. Zoning/land use
   ii. Shoreline Master Plan designation
   iii. Portion of site within 100-year floodplain
   iv. Portion of site within designated floodway

K. Explain why federal, state, and local regulations are insufficient to protect the property from degradation.

L. For water rights and water savings projects:
   i. Describe the mechanism that the sponsor intends to use to conserve water (trust, etc.) and explain why this is the preferred approach.
   ii. Which steps in the water conservation process will be completed under this project proposal?
iii. How much water, if any, will be saved because of this project? By what methods will the sponsor calculate the amount of water conserved?

M. For acquisition projects intending to purchase multiple properties within an area, identify the target parcels and how the sponsor will prioritize the parcels.

Fish Passage Project Supplemental Questions

Answer the supplemental questions below.

NOTE: For fish passage design and evaluation guidance, applicants should refer to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Diversion Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual and the Water Crossing Design Guidelines (2013) For engineering design questions or technical assistance, contact Don Ponder, Department of Fish and Wildlife, (360) 902-2547. To schedule fish passage and diversion inventory and assessment training, contact Christy Rains, Department of Fish and Wildlife, (360) 902-2574.

A. Describe the passage problem (outfall, velocity, slope, etc.)

B. Describe the current barrier (age, material, shape, and condition).

C. Is the current barrier a complete or partial barrier?

D. If a culvert or arch is proposed, does it employ a stream simulation, no slope, hydraulic, or other design?

E. Describe the amount and quality of habitat made accessible if the barrier is corrected. Has the project received a Priority Index (PI) number? If so, provide the PI number and describe how it was generated: Physical survey, reduced sample full survey, expanded threshold determination, or Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife generated PI (list source, such as a study or inventory).

F. Identify if there are additional fish passage barriers downstream or upstream of this project.

G. Engineering licensing requirement. Will a licensed professional engineer design the project? Choose an answer If not, please describe the qualifications of the design team.
Diversions and Screening Project Supplemental Questions

Answer the supplemental questions below.

NOTE: For questions or technical assistance, contact Danny Diedrickson, Department of Fish and Wildlife, (509) 571-5559. Refer to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s [Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Diversion Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual](#) for further guidance. To schedule fish passage and diversion inventory and assessment training, contact Christy Rains, Department of Fish and Wildlife, (360) 902-2574.

A. **Problem statement information to include in Item 3 in Appendix C-1 of main questions above:** If the diversion is equipped with a fish screen, provide details of why it is not functioning properly from a fish protection perspective (entrainment or impingement).

B. **Has the project received a Screening Priority Index (SPI) number?** If yes, provide the SPI and indicate if the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife developed the SPI.

C. **Is this a pump or gravity diversion?**

D. **What is the flow of the diversion in gallons per minute (gpm)?** How was the flow determined (water right, meter–system meter, calculated from irrigation system components or direct measurement during peak spring/summer diversion using a flow meter)?

E. **If it is not possible to determine the flow, then provide the bank-full, cross-sectional area of the ditch, measured 100-300 feet downstream of the point of diversion.** Refer to Section 8.3 of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s [Fish Passage Barrier and Surface Water Screening Assessment and Prioritization Manual](#) for instructions on how to collect this information.

F. **For projects that have a goal of saving water:**

   i. Describe the mechanism that the sponsor intends to use to conserve water (trust, etc.) and explain why this is the preferred approach.

   ii. Which steps in the water conservation process will this project proposal complete?

   iii. How much water, if any, will be saved because of this project? By what methods are you calculating the amount of water conserved?
G. Will a licensed professional engineer design the project? Choose an answer If not, please describe the qualifications of the design team.

Invasive Species Removal Project Supplemental Questions

Answer the following supplemental questions:

A. Describe the level of infestation in the watershed.

B. What has been accomplished to date related to knotweed control in the watershed? Who has done the work? What is the success of these actions?

C. What is the planned prioritization strategy for knotweed control within the sub-watershed or watershed? Include efforts before and beyond the duration of the requested grant funding.

D. What is the anticipated time to control? Time to control is defined as treatment from upper extent to lowest, until the need is only a minor maintenance control effort to prevent re-sprouting or new stems from becoming established.

E. List the major tasks necessary to reach a maintenance control level and their anticipated time schedule. Include efforts before and beyond the duration of the requested grant funding.

F. Describe the staffing level needed to meet annual treatment goals and the plan to achieve that staffing level.

G. What are the completed and/or planned landowner outreach efforts?

H. What is the estimated total cost to reach a maintenance control level within the sub-watershed/watershed proposed for treatment?

I. What is the 10-year strategy (including funding) for the following:
   
   i. Getting to maintenance control levels for the sub-watershed/watershed?

   ii. Long-term maintenance/control?

J. How will the SRFB funds leverage other programs in the same sub-watershed/watershed?

K. What are the proposed re-vegetation plans for treated sites?
Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) Projects in Large Forest Supplemental Questions

Answer the following supplemental questions:

A. **Explain how the RMAP project is not solely mitigation (i.e. not exclusively compensation for unavoidable impacts of specific forestry projects or actions).**

B. **Provide documentation that the landowner has received an extension from the Department of Natural Resources for the proposed project.** Identify how this RMAP project fits within the landowner’s great RMAP requirements. Attach documentation in PRISM.

C. **Provide a prioritized list of stream crossing barriers based on fish and habitat data.** This prioritized list may be different from the landowner’s RMAP prioritization list. The prioritization should be based on information including the following: Fish species documented in the stream, miles of stream habitat above barrier, quality of upstream habitat, relationship to other barriers on the stream, and other factors. This list should include an introduction that identifies the factors and data sources used in the prioritization. Include the proposed project on the prioritized list. Attach this documentation in PRISM.

**Comments**

Use this section to respond to the comments received after the initial site visits, and then again after submitting the final application.

**Response to Site Visit Comments**

Please describe how the sponsor responded to the review panel’s initial site visit comments. List each review panel comment and question and identify the response. Use this space to respond directly to the comments or refer to changes in the proposal.

**Response to Post-Application Comments**

Please describe how the sponsor responded to the review panel’s post-application comments. List each of the review panel’s comments and questions and identify the response. Use this space to respond directly to the comments or refer to changes in the proposal.
Appendix C-4: Regional Monitoring Project Proposal

List all related projects previously funded or reviewed by RCO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project # or Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status of Prior Phase Deliverables and Relationship to Current Proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If previous project was not funded, describe how the current proposal differs from the original.

