WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee
2026 Salmon Habitat Recovery Process Guide
FINAL 12-03-2025

Introduction

The intent of this document is to guide prospective sponsors through the process for developing a project proposal for consideration by the WRIA 13 Lead Entity for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) grant cycle. (*Pursuant to Chapter 77.85 RCW and SRFB policies, all projects seeking funds administered by the SRFB must be reviewed and prioritized by a lead entity group in order to be considered for funding by the SRFB).* Additionally, this guide is intended for all Lead Entity Committee members and members of the public as a reference and guiding document for this 2025 funding cycle.

The Salmon Habitat Protection and Restoration Plan for Water Resource Inventory Area 13 – Deschutes identifies and prioritizes projects that protect and restore habitat for salmonids that occur in the marine and freshwater environments of Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 13. The strategy promotes projects and activities that support all salmonids species at all life stages. There is an additional focus on freshwater restoration efforts towards the benefit of coho and steelhead, which are in a downward trend in South Puget Sound, and preservation of freshwater habitats for the benefit of steelhead, coho and chum.

Vision

We envision natural watershed processes in the freshwater and marine environments of WRIA 13 that preserve or enhance biologically diverse runs of salmonids capable of self-sustaining natural reproduction. We will achieve this by implementing strategic actions to maximize the productive capacity of the habitat.

We envision a community that supports these efforts through land-use and development choices that emphasize naturally functioning aquatic systems. We will achieve this by working with local partners to provide outreach and educational information to the public in many different forms to reach and involve the broadest possible segments of the population.

The outcomes we intend to achieve through our efforts are:

- A process to rank and coordinate SRFB projects

- Integration of this salmonid habitat restoration and protection plan into larger watershed plans and the larger South Puget Sound Salmon Recovery
- Increased public awareness of salmonid habitat needs
- Increased predictability of success when applying for project funding
- Linkage of co-managers
- Renewed funding
- Building a positive reputation and strong relationships between the community and governmental organizations
- The full participation of citizens in restoring and protecting salmonid habitat
- Maintaining and building momentum for salmonid recovery
- Provide habitat conditions that support historical salmonid distributions

Strategic goals

1. Protect habitat through conservation easements and acquisition where the habitat is intact
2. Restore ecosystem structure and functions in areas where natural processes can be restored.
3. Address gaps in our knowledge of fish populations, fish use, and condition of natural processes
4. Give priority to projects that directly benefit high priority salmonid stocks
5. Give priority to intact watersheds

WRIA-wide Stressors

Across the watersheds of WRIA 13, the freshwater systems are lacking sufficient amounts of large woody debris (LWD) and functioning riparian areas. Many and streams are disconnected from their floodplains and have incised channels. Lack of LWD and channel incision inhibits natural gravel sorting and storage, limiting spawning habitat for salmonids. Pool habitat are limited as well due to the lack of LWD, specifically key pieces. Historic anthropogenic land uses have affected the riparian corridors, encroaching on the natural green spaces that protect stream functions. The removal of trees reduces the potential for the future recruitment of habitat forming LWD into streams as well as altering instream temperatures. This loss of forest cover and degradation of freshwater and saltwater habitats negatively affects the natural ability to deliver watershed functions that provide ecological benefits to salmonids, humans and many other species. Restoring stream side riparian areas, creating potential LWD recruitment, and protecting in stream and off channel habitat are priority actions within WRIA 13. Additional stressors include: man-made migration barriers/blockages and stream bank armoring, loss of floodplain connection, filling of wetlands, and channel modification.

Protection

Protection efforts in WRIA 13 will focus on areas of functional habitat that have a high threat of development or land use changes that will deleteriously impact and/or have the potential to lead to aquatic habitat degradation. Protection projects will conserve critical aquatic habitats and/or landscape features that directly influence the natural processes within a watershed/marine shoreline. These efforts will also target key habitat that provides the most benefit to salmonids. Restoration of vital habitat functions may also be a component of a protection project.

Restoration

Restoration efforts in WRIA 13 will focus to restore the natural watershed functions. These efforts will take place in the freshwater watersheds and marine shorelines where it is most attainable to successfully restore the natural processes to benefit salmonids.

Potential restoration areas within WRIA 13 will include those watershed systems that have a greater potential to restore habitat functions. Restoration efforts will address the problems impacting the natural processes rather than their symptoms.

The project or program considers all stocks and life stages.

Sub-basins and marine shorelines having restoration potential must incorporate habitat functions for life history phases, which include spawning, rearing, and migration.

WRIA 13 considers restoration, acquisition and design/data gathering projects and programs that benefit salmonids listed under the Endangered Species Act and those ranked as critical or depressed under SaSI. With declining coho populations and risk of ESA listing, coho are a priority stock for both restoration and protection. This species is dependent upon the freshwater for major portions of its life stages for spawning adults and rearing for juveniles as they spend up to two years in the streams before out-migrating to marine waters. The Committee remains committed to its vision of a multi-species approach. Puget Sound Steelhead were listed under ESA in 2007.

The Committee remains committed to its vision of a multi-species approach, as protecting and restoring habitat creates the potential for natural productivity for all salmonid species.

Additionally, to ensure the continued health of chum within South Sound, chum are also a priority for restoration and preservation activities.

The project or program increases the potential for natural productivity.
The long-term health of salmonids in WRIA 13 depends on self-sustaining salmon reproduction. Ultimately, successful projects must provide a direct or indirect link to an increase in salmonid survival and numbers.

The project or program has the potential for long-term success.
Projects and programs must demonstrate a certainty of success by relying on proven best available science and best management practices in their design and implementation. There must also be a clear commitment towards monitoring and maintenance of a project or program to guarantee long-term duration of the benefit to salmonids.

Adaptive management entails relying on scientific methods to test the results of a project or program so that appropriate adjustments can be made to provide the greatest opportunity for project success. Good projects and programs employ a strong adaptive management approach within their design, along with the capacity to accommodate the need for change when necessary.

The project or program addresses priority data gaps.
The limiting factors analysis (Konovsky and Haring, 1999) clearly communicates the breadth of information still missing about existing conditions in WRIA 13 sub-basins. This prevents biologists and communities alike from making the best decisions that adequately address the habitat needs in a logical, prescriptive, and efficient manner. Recent studies that have filled data gaps include: Deschutes River Bank Erosion Report (2007), Final Deschutes River Watershed Recovery Plan (2008), McLane Creek Action Plan (2010), Water-Type Projects (ongoing), The Deschutes River, Percival Creek, and Budd Inlet Tributaries TMDL. The WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee will rely on the best available science to inform priority restoration, acquisition and data gathering projects and programs.

WRIA 13 encourages projects and programs that address information gaps identified as "High Priority Projects and Programs" within individual sub-basins.

Community Values

Although a salmonid habitat protection and restoration project or program must pass a review regarding its technical merits, simultaneously it must deal with community issues and concerns in an effective and appropriate manner.