Please respond to each question individually. Do not summarize the answers in essay format. Regions and the SRFB Monitoring Panel will use this information to evaluate the project. Please be concise. Prepare as brief a proposal as possible that adequately describes the project, yet provides enough details to determine it is scientifically sound. The sponsor may reference and attach longer documents in appendices, if they provide essential information to convey context or prior work. The sponsor may delete the italicized portion of the questions and inapplicable supplemental questions to shorten the proposal.


Submit this proposal as a PRISM attachment titled “Project Proposal.”

1. **Project brief.** In one or two sentences, what do you propose to do?

2. **Project location.** Please describe the geographic location, water bodies, the location of the project in the watershed, and the habitat category, i.e. nearshore, tributary, main stem, off-channel, etc.
3. List the most important fish resources that will benefit from the information generated by the monitoring effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Life History Targeted (egg, juvenile, adult)</th>
<th>Endangered Species Act Coverage (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What resource management actions could the information affect?

5. Approach. Please attach a detailed study plan in PRISM titled “Study Plan” that includes all of the elements identified in the supplemental requirements section at the end of this proposal.

6. Costs.

7. Explain how cost estimates were determined.

8. Why are SRFB funds necessary, rather than funds from other sources? State if other funds are unavailable. Identify other funding partnerships involved and explain what aspects of monitoring the proposed SRFB funds will cover.

9. Certainty of success. Explain why the sponsor and project partners’ knowledge, planning, and experience will ensure that the project will yield meaningful information.

10. Forms for project proponents.

11. List all landowner names. If the monitoring project will occur on land not owned by the organization, attach a Landowner Acknowledgement Form (Manual 18, Appendix F) in PRISM.

12. Attach a Partner Contribution Form (Manual 18, Appendix G) from each partner in PRISM. Refer to Manual 18, Section 3 for when this is required.

13. Will the sponsor apply for permits as part of this project’s scope? Choose an answer

14. If so, identify the permits required and the issuing organization.
Supplemental Requirements

Study plan. Please attach a detailed study plan in PRISM titled “Study Plan” that includes the elements below; present the information in any order.

A. Purpose. Describe the information needs and how these data will be used.

i. Describe how the proposed monitoring will provide data essential for advancing salmon recovery. What high priority information needs or data gaps identified within the regional recovery plan and/or associated regional research, monitoring, and evaluation plan (or lead entity strategy in areas without a recovery region) will the study address? What salmonid fish species will benefit?

ii. Explicitly identify the geographic scale of data collection and conclusions referred to within the data. Describe if the design and analyses allow for generalized results beyond the initial geographical scale of the project. If the project is a part of a larger overall monitoring project or strategy, describe the goal of the overall strategy, explain individual sequencing steps, and which steps are included in this application for funding. Attach a map in PRISM that illustrates how this project fits into the overall strategy, if relevant.

iii. Are these data available from other sources (literature, other SRFB monitoring, etc.) or being adequately addressed by prior or ongoing studies or existing literature? Describe any previous or ongoing assessment or inventory work in the project’s geographic area and describe how this project will build upon, rather than duplicate, the completed or ongoing work. Include detail about other monitoring efforts that complement or could help accomplish the overall objective, so that readers can understand the gaps, if any.

iv. How will the study contribute to validating or revising current management strategies or assessing progress toward delisting the focal species? Include explicit ties of the proposed monitoring to advancing our knowledge of viable salmonid populations (VSP) parameters (abundance productivity, spatial structure, diversity) of the focal species.

v. Does this study have specific regional importance and provide a regional benefit? Has the appropriate region shown its support for this project by signing and submitting regional certification?
B. Project goals, objectives, and hypotheses.

i. What are the project’s goals? The goal of the project should fill specific gaps in information essential to salmon recovery efforts. The goal statements should broadly articulate desired ecological outcomes of the proposed activity.

ii. What are the project’s objectives? Objectives support and refine the goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). State SMART objectives as expected “outcomes” rather than “output.” Monitoring project objectives should tell a reader what the sponsor wants to learn rather than what they will do. The description should include clearly stated, testable hypotheses.

C. Methods.

i. Sampling design. Provide a written description and map of the sampling locations. If locations are not yet defined, describe the process by which the sponsor will identify sampling locations.

ii. Data collection methods. Describe or reference the response variables or metrics evaluated, the rationale for their selection, field methods, protocols, and essential equipment. Are the selected metrics consistent with ongoing monitoring efforts in the region? If not, provide justification for the departure.

iii. Analytical approach. Describe the statistical tests used to test the hypotheses identified in Part B of the Study Plan. Include a preliminary power analysis.

iv. Data management. Describe the sponsor’s approach to data management, storage, and archival to ensure data quality and availability for sharing.

v. Dissemination of results. How will the sponsor disseminate collected data and reports?

D. Tasks and schedule. Identify project collaborators and their roles and contributions to the project. Provide a detailed description of the proposed project tasks, the party responsible for each task, a schedule or timeline for accomplishing them, and list the project deliverables. Include an annual report as a deliverable.
E. Assumptions and contingencies. Identify assumptions and constraints that could affect the sponsor’s ability to achieve objectives and how the sponsor will modify the approach if the sponsor does not meet assumptions.

F. Literature cited. If available, clearly cite documents referenced within the study plan with electronic links. If supporting documents are not publicly available, they should be loaded onto PRISM. Where appropriate, a brief literature review can be included in the study plan.

Comments

Monitoring projects will not usually include a site visit by the Monitoring Panel, but site visits may occur at the panel’s discretion. Use this section to respond to any questions that the sponsor received after submitting the final application.

Response to Post-Application Questions

Please describe how the sponsor responded to the SRFB Monitoring Panel’s post-application questions. List each of the monitoring panel’s questions here and use this space to respond directly to the questions. Update the proposal to be consistent with comments.
Appendix D: Design and Restoration Project Deliverables

This appendix covers a wide range of design and restoration project elements, and reflects best practices for salmon recovery projects. The guidance intends to provide clear requirements for documentation of the design and construction process and help the sponsor demonstrate project quality and success. Appendix D will serve as a guide to develop a project application and specific deliverables in the project agreement.

How Appendix D is Organized

This appendix is split into four sections. The goal is to provide a better understanding of the different design stages and deliverable expectations that will go into the project agreement. For example, D-4 covers a comprehensive restoration project from conceptual design through construction, including as-built documentation. All restoration projects that include design elements shall follow four standard project development stages, described below, completed in a single design grant or in multiple design phases.