There are areas throughout WRIA 13 that present pockets of opportunity for outreach, places that have historically been difficult to perform restoration activities but could house the keystone landowner that is pivotal for recovery of a given system. The known areas are, but not limited to: McLane creek landowners; landowners along the mid and upper Deschutes, downstream from

the falls and from McIntosh Lake to Lake Lawrence; agricultural landowners adjacent the Deschutes River; and community associations that collectively own large pieces of land along the nearshore. Projects that address concerns and incorporate outreach in these areas will be given priority during the ranking process.

The LE Committee encourages and supports projects that have the opportunity to incorporate an educational element to some extent, whether it be active or indirect. These opportunities are important to share information to the community about why salmonid habitat protection and restoration is crucial.

Actions incorporated into projects that provide opportunities for more effective education are:

- Publicizing good stewardship practices and actions
- Getting the word out about salmonid habitat recovery and restoration efforts through a website, educational signs, radio ads, written information distributed in high traffic areas, public access TV shows, and interpretive trails
- Giving presentations before community groups during and after completion of projects

Outreach Activities

Despite the detrimental effects of development in WRIA 13, the level of community outreach and involvement is quite high. The local utility funded volunteer outreach and education program, Stream Team is active within WRIA 13, with all three municipalities and Thurston County coordinating water quality and stormwater related education, benthic macroinvertebrate monitoring and restoration activities in the area on public and private land. They also do citizen science monitoring including macroinvertebrate monitoring, nearshore forage fish surveys, amphibian egg mass surveys, and plankton sampling. Stream Team hosts climate-related lectures, workshops, and restoration events. South Sound GREEN works with school teachers and students throughout Thurston County to monitor water quality within local streams.

The South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group, the Thurston Conservation District, and the Center for Natural Lands Management all provide direct services to help private landowners get involved with watershed restoration activities.

Geographic / Project Priorities

As a general approach, lowland freshwater habitat suitable for chum spawning is a priority for protection and restoration as the chum populations within WRIA 13 are healthy and maintaining these healthy populations is a priority.

coho are a priority stock for both restoration and protection as their populations are declining in South Sound. This species is dependent upon the freshwater for major portions of its life stages for spawning adults and rearing for juveniles as they spend up to two years in the streams before out-migrating to the marine waters.

To better evaluate habitat conditions in WRIA 13 a strong priority will be given to address data gaps in both freshwater and marine shoreline areas.

The Co-managers (WDFW, Squaxin Island Tribe) have developed a stream ranking model for the South Sound (2005), based on basin size and intactness and species use, among other parameters. In 2021, the freshwater prioritization was updated based upon: existing habitat conditions (water temperature, sediment composition, and habitat complexity), salmonid potential (anadromous stream miles and coho intrinsic potential), and restoration and conservation priority. Detailed explanation can be found online here.

TABLE 4 (*PULLED FROM WRIA 13 FRESHWATER PRIORITIZATION SUMMARY, 6-2021*)
MATRIX OF EXISTING HABITAT CONDITION AND SALMONID POTENTIAL CATEGORIES

Existing Habitat Condition Category	**Highest (least degraded)**	Houston Dr Snyder Cove	Ellis Green Cove	McLane - Lower McLane - Upper
	High	Adams – Upper	Dobbs Libby	McLane – Swift Woodard – Lower Woodard – Upper Woodland – Middle
	Medium	Adams – Lower Moxlie Schneider Woodland – Long Lake Woodland – Hicks and Pattinson Lakes	Woodland – Lake Lois	Percival – Lower Woodland – Lower
	Low (most degraded)	Indian		Percival – Black Lake Ditch Percival - Upper
		Low	**Medium**	**High**
		Salmonid Potential		

TABLE 5 (*pulled from WRIA 13 Freshwater Prioritization Summary, 6-2021*)
RESTORATION AND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES

Reach	Restoration Priority	Conservation Priority
Adams – Lower	low	low
Adams - Upper	low	medium
Dobbs	medium	medium
Ellis	high	high
Green Cove	high	high
Houston Dr	low	medium
Moxlie	low	low
Indian	low	low
Libby	medium	medium
McLane - Swift Creek	high	high
McLane - Lower	high	high
McLane - Upper	high	high
Percival - Lower	high	medium
Percival - Black Lake Ditch	medium	medium
Percival - Upper	medium	medium
Schneider	low	low
Snyder Cove	low	medium
Woodard - Lower	high	high
Woodard - Upper	high	high
Woodland - Lower	high	medium
Woodland - Middle	high	high
Woodland - Lake Lois	medium	low
Woodland - Long Lake	low	low
Woodland - Hicks and Pattinson Lakes	low	low
The importance and size of the Deschutes River and its tributaries skewed the importance of all other freshwater systems. Therefore, the Deschutes mainstem and its tributaries are considered separately from other freshwater systems.		
Deschutes Tributaries	**Restoration Priority**	**Conservation Priority**
Deschutes Tributaries RM 2-31	Deschutes - high	Deschutes - high
Deschutes Tributaries RM 31-41	Deschutes - highest	Deschutes - highest
Deschutes Mainstem - Reach	**Restoration Priority**	**Conservation Priority**
Deschutes RM 2-10	Deschutes - low	Deschutes - low
Deschutes RM 10-17	Deschutes - low	Deschutes - low
Deschutes RM 17-25	Deschutes - low	Deschutes - low
Deschutes RM 25-31	Deschutes - moderate	Deschutes - moderate

Reach	Restoration Priority	Conservation Priority
Deschutes RM 31-41	Deschutes - high	Deschutes - high

Implementation Targets (established 2021)
These targets represent an ideal for salmon recovery in the watersheds of WRIA 13 and are what the WRIA 13 Lead Entity Committee is striving to create. The Committee will consider each project proposal individually to determine if the proposal meets the functional intent of these targets.

Large-Woody Debris Implementation Target:
LWD pieces should be stable in the system and collect additional pieces of wood, meeting the intent of TFW and Fox and Boulton. Needs to provide habitat forming structures.

Projects will meet these criteria or their functional equivalents.

Habitat Attribute	Implementation Target	Long-Term Desired Future Condition	Additional Notes
Large Woody Debris (LWD)	By 2032, 75% of priority reaches have a functional amount of large woody debris, including the total amount of pieces and the number of key pieces in channels.	By 2050, the amount of LWD is functional in 80% of freshwater stream systems, including the total amount of pieces and the number of key pieces in channels.	Priority reaches and functional amount for this target are defined in the LWD section below. Functional LWD includes the total number of pieces and the number of key pieces of wood (Fox and Bolton 2007 and TFW protocols).

Freshwater Riparian Buffer Width Implementation Target:
The WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee is striving for 250' buffer width for salmon projects.

Habitat Attribute	Implementation Target	Long-Term Desired Future Condition	Additional Notes
Freshwater Riparian Buffer Width	By 2032, the percent of vegetated riparian cover will increase by 20% in priority freshwater streams. Current vegetated riparian cover will be maintained.	By 2050, all watersheds will achieve 90% functional riparian vegetation cover.	Priority freshwater streams for this target and riparian function are defined in the riparian section below.

Freshwater Fish Passage Barrier Implementation Target:

Habitat Attribute	Implementation Target	Long-Term Desired Future Condition	Additional Notes

Freshwater Passage Barriers/ Access	100% of the known full and partial barriers be remedied using the WDFW stream simulation and/or bridge design by 2032	By 2050, 100% of freshwater streams containing fish rearing and spawning habitat are accessible.	Total and partial barriers for this target are listed below. Priority barriers will be updated with the WRIA 13 Passage Inventory and Prioritization results in 2022.

Lengths of natural and bulkheaded marine shoreline in WRIA 13 from Thurston Regional Planning Council 2004.

Geographic Area	Marine Shoreline (mi)	Length of Bulkheads (mi)	Percentage of bulkheaded shoreline
Eld Inlet	37.9 (east shore only = 17.2)	13.7 (east shore only = 5.7)	36.1 (east shore only = 33.1)
Henderson Inlet	21.4	4.0	18.7
Budd Inlet	18.4	8.3	45.1
Dana Passage	8.4	3.1	36.9
Nisqually Reach	11.9	4.8	40.3
Total	**98.0**	**33.9**	**34.6 %**

WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Workgroup

The WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Workgroup (Workgroup) is comprised of 25 technical and citizen members representing the cities, counties, Tribes, environmental community, citizen groups, state agencies, agriculture, shellfish growers, realtors and other interested or affected people and groups within the area. The Workgroup is the combined Technical Advisory Group and the Citizen Advisory Committee, who meet together once a month to discuss projects and activities in the watersheds of WRIA 13. The Workgroup created a WRIA-wide strategy to provide a regional understanding of the reasons that salmonid habitat is impaired, what caused those impairments, how to restore those habitats and what the desired future conditions look like. Beginning in 2006, the Workgroup began developing a 4-Year-Work-Program (now referred to as the 4-year-work-plan) in 2006 to streamline implementation of the Chinook Recovery Plan. This annually updated capital improvement plan (CIP) facilitates the multiple layers of review which occur in the SRFB process in addition to focusing on the most strategically important projects for salmonids. Moving from an annual review process to a CIP approach allows the Lead Entity to more fully integrate priorities, sequencing, and work towards H-integration.

The WRIA 13 Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) perform important, unique and complementary roles. These roles are essential to ensure the best projects are proposed for salmonid recovery and that the projects will increase the technical and community support for expanded and ever-increasing effectiveness of Lead Entities at both the local and regional levels. Due to the collaborative attributes of the TAG and Citizens committees, they meet in tandem monthly. Occasionally a sub-committee will be formed, who meet separately bringing suggestions and recommendations back to the larger Workgroup for a final decision. The sub-committee can be comprised of a combination of technical and citizen representatives, depending on purview and as outlined within this document, as it applies. Examples of when a sub-committee would be formed include but are not limited to: the biennial creation of the Lead Entity Scope of Work with the fiscal agent and the Recreation and Conservation Office; when considering proposals from sub-contracts; and revising the 4-year-work-plan and strategy documents.

Annual Process Revisions

The 4-Year-Work-Plan is updated by the TAG and submitted to the full Workgroup for approval each year, prior to the draft application deadline. Beginning in 2006, all projects proposed for SRFB and PSAR funding must be consistent with the updated 4-Year-Work-Program. Exceptions may exist, but these must be approved by the Workgroup and justified within the meeting summary.

Beginning in 2010, all projects that have been listed on the 4-Year-Work-Program, all funded projects and projects identified within local studies are listed online on the Salmon Recovery Portal. Here you can sign-in to track implementation, see what remains to be completed, and review pertinent studies. Another tool to track implementation and impacts to watershed and more broadly Puget Sound, is the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda, updated every four years.

Project Ranking Procedures

The entire committee works together to rank the projects annually at the project ranking meeting. The timeline for this meeting is approved by the Committee. The TAG discusses elements of the project that relate to benefit to salmonids and certainty of success while the CAC discusses elements of the project that relate to partnerships, community outreach and involvement. This discussion begins following the presentation of each project by the project proponent and initiates with each member revealing their scores on the ranking sheet for each of the three categories for each project. One final discussion and question session occurs at the culmination of the project presentations. Then each stakeholder uses the ranking criteria to score each project. They then translate the score for each project into a rank for each project. For example, scores of 127, 143 and 158 would translate to a rank of: 3, 2, 1 for the projects. All scoring sheets are collected and the LEC tabulates the average ranked score for each project. This becomes the ranked list for the Lead Entity.

If there is more than one representative for a given organization, those representatives must submit one scoring sheet per project scored. The exception is if there are both citizen and technical representatives present ranking the project. In that instance, a ranked sheet may be submitted from both the citizen and technical perspectives. This is to accommodate for differing expertise and perspectives from stakeholder organizations. Additionally, RCW 77.85 requires citizen membership from a broad representation of the community.

Projects may only be moved on the ranked list by the Citizen's Committee for specific reasons as outlined below:

1. If the last ranking project ranked within the funding allocation is only partially funded and cannot go forward with partial funds and the project below it is able to be implemented with those funds, then the ranking can be altered.
2. If a project has substantial budgetary or permitting uncertainties remaining even though it is technically sound and supports community values, it may be moved down within the ranked list after discussion.

This process is set up to meet the requirements of the state statute creating the SRFB and the Lead Entity program, and is designed to ensure that projects proposed for SRFB funding are technically sound, address priority issues, and are broadly supported by diverse community interests.

Decisions shall be arrived at by a full and open discussion of the alternatives and opinions. Decision making shall be made by consensus of the Workgroup in attendance. Consensus is herein defined as a preponderance of agreement, not unanimous agreement. In all discussions, preference is decision-making by consensus and to that end, every attempt will be made to achieve a unanimous decision. Consensus, defined as consent of all members present, will be the preferred method of determining agreement on issues. WRIA 13 will reach consensus on an issue when it agrees upon a single alternative and each participant can honestly say:

- I believe that other participants understand my point of view.
- I understand other participants' points of view.
- Whether or not I prefer this alternative, I will not block it because it was arrived at openly and fairly, and it is the best decision for us at this time.
- I may request that any concerns about the issue be officially recorded.

The decisions of the committee are final.

Ground Rules

The following rules shall govern the participation of project sponsors, TAG members, and CAC members during the habitat project list process.

Project Sponsors

- Project sponsors must submit a complete proposal in accordance with the schedule set forth by the WRIA 13 Workgroup.
- A complete proposal includes all required information requested by the SRFB within the application materials and by the WRIA 13 Workgroup, as requested by the Lead Entity Coordinator.
- Proposals are considered public as soon as they are submitted and will be available on the Lead Entity website (under development on Thurston Regional Planning Council's website) and within the PRISM database for review and comment by Workgroup members, Review Panel members, and the public at large.
- Projects submitted for consideration must address the strategic plan, recovery plan, limiting factors, watershed processes, best available science and/or supporting data.