- Appendix D-1–Conceptual Design Deliverables
- Appendix D-2–Preliminary Design Deliverables
- Appendix D-3–Final Design Deliverables
- Appendix D-4–Construction Deliverables

Project Deliverables

Each section of Appendix D (D1-D4) includes the deliverables matrix (see below). The project agreement will include specific project deliverables based on project type, application, local evaluation, SRFB Review Panel recommendations, and the sponsor’s experience.
Appendix D: Design and Restoration Project Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Deliverables</th>
<th>Conceptual Design</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Construction Project(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td>Final Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landownership Certification Form</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Applications</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review Comments</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Quantities and Costs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources Compliance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control and Tenure Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Design-build construction projects have an abbreviated set of design requirements before construction. See Appendix D-4.

\(^2\)Cultural resources compliance may be required if sponsor is conducting ground-disturbing activities during the design phases.

\(^3\)Rough cost estimate of the preferred alternative.

Restoration Project Design

Salmon habitat restoration projects require a designer or team with a balance of knowledge and experience within fisheries biology, civil engineering, and other technical fields. The person or team completing the preliminary project design should include at least one licensed professional engineer with experience in salmon habitat restoration. Projects with straightforward project design and minimal sponsor liability concerns may not require a licensed professional engineer and people with applicable experience and technical knowledge can design the project.

If a licensed engineer will not design the project, indicate this on the salmon project proposal and describe the qualifications and experience of the team which will design the project. The review panel will use this information during its review.

Restoration Design Report Examples

To help with understanding the design report deliverable, RCO staff have published some [sample design reports](#) on the RCO Web site. They include simple to complex examples to help illustrate the needed level of detail and the layout of a design report.
Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines

The Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines are part of a series of guidance documents produced with SRFB funding through the Aquatic Habitat Guidelines program. The aquatic habitat guidelines do not replace existing regulatory requirements, though they are designed in part as technical guidance supporting regulatory streamlining and grant application review for stream restoration proposals.

In developing the application, RCO highly recommends the sponsor consult Chapters 4 and 5 of the Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines. Chapter 4 provides guidance for developing goals and objectives for the restoration projects as well as restoration strategies. Chapter 5 provides guidance on designing and implementing restoration techniques.
Appendix D-1: Conceptual Design Deliverables

This appendix identifies the deliverables required when a planning project includes a conceptual design in the scope. Such planning projects may include watershed or reach assessments and feasibility studies. Projects resulting in a conceptual design require a minimum 15 percent match. This guidance intends to ensure that applicants, evaluators, and RCO staff have the same expectations for grant agreement deliverables.

Conceptual Design

The conceptual design is the first stage of developing site specific restoration actions. This process should use available watershed- and reach-level assessment information to address one or more priorities within a watershed strategy. The conceptual design
should be guided by specific desired outcomes (objectives). Adequate technical information must be collected from the site to evaluate existing conditions and develop concept-level restoration techniques (alternatives). The preferred alternative concept must be documented with detailed drawings and a written report sufficient to explain and support proposed actions as well as guide the next stages of design.

Submit the following deliverables to the grants manager.

**Conceptual Design Deliverables**

Submit the following deliverables to the grants manager along with any assessment and feasibility deliverables funded in the scope of work.

1. Description of the project site and the problems within the context of salmon recovery.

2. Identification of specific goals and objectives to address the problem(s).

3. Identification and conceptual design of alternatives to achieve the project objectives. Each conceptual design alternative must include a description of the design and a plan view drawing of existing site conditions and the proposed project on accurately scaled site plans. The plan view drawing must include an area/location map, property boundaries (either surveyed or approximated based on assessor’s data), landownership, roads or other infrastructure as appropriate, scale, north arrow, water bodies and direction of flow, bank-full width or mean high water line for marine waters, and approximate dimensions of proposed elements.

4. Evaluation and discussion of stakeholder comments and the pros and cons of each alternative.

5. Selection of the preferred alternative(s).

6. Rough construction cost estimate of the preferred alternative(s).
## Appendix D-2: Preliminary Design Deliverables

### Conceptual Design

The conceptual design phase of the project describes the initial phase of identifying a restoration project. For preliminary design projects, the application requirements in the project proposal comprise an adequate conceptual design.

### Preliminary Design

RCO uses the term “preliminary project design” to define the final deliverable in a preliminary design project, or an intermediate deliverable in a final design or restoration project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Deliverables</th>
<th>Conceptual Design</th>
<th>Preliminary Design</th>
<th>Final Design</th>
<th>Construction Project&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landownership Certification Form</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Applications</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review Comments</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specifications</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Quantities and Costs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding Documents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources Compliance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control and Tenure Documents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Built</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Design-build construction projects have an abbreviated set of design requirements before construction. See Appendix D-4.

2Cultural resources compliance may be required if sponsor is conducting ground-disturbing activities during the design phases.

3Rough cost estimate of the preferred alternative.
Appendix D-2: Preliminary Design Deliverables

project. Preliminary designs intend to advance project concepts to a detailed understanding and quantification of all the major project elements.

Preliminary designs may traditionally be labeled “30 percent design,” “50 percent design,” etc., but these numeric labels tend to confuse the process and do not always reflect the design detail of the project. For example, preliminary designs for some straightforward projects, such as culvert replacement on a private driveway, may be considered 80 percent of the final design requirements. Conversely, the preliminary designs for some large-scale, complex projects, such as levee setbacks with tidegate installations, may be considered only 20 percent of the final design requirements. Therefore, sponsors and consulting engineers should use the RCO definitions for consistency.

A licensed professional engineer must supervise the preparation of the preliminary design unless the project design is straightforward and sponsor liability concerns are minimal. In that case, a licensed professional engineer may not be required and individuals with applicable experience and technical knowledge may complete the design.

While the detailed scope of each project’s preliminary design process is unique, in general, the process for developing a preliminary design includes preparing surveyed site plans; conducting field investigations of hydrologic, geotechnical, and other site conditions; conducting data analysis; preparing drawings and designs; preparing the design report; and preparing engineering cost estimates. For additional detailed guidance on designing and implementing restoration projects, please refer to Chapters 4 and 5 of the Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines.

**Preliminary Design Deliverables**

Preliminary designs must adequately describe all proposed project elements in sufficient detail for permit review and authorization. While the design team may tailor the design process to suit the unique circumstances of each project, the following project deliverables are required for preliminary design projects:

1. Preliminary design report, drawings, and engineering cost estimate
2. Landownership Certification Form (Appendix N), if not already provided
3. Design review comments (optional)
4. Permit applications (optional)

Sponsors must submit these deliverables to the grants manager at the close of the preliminary design project or before moving on to the next phase of the project. The following section provides more details on the preliminary design deliverables.
A. Preliminary Design Report, Drawings, and Construction Cost Estimate

A design report is a record of the technical decisions that inform the development of the selected project design at the preliminary and/or the final design stage. By clearly documenting and explaining the design process, the report allows reviewers and other stakeholders to understand the proposed project and the relevant factors that contributed to its design. The preliminary design report must describe all elements of the project and provide sufficient details to support project permitting.