- Sponsors will be asked to make written and oral presentations to the Workgroup, in addition to leading one or more site visits for the benefit of the Workgroup and for evaluation purposes of the SRFB Technical Panel.
- The TAG and Citizen members will recommend modifications to a proposal to the project sponsor. It is for the benefit of the project that these suggestions are made. It is up to the discretion of the sponsor to heed this advice, knowing that project ranking may be affected by this decision. Once the CAC has finalized the ranked project list at the conclusion of the review process, the project sponsor cannot change the scope or budget of the project unless directed to do so by the RCO or the Workgroup.
- Project sponsors are given one rough draft review to incorporate beneficial changes, expand partnerships, etc.
- During the combined TAG / CAC ranking meeting discussions that follow the project presentations, project sponsors will be admitted to the room, but asked to remain quiet save for questions asked directly of them by a LE Committee member. Sponsors will not be allowed to advocate for their proposals during the ranking meeting. Those who do will be given one verbal warning. If the conduct continues, they will be asked to leave.

A committee of citizens, with the assistance of a Technical Advisory Group (TAG), evaluates projects proposed to the Lead Entity. The TAG evaluates projects based on their technical merits, with an emphasis on the project's benefits to salmonids and certainty of success as provided in this plan. The citizen's committee works with the TAG to determine the final ranking of the projects based upon their technical merits in addition to how well the project fits within the Salmon Habitat Restoration and Protection Plan for WRIA 13, public involvement, the current year's 4-year-work-plan, the South Sound chapter of the Chinook Recovery Plan, and cost appropriateness. The lead entity then compiles the entire list of proposals in ranked order and submits them with lead entity details as one package to the SRFB for funding consideration.

The TAG and CAC will meet in a cooperative workshop style format to discuss the overall merits of each project. The technical and community ranking criteria are on a single form and evaluates both technical and community components. It is incumbent on the project sponsor to address all the criteria contained within the ranking documents to ensure a robust understanding by all members. Given the iterative nature of the process, there are many opportunities for Workgroup members to ask questions in the months leading up to the ranking meeting, at the site visits, and at the ranking meeting itself.

The ranking criteria contain questions to determine if a project addresses the following factors:

- Benefits to Salmon

- Certainty of Success
- Consistency with Strategic Plan
- Cost / Benefit
- Consistency with the current year's 4-year-work-plan
- Education and Outreach
- Partnerships
- Consistency with Strategic Plan

The goal of the ranking discussion is to come to a consensus on the various merits of each project. This holistic approach will incorporate a full discussion of each project, the outcome of which will outline the ranking rational for each proposal.

A consensus of ranking between all members of the LE Committee is the intent of this exchange. Consensus is defined above.

WRIA 13 Technical Advisory Group

The TAG is often the most knowledgeable about watershed, habitat and fish conditions. Their expertise is invaluable to ensure priorities and projects are based upon ecological conditions and processes. They are also the best judges of the technical merits and the certainty of a project's technical success.

The purpose of the TAG is to work together as a group to review proposals in WRIA 13 and to assist the sponsor to improve projects for habitat restoration and preservation. The TAG will evaluate the projects to assess their degree of integration with other previous or current projects in the same watershed, consistency with the strategy and/or recovery plan, benefit to salmonids, number of species affected, budget, etc. The primary goal of the TAG evaluation is to ensure that restoration / preservation projects are part of a holistic method to restore or preserve habitat function to the affected area. If reviewing an assessment project, the role of the TAG is to ensure the study is identified with the strategy or fills a previously unidentified data gap, will lead to habitat projects and benefits salmonids.

The TAG will assure that the proposed project addresses limiting factors, the strategy and clearly benefits salmonids. To achieve that goal, the TAG will evaluate projects and conditions using objective criteria as outlined within the strategy document.

TAG membership includes representatives from:

- Squaxin Island Tribe
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group
- Wild Fish Conservancy
- City of Olympia
- Thurston Conservation District
- Capitol Land Trust
- Thurston County
- Others as identified

WRIA 13 Citizen's Advisory Committee

The WRIA 13 Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) members are critical to ensure that priorities and projects have the necessary community support for success. They are the best judges of current levels of community interests in salmonid recovery and how to increase community support over time with the implementation of habitat projects. Citizen members must reside in the geography of WRIA 13.

The CAC is responsible for developing the final prioritized project list and submitting it to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board for funding consideration. As a group, the CAC may reject a project proposal from inclusion on the final ranked list if recommended by the TAG or if it conflicts with established SRFB guidelines. They may also change the ranking recommended by the TAG based upon social, economic or public acceptance reasons. As the ranking discussion occurs with CAC and TAG members concurrently striving for consensus and consensus cannot be reached, a vote will be taken that breaks the members into CAC and TAG member groups. Final say is given to the CAC.

When examining the projects, the CAC will evaluate each proposal based upon technical, budgetary, and community support criteria. It is the role of the CAC to integrate these issues and for the entire committee to formulate a final ranked list to be submitted to the SRFB for funding consideration. The conclusion of the joint discussion between all members of the LE is the final list.

WRIA 13 Citizen Advisory Committee membership may include:

- Squaxin Island Tribe
- Thurston County
- City of Olympia
- City of Lacey
- City of Tumwater
- Thurston Regional Planning Council

- Watershed Council Members
- Thurston Conservation District
- Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team
- Olympia Coalition for Ecosystems Preservation
- South Sound GREEN
- South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group
- Interested Citizens and Groups

This coordinated organizational structure ensures that the technical merit of each project is: fully reviewed and commented on by local, state and tribal representatives; represents a blend of benefit to salmonids and community interests; and that the ranked list is supported by the entire Workgroup.

Operating Procedures
WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee
September 10, 2003
Revised March 5, 2012

1.0 Purpose and Authority

1.1 Name
The name of this Lead Entity will be the WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee. The authority for this committee to act as the lead entity derives from RCW chapter 75.46 and RCW 77.85.

1.2 Purpose
The Lead Entity (LE) shall function as a non-governmental extension of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB), independent of local, state, tribal, or federal government except as mandated by the applicable RCW.

The primary purpose of the committee is to develop habitat recovery project lists for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board. To aid in the development of each project list, the LE will also develop a strategy document to guide the selection and ranking of projects. Project lists shall be prioritized in a way that preserves or restores habitat capable of sustaining salmonid populations, as outlined in the strategy. Prioritized lists of habitat projects shall be presented to the SRFB for consideration.

The committee shall also identify potential federal, state, local and private funding sources to implement habitat recovery projects in this WRIA. The committee will attempt to match funding sources to appropriate projects to maximize the benefit to salmonids and the community.

1.3 Geographic boundaries
The boundaries of WRIA 13 include the streams that drain into Henderson, Budd and the eastern portion of Eld Inlets.

2.0 Organization

2.1 Lead Entity
The Lead Entity stakeholder committee is composed of three components: the coordinator; a citizen advisory committee; and a technical advisory committee. The Thurston Conservation District serves as the fiscal agent for the Recreation and Conservation Office, overseeing billing. Decisions on funding, projects and all elements of the Lead Entity work plan and its implementation are the purview of the stakeholder committee.

2.2 Coordinator

The Lead Entity coordinator shall be an employee of the Thurston Regional Planning Council and will act as chairperson for committee meetings. While the lead entity coordinator is an employee of Thurston Regional Planning Council, the stakeholder committee of the Lead Entity is responsible for developing and overseeing the annual work plan and gives direction and provides input to the Coordinator.

The chairperson will be responsible for the orderly conduct of meetings, pursuit of the lead entity's mission and other administrative duties as required. The chair is authorized to represent the lead entity in public meetings but cannot commit the Committee to any action without expressed permission. Issues pursuant to the organization of the lead entity shall be vetted to the committee.

2.3 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee / Citizens Advisory Committee

The citizen's committee shall be comprised of representative interests from local tribes, local watershed groups, conservation groups, municipalities, landowners, citizens, etc. The entire committee's full membership, composed of representatives from agencies, tribes, governments, groups and individuals interested in salmonid habitat restoration in WRIA 13 will provide a citizen-based evaluation of the project proposed for salmonid habitat restoration. This committee approves the final project list to be submitted to the SRFB for review and funding. The citizens committee has the authority to re-rank the proposed project list from the technical committee based on community criteria established within the strategy document.

2.4 Technical Advisory Committee

The technical committee shall be composed of representatives from a variety of agencies, organizations, and municipalities that possess the appropriate expertise and training to provide technical advice on habitat preservation and restoration issues. This committee shall be a standing technical advisory body for the citizens committee. It shall meet as needed to review projects and perform tasks as necessary with the guidance of the coordinator and citizens committee. This committee shall work with project sponsors to refine projects and ensure they reflect the intent of the strategy. This committee will propose a habitat project list to the citizens committee.

2.5 Sub-committees

The Committee may appoint or request a special sub-committee from the entire committee as needed, to accomplish the mission of the lead entity.

2.6 Membership and Attendance

Membership is voluntary and shall be composed of local, state, tribal and federal representatives, conservation groups, local business interests and citizens. It is encouraged that members actively participate by attending regularly scheduled meetings. Citizen members must reside in the geography of WRIA 13.

2.7 Meetings

Meetings shall be open to the public and advertised to the extent possible. Meeting frequency, time and location shall be at the discretion of the committee. The grant timeline and meeting schedule can found on the Thurston Regional Planning Council website.

2.8 Conflict of Interest

The Lead Entity Coordinator (LEC) works for the SRFB process and does not represent any other entity while conducting the Lead Entity process. The LEC represents and serves all project sponsors and committee members equally and will work to assist each with issues as they arise. The primary role of the LEC is as facilitator to the process and advocate for the LE Committee and its projects in all local, regional and statewide meetings. The LEC will not present projects for review by the Lead Entity Committee. If the Lead Entity Committee believes that he/she has a conflict of interest with a specific project, they should inform the relevant committee and recuse himself/herself from the discussion. If such a recusal is necessary, a committee member can be selected by the members present to facilitate the discussion.

Committee members must inform the Lead Entity Committee and the Lead Entity Coordinator when there may be a perceived conflict of interest. If the member does not think he/she has a conflict, he/she should clearly state why. Members who have a conflict of interest must disclose any potential conflicts and let the committee decide how serious it is and what action to take.

Citizen and technical committee members should recuse themselves from evaluating a proposal if they believe their participation in the development of a project would impair their ability to fairly judge that project. Other committee members have the opportunity to ask questions that assure the transparency of the process and suggest that a fellow member may have a conflict of interest. This can occur through discussions with the LEC, who will then bring it to the Lead Entity Committee.

A conflict of interest may constitute benefiting financially, directly or indirectly, from the implementation of a project. If the member stands to benefit or has other ties to a project, the member should notify the group, have a discussion and follow the consensus of the group. Prior knowledge of the proposal or prior contact with the applicant does not constitute a conflict of interest, as long as

none of the above criteria apply to the reviewer. If you have any concerns or questions about whether your relationship with an applicant or proposal warrants recusal, please explain your situation to the other members of the committee at the meeting. They will decide jointly whether it constitutes a conflict of interest.

3.0 Guiding Documents

3.1 4-Year-Work-Program (now referred to as the 4-year-work-plan, as per PSP)

The WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee began developing a 4-Year-Work-Program in 2006 to streamline implementation of the Chinook Recovery Plan. This annually updated capital improvement plan (CIP) facilitates the multiple layers of review which occur in the SRFB process in addition to focusing on the most strategically important projects for salmonids. Moving from an annual review process to a CIP approach allows the Lead Entity Committee to more fully integrate priorities, sequencing, and work towards H-integration.

3.2 Salmon Habitat Recovery Strategy

Each Lead Entity develops a recovery strategy to guide its selection and ranking of projects. The strategy prioritizes geographic areas and types of restoration and protection activities, identifies salmonid species needs, and identifies local socio-economic and cultural factors as they relate to salmonid recovery. These stakeholder-supported strategies increase effective decision-making by Lead Entities and define and clarify roles between Lead Entities and the broader salmonid recovery planning environment.

4.0 Process and Administration

4.1 Decision Making

Committee decisions shall be arrived at by a full and open discussion of the alternatives and opinions. Decision making shall be made by consensus of the group in attendance. Consensus is here defined as a preponderance of agreement, not unanimous agreement. In all discussions, preference is decision-making by consensus and to that end, every attempt will be made to achieve a unanimous decision including tabling a motion for further discussion. In certain cases, the delay of tabling an issue may not be practical due to time or administrative requirements. Then, it shall be the responsibility of the chair to refer the matter to the committee for a vote. The committee shall first vote to determine the matter is of such consequence and urgency that the issue is called for the question. If this is decided in favor of a vote, then the committee is required to vote the issue over any objection by individual members. The outcome of all voted decisions shall be recorded in the minutes of the committee. Dissenting individuals may submit written opinions of the dissent or disagreement for inclusion in the minutes.

4.2 Voting Members

Each representative organization or group, shall appoint one person to represent that organization when a vote is called for. To the extent possible, voters shall be informed participants, actively involved in the business of the committee. All voting decisions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of those present. A quorum of members will be one-third of the voting members. These rules do not restrict the number of people who may participate in meetings, merely those who may participate in voting decisions.

Voting decisions will be passed by a vote of a two-thirds majority of members present. If a two-thirds vote fails, the issue will be discussed further until the two-thirds majority can be satisfied. The coordinator will strive to ensure that all members are given opportunity to express their thoughts and will provide additional information as available and necessary to resolve an impasse. If obtaining the two-thirds majority continues to be difficult, committee members can decide to table the issue for later discussion and resolution using the decision-making steps outlined in 3.1 of this draft.