While the design team may structure the design report to suit the circumstances of its project, in general, the design reports should include the following elements:

- **Introduction**: An explanation of the purpose of the project and its specific habitat restoration goals and objectives.

- **Existing Conditions**: A characterization and analysis of the existing conditions relevant to project design. These conditions include: Description of the problem; summary of site, reach, and watershed conditions; biological and water quality factors as they relate to the project conditions; site history and constraints leading to the observed problems and which may present challenges to restoration; and description of identified causes of the problem. This section typically includes historical data; surrounding land uses; landowner and community expectations; survey information (topographic, geomorphic, and vegetative); sediment sampling; water velocities, depths, and flow rates; groundwater or hyporheic flow evaluation ranges; tidal elevation and ranges; and maintenance requirements. The level and detail of survey and data collection needed depends upon project goals, objectives, and the context of the project.

- **Preliminary Design Alternatives**: An identification, description, and evaluation of design alternatives considered to achieve the project goals and objectives. Describe each element of the design alternatives. Include a comparison of each of the alternatives discussing project objectives, other evaluation criteria (such as fish benefit, maintenance, sustainability, social acceptance, etc.) and cost, to the extent that cost data is available at this stage of the design process.

- **Preferred Alternative**: A description of a preferred alternative and the rationale for choosing it, citing the relevant factors described above. Include a brief explanation of why other alternatives were not selected.

- **Design Considerations and Preliminary Analyses**: A listing of specific design criteria that define the intent and expectations for each project
element. Design criteria are specific, measurable attributes of project features that clarify the purpose of each project element and articulate how each element will contribute to the overall project’s goals and objectives. Include justification and documentation of design methods applied, including assumptions that facilitated the design. Provide design output, including analytical results of all technical and design analyses and how these translate to project element designs.

- **Permitting and Stakeholder Consultation:** A description of regulatory and/or other public consultation activities. Review and address comments from agencies and other stakeholders in the preliminary design. This section is optional based on proposed deliverables in the application.

- **Preliminary Design Drawings:** The preparation of preliminary design drawings is key to completing a successful habitat restoration project. All design and restoration projects require preliminary design drawings. Provide preliminary design drawings in digital format (e.g. AutoCAD). Each drawing should be to scale, and it is strongly suggested that the vertical and horizontal scales on the drawings be kept the same.

  For the preferred alternative, minimum drawing requirements include depiction of all elements of the project in sufficient detail to support project permitting and include at a minimum the following:

  - Existing site plan showing: Area/location map; property boundaries; landownership; road, utilities, or other infrastructure as appropriate; scale; north arrow; water bodies and direction of flow; and bank-full width or mean low and high water (marine waters).

  - Project site plan view drawing(s) showing proposed actions overlaid on the existing site plan (above). The site plan should include all project elements including installation and removal of fill, wood, rock, culverts, infrastructure, clearing and staging, dewatering, etc.

  - Project profile and cross-section at important project locations showing water surface elevations relevant to the design (e.g. ordinary high water, maximum design flow, tidal elevations, flood elevations, etc.)

  - Structure design details, as needed.

  Provide additional design drawings for complex projects and projects with multiple features or multiple sites.

- **Construction Quantities and Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate.**
• **Appendices**: Include references, analytical and model inputs, outputs, and other supporting documentation.

**B. Design Review Comments**  
*(Optional at Preliminary Design Phase)*

Send the preliminary design report and drawings to relevant stakeholders and the grants manager after the in-house review. After a reasonable time for review, plan an on-site visit to review the design plans at the project location with stakeholders (e.g. landowners, co-managers, lead entity citizen and technical groups, the grants manager, etc.).

These steps have been very useful for a comprehensive “reality check” for stakeholder review and consideration of all stated project objectives.

Send the grants manager a memo (or similar correspondence) that consolidates stakeholder comments and other considerations received during design review. The memo should describe how the comments have (or have not) been incorporated into the design. Distribute this memo to all entities involved in the review. This step is optional because, for some sponsors, this step is more practical during the final design phase.

**C. Permit Applications** *(Optional at Preliminary Design Phase)*

The sponsor should provide permit applications or proof of permit receipt (e.g. copies of permits or permit numbers and issue dates) to the grants manager or in the PRISM progress report under the “Permit” tab. This step is optional at the preliminary design phase because, for some sponsors, this step is more practical during the final design phase.
Appendix D-3: Final Design Deliverables

Conceptual Design

For restoration projects and preliminary and final design projects, the application requirements in the project proposal should comprise an adequate conceptual design.

Preliminary Design

RCO uses the term “preliminary project design” as either a final deliverable in a preliminary design project or an intermediate deliverable in the design process of a final design or restoration project. Submit the preliminary design deliverables to the grants manager before progressing to the final design and restoration phases. See the

---

1Design-build construction projects have an abbreviated set of design requirements before construction. See Appendix D-4.

2Cultural resources compliance may be required if sponsor is conducting ground-disturbing activities during the design phases.

3Rough cost estimate of the preferred alternative.
Final Design

The final design will incorporate comments provided by stakeholders, landowners, RCO, and/or permit agencies about the preliminary design report and on-site review. The final design process must address and resolve all substantial issues raised in the permitting and stakeholder review process, so that all stakeholders agree on the final plans.

The final project design process converts the preliminary design drawings and report into a stand-alone and comprehensive set of final design drawings (construction drawings) and technical specifications for project construction. A licensed professional engineer must supervise the preparation of the final design unless the project design is straightforward and sponsor liability concerns are minimal. In that case, a licensed professional engineer may not be required and individuals with applicable experience and technical knowledge may complete the design.

Final Design Deliverables

While the design team may tailor the design process to suit the unique circumstances of each project, the following are required deliverables for final design and restoration projects. The grants manager must accept these required deliverables before moving forward to construction.

1. Design review comments
2. Final design report and drawings (refer to Section D-2 for a list of items to include in the design report)
3. Landownership Certification Form (Appendix N), if not already provided
4. Technical specifications
5. Final construction quantities and costs
6. Contract bidding documents and general contract conditions (unless the project will be built by sponsor crew)
7. Construction permits (optional)

The following section provides more details on the final design deliverables.
A. Design Review Comments

Include the design review memo in the final design report or submitted as a separate document.

Submit a memo that consolidates stakeholder comments and other considerations received during preliminary design review. The memo should explain how the comments and other feedback have, or have not, been included in the final design. Distribute this memo to all entities involved with design review. This step may have been completed during the preliminary design phase.