4.3 Changes to Bylaws

The committee shall operate under written bylaws. Bylaws may be altered by a two-thirds majority of the voting members. A quorum of the voting membership must be present to conduct a vote.

4.4 Meeting Summary

Meeting summaries shall be taken at each meeting, distributed to members prior to the next scheduled meeting and kept on file.

5.0 Project Evaluations

5.1 Project Lists

Evaluation of salmonid habitat preservation and restoration project list is the primary mission of the WRIA 13 Lead Entity Committee. The evaluation of the projects shall be based on the guidelines of the SRFB criteria. Projects which do not meet these criteria shall be eliminated from further consideration.

5.2 Project Priorities

Projects shall be evaluated in a systematic way. The technical committee is responsible for developing systematic and objective criteria for evaluating and ranking project lists. Project priorities will be based on the most current strategic plan and 4-year-work-program.

5.3 Public Outreach

Public outreach is intended to develop widespread public support for salmonid habitat restoration efforts. Guidance for public outreach component is provided in the strategic plan and will be addressed in the development of the annual plan of work for the committee. Outreach possibilities include articles in local newspapers, participation in county festivals and fairs, publications educating the public, sponsoring signage at local streams, participation in county and city Stream Team and South Sound GREEN activities, etc.

Procedures for Securing Sub-Contracts

November 18, 2013

(adopted on November 13, 2013 by WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee)

FINAL

Background (from RCO Manual 19):

> Each regional organization and lead entity must develop and adopt written procedures on the procurement of contracted services. The Recreation and Conservation Office also will have a role in reviewing and assisting regional organizations and lead entities with higher value (in dollars) sub-contracts. For sub-contracts more than $20,000 or a combined dollar amount of more than $20,000 going to one vendor (during the contract period), the regional or lead entity organization must send the Recreation and Conservation Office a copy of the sub-contract for review before letting the sub-contract. The Recreation and Conservation Office will review the sub-contract proposal in a timely manner for consistency with work products promised in the implementation scope of work.

An Evaluation Committee shall be established as a sub-committee of the entire WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee (Committee). The sub-committee shall review proposals and prepare a recommendation to be presented to the entire WRIA 13 Committee for their input, guidance and a final decision. Examples of instances when the Lead Entity will need to sub-contract are: PSAR capacity funds; or PSAR Project Implementation Development Awards (PIDA) funds, when funds for specific deliverables need to be passed through for implementation.

The Evaluation Committee shall include a minimum of the following:

- Representation from the Puget Sound Partnership
- Representation from the Recreation and Conservation Office
- Representation from the Squaxin Island Tribe
- Representation from at least two citizen committee members

The Lead Entity Coordinator facilitates the discussion, takes notes and undertakes the actions outlined by the sub-committee. The sub-committee then makes a report to the entire Lead Entity stakeholder committee during a meeting. The entire Lead Entity Committee makes a decision as to the path forward, using decision-making as laid out in the by-laws. Direction is given to the Lead Entity Coordinator, who moves forward with the action(s) laid out by consensus of the stakeholder committee.

Evaluation Committee members must inform the committee and the LEC when there may be a perceived conflict of interest. If the member does not think he/she has a conflict, he/she should clearly state why. Members who have a conflict of interest must disclose any potential conflicts and let the committee decide how serious it is and what action to take. Additional information on conflicts of interest can be found within the by-laws.

Proposals will be distributed to the WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery email distribution list and forwarded as necessary for the tasks. They will also be on the LE website, as appropriate.

Proposal Evaluation Criteria:

- Responsive Applicant is an entity whose bid conforms in all material respects to the terms and conditions, the specifications, and other requirements of the solicitation
- Applicant is qualified and capable of fulfilling contract obligations
- Applicant has experience working with landowners, permit agencies, citizen groups, and funding agencies
- Applicant has a record of successful implementation of projects and/or of obtaining funding for implementation
- Applicant demonstrates an understanding of watershed processes and is able to manage a salmonid habitat project that benefits all species at all life stages
- Pricing of the Applicant has been evaluated and deemed appropriate for the tasks outlined within the solicitation
- Protests will be brought to the Evaluation Committee for review and consideration

Components of a Proposal Request for consideration by the Committee:

Committee provides to potential sub-contractor:

- Description of services required
- Project schedule

- Due date for responses

Respondent / sub-contractor provides (in no more than three pages):

- Task name
- Task cost
- Work to be completed
- How was the cost estimate determined
    - Proposed approach and methodology
    - Proposed tasks, services, activities, etc. necessary to accomplish the task.
- Qualifications, experience and approach
- Timeline for execution and completion of task
- Staff availability for task period

Background Reference: From RCO Manual 19, February, 2010
Criteria for Deciding What SRFB Will Reimburse

Allowed costs must:

1. Be necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient performance and administration of SRFB awards. A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost. The question of reasonableness is particularly important when governmental units or components are predominately federally funded.

In determining reasonableness of a given cost, consideration shall be given to:

2. Whether the cost is of a type generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the operation of the grantees and the performance of the grant agreement.
3. The restraints or requirements imposed by such factors as sound business practices; arms-length bargaining; federal, state, and other laws and regulations; and terms and conditions of the grant agreement.
4. Market prices for comparable goods or services.
5. Whether the individuals concerned acted with prudence in the circumstances considering their responsibilities to the grantees, its employees, the public, and the state and federal governments.
6. Significant deviations from the established practices of the grantees, which may unjustifiably increase the grant agreement cost.
7. Be authorized or not prohibited under federal, state, or local laws or regulations.
8. Conform to any limitations or exclusions set forth in these principles.

9. Be consistent with policies, regulations, and procedures that apply uniformly to both the grant agreement and other activities of the grantees.
10. Be determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.
11. Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost sharing or matching requirements of any other SRFB state award in either the current or a prior period.
12. Be the net of all applicable credits. This includes those receipts or reduction of expenditure-type transactions that offset or reduce expenses allocable to SRFB awards. Examples of applicable credits include purchase discounts, rebates, etc.
13. Be adequately documented.
14. Be incurred during the grant period specified in the grant agreement, identify billing period on A-19.
15. Be identified in the scope of the grant agreement.

Lead Entity Contract – Creation and Adoption Procedures

Background

In conjunction with each state fiscal biennium, the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) provides base funding to carry out the requirements of RCW 77.85, in concert with the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), when funding is available. The RCO and PSP collaborate to provide a template of the Scope of Work to the Lead Entity Coordinator towards the end of the biennium, outlining generally the tasks to be undertaken.

Procedure

The Lead Entity Coordinator will convene the Evaluation Sub-Committee to outline tasks within the contract. The Evaluation Sub-Committee may also include members of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) in their meetings and discussion.