B. Final Design Report and Drawings

Revise the preliminary design report and drawings to address the review and permitting comments, as needed. RCO may need additional detailed drawings to clarify the design of specific work items. Final designs should define the project elements considered essential to meet the project’s goals and objectives in sufficient detail to minimize changes made during construction.

C. Technical Specifications

Technical specifications may be included in the final design report or as a separate document.

Support all work shown on project drawings with one or more technical specifications to further describe and/or control the work. The construction contractor should know about project materials, technical requirements, project elevations, permit requirements, or any other elements of the proposed project. Clear and detailed technical specifications reduce on-the-ground adjustments and changes that may deviate from the original project objectives.

D. Final Construction Quantities and Costs

Include construction quantities and costs in the final design report or as a separate document.

SRFB-funded projects require a detailed list of work items and quantities as part of the final project design; the practice of listing a lump sum cost for the entire project is not acceptable. A detailed breakdown of work quantities typically includes 10 to 40 separate work items, matched with respective estimated quantities. Generate a construction cost estimate for comparison with contractor bids to ensure a competitive bid; any experienced project designer can produce this estimate, traditionally termed “engineer’s estimate.”
E. Contract Bidding Documents and General Contract Conditions

Include contract bidding documents and contract conditions in the final design report or as a separate document.

If the sponsor’s construction crew will build the project then bidding documents and contract conditions are not required; however, the requirements for technical specifications and a detailed list of work items (above) still would apply.

Bidding documents should include: A bid form, definitions, a proposed agreement (to be between the sponsor and contractor), general conditions, special provisions, technical specifications, and the project drawings (usually bound separately).

Sponsors should select contractors using good business practices, which could include selective negotiations with known contractors, public advertisement for bidding, or competitive bidding using some combination of proposed price and contractor qualifications. The contractor selection process should be objective and defensible in case of contest by companies not selected for the construction work. Follow all applicable state and/or required federal procurement procedures.

F. Construction Permits (Optional at the Final Design Phase)

Provide permit applications, or proof of permit receipt (e.g. copies of permits or permit numbers and issue dates) to the grants manager or in a PRISM progress report. This step is optional at the final design phase because, for some sponsors, this step is more practical during the construction phase.
Appendix D-4: Construction Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Deliverables</th>
<th>Conceptual Design</th>
<th>Preliminary Design</th>
<th>Final Design</th>
<th>Construction Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landownership Certification Form</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review Comments</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Report and Drawings</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Quantities and Costs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources Compliance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control and Tenure Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Design-build construction projects have an abbreviated set of design requirements before construction. See Appendix D-4.
2Cultural resources compliance may be required if sponsor is conducting ground-disturbing activities during the design phases.
3Rough cost estimate of the preferred alternative.

Conceptual Design

For restoration projects, preliminary and final design projects, the application requirements in the project proposal comprise an adequate conceptual design.

Preliminary Design

Submit preliminary design deliverables to the grants manager before moving onto the final design and restoration phases. See Appendix D-2: Preliminary Design Deliverables for detailed information on the preliminary design process.
Final Design

Before awarding the construction contract or initiating construction, submit the final design deliverables to the grants manager. See Appendix D-3: Final Design Deliverables for detailed information on the final design process and required pre-construction design deliverables.

Design-Build Projects

Most sponsors complete final design reports before moving forward into construction. However, some sponsors prefer to proceed to construction after completing a preliminary design. RCO refers to these projects as “design-build” projects.

Design-build projects are considered only in cases where the sponsor, the engineer, and construction crew have extensive experience and have been successful with a particular project type. Additionally, design-build may be considered where design is straightforward and liability concerns are minimal. Design-build projects typically develop less detailed drawings before construction than other construction projects. In exchange, design-build documents typically include a detailed written description of how to locate and construct various project elements in the field. Design-build projects require the project designer to provide a high level of construction oversight to ensure the project goes as planned. Sponsors should develop detailed, as-built drawings following construction, and submit them to the grants manager before project close out. Sponsors must obtain all required permits before construction.

If proposing the design-build method to complete the project, indicate this on the salmon project proposal and describe the pre-construction design deliverables that will be submitted to RCO in lieu of the final design and report.

The application and the SRFB Review Panel’s recommendations will develop the specific deliverables for design-build projects. The special conditions section of the project agreement will identify specific project deliverables.

Construction Phase

This section identifies the required pre-construction deliverables, the construction management process, and “as-built” requirements.

Pre-Construction Deliverables

1. **Control and tenure documentation.** Before construction, provide control and tenure documentation of the property being restored. See Section 6 for more information.
2. **Cultural resources review.** Real property restored through RCO funding is subject to Governor’s Executive Order 05-05 or compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. RCO requires documented compliance with the applicable cultural resources review process. For more information on cultural resources review, see Section 6.

3. **Proof of permits.** Before construction, secure all necessary permits and submit proof of permit receipt (e.g. copies of permits or permit numbers and issue dates) to the grants manager or in a PRISM progress report.

**Construction Management**

To minimize unintended errors introduced during construction, RCO highly recommends that the project engineer has direct, on-site involvement during construction. Some project sponsors may have extensive construction experience and knowledge, and may perform daily construction supervision. RCO recommends that the sponsor and the engineer agree to share construction supervision responsibilities with mutual confidence required of both entities. The engineer should be confident that the on-site construction inspector will recognize any problems before construction is complete and ensure daily communication between the construction inspector and engineer. The engineer should review and approve substantial changes during construction before implementation.

**Post-Construction Deliverable: “As-Built Drawings”**

Document all changes made during construction. “As-built drawings” refers to the conventional term applied to project design drawings modified by the engineer after completion of construction to document the completed project. Prepare “as-built drawings” if changes were made to the final design during construction and if the sponsor used a design-build construction approach. Submit these drawings to the grants manager after project completion.

Instead of the conventional “as-built drawings” described above, RCO may allow the sponsor to submit the following as-built documentation:

- Original final designs (if no changes were made during construction).
- Original final designs with a list of change orders describing the construction changes.
- A design memo from the engineer with notations on the final design/construction plans identifying the changed elements of the project with photo-points and photographs showing the project post-construction.
The **Barrier Evaluation Form** is required for all planning or restoration (i.e. construction) projects including a fish passage correction. Submit photographs of the barrier with this form.

The **Correction Analysis Form** is required for all restoration projects that (i.e. construction) include a fish passage correction.

These forms are found on the RCO Web site.