The Evaluation Sub-Committee shall include a minimum of the following:

- Representation from the Puget Sound Partnership
- Representation from the Recreation and Conservation Office
- Representation from the Squaxin Island Tribe
- Representation from at least two citizen committee members

The Lead Entity Coordinator facilitates the discussion, takes notes and undertakes the actions outlined by the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee then makes a report to the entire Lead Entity stakeholder committee during a meeting. The entire Lead Entity stakeholder group makes a decision as to the path forward, using decision-making as laid out in the by-laws. Direction is given to the Lead Entity Coordinator, who moves forward with the action(s) laid out by consensus of the stakeholder committee.

Evaluation Sub-Committee members must inform the committee and the LEC when there may be a perceived conflict of interest. If the member does not think he/she has a conflict, he/she should clearly state why. Members who have a conflict of interest must disclose any potential conflicts and let the committee decide how serious it is and what action to take. Additional information on conflicts of interest can be found within the by-laws.

2026 WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee SRFB and PSAR Process

PROPOSED Timeline and Monthly Meeting Dates

REVISED DRAFT 11-25-2025

DATE	PHASE	DESCRIPTION
January 14 **1:30 – 3:30**	**MEETING**	Monthly LE meeting
January 30 **Close of business**	**DUE DATE:** Letters of Intent	Applicants for Salmon Recovery Funding Board funds must complete a Letter of Intent and all associated documents. Submitting a Letter of Intent does not obligate the sponsor to submit a full proposal. However, the Letter of Intent notifies the Lead Entity of intent to apply and without this, the project will not be eligible for funding in the current round. All projects must come from the current 4-Year-Work-Program. Projects will need to be submitted from the Salmon Recovery Portal – formerly the Habitat Work Schedule (Amy will help on this step).
February 4	Legislative outreach – Salmon Day on the Hill	Meeting with area Legislators with Citizen Committee Representatives. Partners from around the state will be participating and some may join in our local meetings.
February 11 **12:30 – 3:30**	**MEETING:** Sponsors to discuss their Letter of Intent	Monthly LE meeting. All sponsors who are proposing a project are required to do an informal 10-minute presentation for the entire LE Committee. This discussion should include the maps and photos that are submitted for consideration through the Letter of Intent
March 4	**MEETING**	The LE Committee, RCO staff and Review Panel members will go into the field to see the project and hear a project overview for each project.
March 24 **Close of business**	**DUE DATE:** Full, final proposals due in PRISM	**Complete proposals are due into PRISM, inclusive of all attachments.** **All materials are due on this date.** The more thorough the project is at this stage, the more meaningful the feedback the LE, RCO and the Review Panel is able to offer. SPONSOR submits projects on PRISM.
April 8 – SITE VISITS **9am-5pm (hold)**	**SITE VISITS**	Monthly LE meeting
May 27 **9:00 – 5:00 (hold)** ***This meeting will combine May and June monthly meetings***	**RANKING MEETING:** Entire LE committee ranks the proposals	Project sponsors will prepare a 20-minute PowerPoint presentation to the entire LE Committee. There will be additional 10-minutes for questions, for a total of 30 minutes for each project proposal. LE committee members will score each project following the presentation. These numerical scores will be tabulated at the end of the presentations and utilized as the starting point for discussion amongst committee members.
May 29	Receive comments from the Review Panel	Approximately two weeks after the site visits, sponsors will receive comments from the Review Panel (RP). The RP will categorize each project as 'clear', 'need more information', or 'flagged' for additional review at the regional area project meeting. Once these comments are received, sponsors should update their applications (using track changes) to address RP concerns in

DATE	PHASE	DESCRIPTION
		addition to attaching a separate document into PRISM called "Response to Site Visit Review Panel Comments".
June 8-9	Sponsor conference call with Review Panel	Lead entities may schedule a 1-hour conference call with project applicants, RCO staff, and one SRFB Review Panel member to discuss "Needs More Information," "Project of Concern," or "Conditioned" projects in their lead entities.
June 22, noon	**SRFB DUE DATE**:	The applicant submits final revised application materials via PRISM. All projects must be submitted by this date. See Application Checklist.
July 8 1:30 – 3:30	**MEETING**	Monthly LE meeting
July 24	Final sponsor comment form due to Review Panel	Applicants receive the final SRFB Review Panel comment forms, which will identify their projects as Clear, Conditioned, or Project of Concern (POC).
August 5 (*note: one week earlier*) 1:30 – 3:30	**MEETING**	Monthly LE meeting
August 6	Lead Entity and sponsors deadline to accept Review Panel's conditioned projects Also, LE ranked list due in PRISM	Applicants with "Conditioned" projects must indicate whether they accept the condition or are withdrawing their project.
September 9 1:30 – 3:30pm	**MEETING**	Monthly LE meeting
September 15-16	**SRFB funding meeting**	Board awards grants. Public comment period available.
Early October mtg - Sept 30 1:30 – 3:30pm	**MEETING**	Monthly LE meeting
November 18 1:30 – 3:30	**MEETING**	Monthly LE meeting
December 16 1:30 – 3:30 (*note one week later*)	**MEETING**	Monthly LE meeting

WRIA 13: Deschutes Salmon Habitat Recovery Lead Entity Request for Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and Puget Sound Acquisition & Restoration (PSAR)Funds Project Proposals 2026

Letter of Intent Due Date:	**January 30, 2026**
Presentation of Project(s) Lead Entity:	**February 11, 2026**
Complete Proposals Due Date:	**March 24, 2026**
Site Visits to project site:	**April 8, 2026**
Ranking meeting presentation:	**May 27, 2026**

Background

The Washington State Legislature established the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) in 1999 to administer state and federal funding and to assist with a broad range of salmon-related activities. Its primary goal is to aid the recovery of salmonids (salmon, trout, and steelhead) by providing grants.

The Water Resource Inventory Area 13 – Deschutes Lead Entity is soliciting project proposals for salmonids habitat restoration and conservation projects in the Deschutes and associated watersheds (the boundaries of WRIA 13 include the streams that drain into Henderson, Budd and the eastern portion of Eld Inlets).

Some important points to consider:

- The SRFB funds projects that protect or restore salmonid habitat.
- Applicants must request at least $5,000.
- Applicants must provide money or resources to match 15 percent or more of the grant (there are some exceptions).
- Applicants must demonstrate a commitment to 10 years or more of stewardship for the project.
- Projects must be finished within two to three years.

Projects must be identified on the current 4-year-work-program as high priority actions. The Technical and Citizen Committee members of the Lead Entity will evaluate and rank the proposals in accordance with RCW 77.85 and submit the final project list to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board for funding consideration.

The Salmon Habitat Protection and Restoration Plan for Water Resource Inventory Area 13 – Deschutes identifies and prioritizes projects that protect and restore habitat for salmonids that occur in the marine and freshwater environments of Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 13. The strategy is intended to focus freshwater restoration efforts towards the benefit of coho

salmon, which are in a downward trend in South Puget Sound, and preservation of freshwater habitats for the benefit of coho and chum salmon. Chum salmon in South Puget Sound are healthy and it is the WRIA 13 Habitat Workgroup's intent to sustain these healthy populations.