**Purpose of Forms**

The purpose of the two forms is to document information on fish passage barriers submitted to lead entities and the SRFB for funding consideration. An updated version of the *Water Crossing Design Guidelines* (2013) is available through the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Web site. The Department of Fish and Wildlife staff are available to help applicants. For barrier evaluation questions contact Daniel Barrett, Department of Fish and Wildlife, at (360) 902-2546. For engineering design questions or technical assistance, contact Don Ponder at (360) 902-2547. The SRFB strongly encourages applicants to take advantage of this service.

The barrier information forms are divided into three steps:

1. **Barrier determination**—Is the structure a fish passage barrier and is the stream fish bearing? The Barrier Evaluation Form captures this initial determination.

2. **Background information**—If the site is determined a barrier and the stream fish-bearing, then use the Expanded Barrier Evaluation Form to capture detailed information including fish species and use, site information, upstream and downstream channel conditions, and potential habitat gain if the barrier was corrected.

3. **Site Visit Documentation and Correction Alternative Form**—This step will help capture important information from site observations by developing conceptual alternatives and rough cost estimates.
Appendix F: Landowner Acknowledgement Form

The Landowner Acknowledgment Form is required with the application if work is proposed on property not owned by the grant applicant. See Section 3 of Manual 18 for a list of exceptions to this requirement.

To [download a form](https://www.rco.org) into which the sponsor may enter information, visit the RCO Web site.
Appendix G: Project Partner Contribution Form

This form is required when the applicant is a state agency. State agencies are required to have a local partner and must attach a signed Partner Contribution Form. This form is recommended, but not required, for other eligible applicants where a third party is providing a funding match.

To download a form into which the sponsor may enter information, visit the RCO Web site.
Appendix H: Regional Monitoring Project Certification

Project Name: ________________________________________________________________
Project Number: ______________________________________________________________
Regional Organization: __________________________________________________________

Questions

1. Explain how the project will address a high priority information need or data gap in the recovery plan and/or associated regional research, monitoring, and evaluation plan, or lead entity strategy.

2. Explain how the monitoring will complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts. Describe communication with other monitoring practitioners of ongoing monitoring efforts.

3. Explain why SRFB project funds are being used rather than funds from other sources.

4. List of Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>SRFB Request</th>
<th>Matching Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL AMOUNT of Request: __________________________________________________________

AMOUNT of Allocation: __________________________________________________________

I do hereby certify under penalty of forfeiture of the above monitoring project amount(s) proposed out of the SRFB allocation to the [Insert Region Name] that the above named project(s) will do the following:
• Address a high priority information need or data gap identified within our recovery plan and/or associated regional research, monitoring, and evaluation plan, or lead entity strategy.

• Not duplicate or interfere with ongoing monitoring efforts.

• Be consistent or compatible with data collection, analysis, and management methods and protocols being used in the region and shall to the maximum extent practicable be consistent or compatible with methods and protocols in common use throughout the state.

• Make data available to RCO, the public, and the SRFB Monitoring Panel.

• Not exceed 3 years.

• Total 10 percent or less than our regional allocation.

Regional Organization Authorized Signature: __________________________________________

Title: ________________________________________________________________________________________

Date: ________________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix I: RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet

The fiscal data collection sheet is required of all applicants. To download the form, visit the RCO Web site.
Appendix J: SRFB Application Authorization Form

The Application Authorization Form can be downloaded from the RCO Web site. Sponsors may reproduce this form in their own formats; however text may not change.
Appendix K: SRFB Review Panel Evaluation Criteria

To help ensure that every project funded by the SRFB is technically sound, the SRFB Review Panel will note for the SRFB any projects it believes have the following:

- Low benefit to salmon
- A low likelihood of being successful
- Costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits of the project

Projects designated as “Projects of Concern” have a low benefit to salmon, a low likelihood of success, or costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits. The review panel will not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects. RCO expects that projects will follow best management practices and will meet local, state, and federal permitting requirements.

The SRFB Review Panel uses the SRFB Individual Comment Form to capture its comments on individual projects. To download a template of the comment form, visit the RCO Web site.

When the review panel identifies a “Project of Concern,” the applicant will receive a comment form identifying the evaluation criteria that determined the status. Before the regional area meetings, the regional recovery organization representing the project’s area can contact the review panel chair with further questions. The regional area meetings represent an opportunity for the review panel to discuss project issues and work with the regional recovery organizations, the applicant, the lead entity, and representatives from regional technical teams to resolve issues before the SRFB reviews the list of “Projects of Concern.”

Criteria

For acquisition and restoration projects, the panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot be significantly improved if it meets the following criteria:

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing. For acquisition projects, this criterion relates to the lack of a clear threat if the property is not acquired.
2. Information provided or current understanding of the system is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
   - Incomplete application or proposal.
   - Project goal or objectives not clearly stated or do not address salmon habitat protection or restoration.
   - Project sponsor has not responded to review panel comments.
   - Acquisition parcel prioritization (for multi-site proposals) is not provided or the prioritization does not meet the project’s goal or objectives.

3. The project is dependent on addressing other key conditions or processes first.

4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor failed to justify the costs to the satisfaction of the review panel.

5. The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.

6. The project may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments, or restoration actions in the watershed.

7. The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes or prohibits natural processes.

8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated goals or objectives.

9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated goals or objectives.

10. There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the project is not completed.

11. The project design is not adequate or the project is sited improperly.

12. The stewardship description is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance and this likely would jeopardize the project’s success.

13. The focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.

Additional Criteria for Riparian Restoration Projects

A. For riparian restoration projects, the review panel will evaluate the riparian planting width based on the site specific conditions and determine whether the
proposed width will provide a benefit to salmon recovery and achieve goals as articulated in the regional recovery plans.

Additional Criteria for Planning Projects

For planning projects (e.g. assessment, design, inventories, and studies), the review panel will consider the criteria for acquisition and restoration projects (1-13) and the following additional criteria. The review panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot improve significantly if the following conditions are met:

A. The project does not address an information need important to understanding the watershed, is not directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will not clearly lead to beneficial projects.

B. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.

C. There are significant constraints to the implementation of projects following completion of the planning project.

D. The project does not clearly lead to project design or does not meet the criteria for filling a data gap.

E. The project does not appear to be coordinated with other efforts in the watershed or does not use appropriate methods and protocols.
Appendix L: Guide for Lead Entity Project Evaluation

Benefit and Certainty Criteria

The SRFB developed the following criteria several years ago for evaluating benefit to fish and certainty of project success. With the evolution of lead entity strategies and recovery plans, the SRFB shifted to a technical evaluation of site-specific projects using the “Project of Concern” criteria. Use the benefit and certainty criteria listed below only for lead entity guidance in their evaluation of projects through their local processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified and Prioritized in the Strategy</th>
<th>High BENEFIT Project</th>
<th>Medium BENEFIT Project</th>
<th>Low BENEFIT Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Processes and Habitat Features</td>
<td>Addresses high priority habitat features and/or watershed process that significantly protect or limit the salmonid productivity in the area. <strong>Acquisition:</strong> More than 60 percent of the total project area is intact habitat, or if less than 60 percent, project must be a combination that includes restoration. <strong>Assessment:</strong> Crucial to understanding watershed processes, is directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and clearly will lead to new projects in high priority areas.</td>
<td>May not address the most important limiting factor but will improve habitat conditions.</td>
<td>Does not address an important habitat condition in the area. <strong>Acquisition:</strong> 40-60 percent of the total project area is intact habitat, or if less than 40-60 percent, project must be a combination that includes restoration. <strong>Assessments:</strong> Will lead to new projects in moderate priority areas and is independent of addressing other key conditions first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified and Prioritized in the Strategy</td>
<td>Benefit Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High BENEFIT Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium BENEFIT Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low BENEFIT Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas and Actions</td>
<td>Is a high priority action in a high priority geographic area.</td>
<td>May be an important action but in a moderate priority geographic area.</td>
<td>Addresses a lower priority action or geographic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment: Fills an important data gap in a high priority area.</td>
<td>Assessment: Fills an important data gap, but is in a moderate priority area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Is identified through a documented habitat assessment.</td>
<td>Is identified through a documented habitat assessment or scientific opinion.</td>
<td>Is unclear or lacks scientific information about the problem being addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Addresses multiple species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or Endangered Species Act-listed fish species or non-listed populations primarily supported by natural spawning. Documented fish use.</td>
<td>Addresses a moderate number of species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or Endangered Species Act-listed fish species or non-listed populations primarily supported by natural spawning. Documented fish use.</td>
<td>Addresses a single species of a low priority. Documented fish use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life History</td>
<td>Addresses an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of the salmonid species in the area or project addresses multiple life history requirements.</td>
<td>Addresses fewer life history stages or habitat types that limit the productivity of the salmonid species in the area or partially addresses fewer life history requirements.</td>
<td>Is unclear about the salmonid life history being addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Has a low cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location.</td>
<td>Has a reasonable cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location.</td>
<td>Has a high cost relative to the predicted benefits for that particular project type in that location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Certainty Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified and Prioritized in the Strategy</th>
<th>High CERTAINTY Project</th>
<th>Medium CERTAINTY Project</th>
<th>Low CERTAINTY Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Scope is appropriate to meet its goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Is moderately appropriate to meet its goals and objectives.</td>
<td>The methodology does not appear to meet the goals and objectives of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Is consistent with proven scientific methods. <strong>Assessment:</strong> Methodology will address effectively an information or data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within 1-2 years of completion.</td>
<td>Uses untested or incomplete scientific methods. <strong>Assessment:</strong> Methods will effectively address a data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within 3-5 years of completion.</td>
<td>Uses untested or ineffective methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Is in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions being taken first.</td>
<td>Is dependent on other actions being taken first that are outside the scope of this project.</td>
<td>May be in the wrong sequence with other protection and restoration actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Addresses a high potential threat to salmonid habitat.</td>
<td>Addresses a moderate potential threat to salmonid habitat.</td>
<td>Addresses a low potential threat to salmonid habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Clearly describes and funds stewardship of the area or facility for more than 10 years.</td>
<td>Clearly describes but does not fund stewardship of the area or facility for more than 10 years.</td>
<td>Does not describe or fund stewardship of the area or facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Landowners are willing to have work done.</td>
<td>Landowners potentially contacted and likely will allow work.</td>
<td>Landowner willingness is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Actions are scheduled, funded, and ready to take place and have few or no known constraints to successful implementation including projects that may result from this project.</td>
<td>Have few or no known constraints to successful implementation as well as other projects that may result from this project.</td>
<td>Actions are unscheduled, unfunded, and not ready to take place, and have several constraints to successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M: Regional Area Summary Information

The final annual funding report provides region-by-region summaries to the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office and the SRFB each December. These summaries document the local process to bring project lists to the SRFB for funding in each salmon recovery region. This year, as recommended by the Lean study, Questions 1B-1D are added to ask regions if they are funding the highest priority projects with their allocations. Questions 4 and 5 from lead entities will be submitted by lead entities to the regions and included in the summaries.

RCO staff requests that regional organizations review their information and update their responses to the questions below in a template of the funding report that RCO will send out to regions in June. Regions may request the template sooner, as needed.

RCO and Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office staff will review the regional submissions and post them on the RCO Web site as part of the funding report. These regional area summaries are due to RCO September 6, 2019.

Questions

Regional organizations answer Questions 1-3

1. Internal funding allocations:
   A. Describe the process and criteria used to develop allocations across lead entities or watersheds within the region. (Only regions answer this question)
   B. Explain if the projects list(s) submitted in your region funds the highest priority projects.
   C. If the highest priority projects were not funded, explain the barriers to implementing the highest priority projects in your region.
   D. Do suballocations to lead entities limit your region from getting to the highest priority projects?
2. **Regional technical review process:** The SRFB envisions regional technical review processes that address, at a minimum, the fit of lead entity projects to regional recovery plans, if available. (Only regions answer this question)

   A. Explain how the regional technical review was conducted.

   B. What criteria were used for the regional technical review?

   C. Who completed the review (name, affiliation, and expertise) and are they part of the regional organization or independent?

   D. Were there any projects submitted to the SRFB that the regional implementation or Habitat Work Schedule did not specifically identify? If so, please provide justification for including these projects in the list of projects recommended to the SRFB for funding. If the projects were identified in the regional implementation plan or strategy but considered a low priority or in a low priority area please provide justification.

3. **Criteria the SRFB considers in funding regional project lists:** Revised Code of Washington 77.85.130 identifies criteria that the SRFB must consider and give preference in awarding funds to projects. Please provide a short description of how the region considered each of the criteria (when applicable) when presenting the project list to the SRFB. Questions A-C can be answered in narrative form. To save time, RCO added questions D-I into PRISM and will supply this information to each region before September 6, 2019. Please include the matrix and the region’s responses as part of the narrative for Question 3.

   How did the regional review consider whether a project met the following criteria:

   A. Provides benefit to high priority stocks for the purpose of salmon recovery or sustainability. In addition to limiting factors analysis, Salmonid Stock Inventory, and Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program, provide stock assessment work completed to date to characterize the status of salmonid species in the region. Briefly describe.

   B. Addresses cost-effectiveness. Provide a description of cost-effectiveness considered.

   C. Preserves high quality habitat. Describe projects on the list that will preserve high quality habitat.

   D. Sponsored by an organization with a successful record of project implementation. For example, identify the number of previous SRFB projects funded and completed.
E. Provides benefit to listed and non-listed fish species. Identify projects on the regional list that primarily benefit listed fish. Identify projects on the regional list that primarily benefit non-listed species.

F. Implements a high priority project or action in a region or watershed salmon recovery plan. Identify where and how the project is identified as a high priority in the referenced plan.

G. Provides for match above the minimum requirement percentage. Identify the project’s match percentage and the regional match total.

H. Involves members of the Veterans Conservation corps established in Revised Code of Washington 43.60A.150.

I. For Puget Sound and Hood Canal regions only
   i. Sponsored by an entity that is a Puget Sound partner, as defined in Revised Code of Washington 90.71.010. Referenced in the “Action Agenda” developed by the Puget Sound Partnership under Revised Code of Washington 90.71.310. (Projects on 3-year work plans will qualify as they are referenced under Near Term Action B.1.1 of the “Action Agenda.”)

4. Local review processes. (Lead entity provides response.)

   A. Provide project evaluation criteria and documentation (local technical reviewer and citizen committee score sheet or comment forms) of the local citizens advisory group and technical advisory group ratings for each project, including explanations for differences between the two groups’ ratings.

   B. Identify the local technical review team (include expertise, names, and affiliations of members).

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

5. Local evaluation process and project lists. (Lead entity provides response.)

   A. Explain how multi-year implementation plans or Habitat Work Schedules helped to develop project lists.

   B. Explain how finalized project lists address the comments of technical, citizen, and policy reviews. Were there any issues about projects on the list and how were those resolved?
Appendix N: Landownership and Stewardship Forms

Landownership Certification Form

This form ensures that the sponsor reviewed property information and that no encumbrances exist that would adversely affect the ability to restore the property. This form is required for all restoration projects and for all preliminary or final design projects after identifying the project site. The sponsor must submit the form before RCO issues a project agreement. Visit the RCO Web site to download a landowner agreement form.

Landowner Agreements

Landowner agreements are required for restoration projects on land that the sponsor does not own. Provide RCO with a signed landowner agreement before construction or before reimbursement for any construction expenses.

The agreement is a document between the sponsor and the landowner that, at a minimum, allows access to the site by the sponsor and RCO staff for project implementation, inspection, maintenance, and monitoring; clearly states that the landowner will not intentionally compromise the integrity of the project; and clearly describes and assigns all project monitoring and maintenance responsibilities.

The landowner agreement remains in effect for a minimum of 10 years from the date of project completion. The date of project completion is the date of final payment to the sponsor, as defined in Section E of the salmon project agreement. It is the sponsor’s responsibility to inform the landowner of this date.

Visit the RCO Web site to download a landowner agreement form.

Acquisition Stewardship Plan

If the sponsor acquired fee simple land, the sponsor must provide a stewardship plan at the close of the project. A plan is necessary to ensure the landowner will maintain the property in perpetuity. To download a template with the recommended plan components, visit the RCO Web site.
Restoration Stewardship Plan

If the sponsor completed a restoration project, the sponsor must provide a stewardship plan at the close of the project. A plan is necessary to ensure the landowner will maintain the project area at least 10 years after completion. Visit the RCO Web site to download template with the recommended plan components.
Appendix O:
SRFB Amendment Request Authority Matrix

Sponsors may appeal any decision to the SRFB. Use the amendment request template to submit a request to an RCO grants manager.

Consult means the lead entity obtains a decision from its technical and citizens committees. Puget Sound lead entities must consult the Puget Sound Partnership for cost increases using Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Request</th>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>RCO Director</th>
<th>SRFB Subcommittee</th>
<th>SRFB Technical Review</th>
<th>SRFB</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Project Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase project funds due to project overruns</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>The site had different soil types than expected and it cost more than anticipated to do the geotechnical analysis, design, and install the culvert. Sponsor now requests an increase in SRFB funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase/decrease project scope (no funding change)</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>Sponsor planted 3,000 trees and shrubs on 3 acres of riparian habitat, as outlined in the contract. Funds remain and the sponsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 Adopted June 9, 2005, revised December 8, 2011

19 Cost increases may be granted only if funding is available.
### Example

A sponsor wants to plant an additional 100 trees and shrubs on adjacent acres. Sponsor plans to replace two barrier culverts. After designing the project, sponsor only has funds to install one culvert. Sponsor requests a scope reduction, but still need to use all the funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Request</th>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>RCO Director</th>
<th>SRFB Subcommittee</th>
<th>SRFB Technical Review</th>
<th>SRFB</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change project type</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>Sponsor proposed to purchase floodplain or riparian habitat and reconnect a side channel on a portion of the site. Sponsor now propose to purchase the land only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer sponsorship</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original sponsor is unable to start or complete the work and requests a different sponsor finish the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce match</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>Sponsor received $75,000 from SRFB and provided $33,000 (30 percent) in match for a total project cost of $108,000. Later, the sponsor could only raise a match of $14,000 (15 percent) for a total project cost or $89,000. Sponsor requests a match reduction of 57 percent ($19,000/$33,000) and corresponding scope reduction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acquisition Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Request</th>
<th>Lead Entity</th>
<th>RCO Director</th>
<th>SRFB Subcommittee</th>
<th>SRFB Technical Review</th>
<th>SRFB</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change site to a contiguous site</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve site add/change</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor proposed to purchase six parcels. One of the parcels is not available, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Request</td>
<td>Lead Entity</td>
<td>RCO Director</td>
<td>SRFB Subcommittee</td>
<td>SRFB Technical Review</td>
<td>SRFB</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change site to a non-contiguous site</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>Sponsor proposed to purchase four parcels. One of the parcels is not available, and sponsor asks to buy a different site on a different part of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay more than fair market value (no increase in funding)</td>
<td>May approve up to 10 percent</td>
<td>May approve over 10 percent</td>
<td>May approve more than 20 percent</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>Sponsor and landowner negotiate a purchase price above the fair market value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restoration Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant change in the project location</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>Sponsor is unable to replace a culvert at the proposed location and ask to replace a culvert on another river, Water Resource Inventory Area, or to benefit different fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studies/Assessments Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant change in the location of study</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>Sponsor proposed to inventory barriers on a specific river and later ask to inventory another river, Water Resource Inventory Area, or to benefit different fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change type of study</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>May approve or recommend</td>
<td>Available to review change</td>
<td>May approve</td>
<td>Sponsor proposed to do an assessment on forage fish but after more research determines an inventory of barriers is more important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>