Strategic goals:

6. Protect habitat through conservation easements and acquisition where the habitat is intact
7. Restore functions in areas where natural processes can be recovered, not just symptoms treated
8. Address gaps in our knowledge of fish populations, fish use, and condition of natural processes
9. Give priority to projects that directly benefit high priority salmonid stocks
10. Give priority to intact watersheds

TABLE 4 (*FROM WRIA 13 FRESHWATER PRIORTIZATION, 6-2021*)
MATRIX OF EXISTING HABITAT CONDITION AND SALMONID POTENTIAL CATEGORIES

Existing Habitat Condition Category				
	Highest (least degraded)	Houston Dr Snyder Cove	Ellis Green Cove	McLane - Lower McLane - Upper
	High	Adams – Upper	Dobbs Libby	McLane – Swift Woodard – Lower Woodard – Upper Woodland – Middle
	Medium	Adams – Lower Moxlie Schneider Woodland – Long Lake Woodland – Hicks and Pattinson Lakes	Woodland – Lake Lois	Percival – Lower Woodland – Lower
	Low (most degraded)	Indian		Percival – Black Lake Ditch Percival - Upper
		Low	**Medium**	**High**
		Salmonid Potential		

TABLE 5 (*FROM WRIA 13 FRESHWATER PRIORTIZATION, 6-2021*)
RESTORATION AND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES

Reach	Restoration Priority	Conservation Priority
Adams – Lower	low	low
Adams - Upper	low	medium
Dobbs	medium	medium
Ellis	high	high
Green Cove	high	high
Houston Dr	low	medium

Reach	Restoration Priority	Conservation Priority
Moxlie	low	low
Indian	low	low
Libby	medium	medium
McLane - Swift Creek	high	high
McLane - Lower	high	high
McLane - Upper	high	high
Percival - Lower	high	medium
Percival - Black Lake Ditch	medium	medium
Percival - Upper	medium	medium
Schneider	low	low
Snyder Cove	low	medium
Woodard - Lower	high	high
Woodard - Upper	high	high
Woodland - Lower	high	medium
Woodland - Middle	high	high
Woodland - Lake Lois	medium	low
Woodland - Long Lake	low	low
Woodland - Hicks and Pattinson Lakes	low	low

The importance and size of the Deschutes River and its tributaries skewed the importance of all other freshwater systems. Therefore, the Deschutes mainstem and its tributaries are considered separately from other freshwater systems.

Deschutes Tributaries	Restoration Priority	Conservation Priority
Deschutes Tributaries RM 2-31	Deschutes - high	Deschutes - high
Deschutes Tributaries RM 31-41	Deschutes - highest	Deschutes - highest

Deschutes Mainstem - Reach	Restoration Priority	Conservation Priority
Deschutes RM 2-10	Deschutes - low	Deschutes - low
Deschutes RM 10-17	Deschutes - low	Deschutes - low
Deschutes RM 17-25	Deschutes - low	Deschutes - low
Deschutes RM 25-31	Deschutes - moderate	Deschutes - moderate
Deschutes RM 31-41	Deschutes - high	Deschutes - high

Eligibility

Eligible applicants for SRFB/PSAR funding include cities, counties, conservation districts, Indian Tribes, non-profit organizations, special purpose districts, and private landowners. Private landowners are eligible applicants for restoration projects only when the project takes place on their own land. Projects that are solely to fulfill mitigation requirements are ineligible.

The SRFB funds a range of projects, but ALL of them must address habitat condition or

watershed processes that are important to salmonid recovery. The project may provide other benefits, such as flood control or education, but those benefits must be secondary. Projects are:

- Acquisitions
- Restoration
- Non-Capital Projects: Assessments, Designs, Inventories, and Studies
- Design-Only Projects with No Required Match
- Combination Projects
- Phased Projects

http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual_18.pdf

Funding Availability

Pending the outcome of Federal and State budgets, it is anticipated the WRIA 13 Lead Entity will have approximately $180,000 in potential 2026 SRFB funds, approximately $666,000 in PSAR funds, and approximately $270,000 in riparian funds.

Further Information

For more information about this opportunity, please contact Amy Hatch-Winecka at hwamy@trpc.org or 360.741.2524.

Project Sponsor:	Type here to enter text
Sponsor Contact Info:	Type here to enter text
Project Name:	Type here to enter text
Key Partners:	Type here to enter text
Project Location: *Include watershed*	Type here to enter text
Project Description:	Type here to enter text *1500 character maximum*
Grant Funding Request:	Type here to enter text
Total Project Cost:	Type here to enter text
Expected total match and source:	Type here to enter text *A minimum of 15% match is required*
List what 4-YWP action and/or plan action the project addresses:	Type here to enter text
Fish species benefitted:	Type here to enter text
Specific benefit to fish:	Type here to enter text
How the project builds upon or relates to previous / current projects:	Type here to enter text
Constraints or uncertainties affecting the project:	Type here to enter text
Have you contacted DNR concerning ownership? 360.902.1100	Type here to enter text

In addition to answering the questions above, please provide:

1) A general location map;
2) Detailed property or parcel map identifying all legal property boundaries and adjacent parcel ownership, aerial photos and designs as appropriate.
3) Provide a list of all potential stakeholders (landowners, adjacent landowners, and other interest groups
4) A cost estimate and draft budget, including a minimum of 15% match
5) Photographs of the site (in addition to aerials)

Letters of Intent are due on or before January 30, 2026 to:

Amy Hatch-Winecka
WRIA 13 Lead Entity Coordinator
Email: hwamy@trpc.org
Phone: 360.741.2524
2411 Chandler Court SW, Olympia WA 98512

WRIA 13 Deschutes Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee 2026 Citizen and Technical Ranking Criteria:

ACQUISITION PROJECTS

Overall Rank

Applicant	Project Title
Reviewer	Date

GENERAL STREAM PRIORITY	**Tier**		
	A	**B**	**C**
	Deschutes	Adams	Indian – Moxlie
	Green Cove	Ellis	Mission
	McLane	Percival	Other Puget Sound Tribs
		Woodard	
		Woodland	

A higher score indicates greater salmon recovery benefit

Overall Criteria:
Are the landowners aware of the project proposal being considered for funding?
YES NO

Are the landowners willing to have the proposed action occur on their property?
YES NO

Category	Criteria for Evaluating Project's Benefit	Score
Action and Areas	1.a. For saltwater projects: is the project located within a high priority area for restoration, according to the project selection tool or equivalent scientific model? **-or- (choose one only)** 1.b. For freshwater projects: is the project located within a high priority stream according to the stream ranking priority table?	*10 points possible*
Scientific	2. Is there a direct and tangible benefit to salmonids?	*10 points possible*
Feasibility	3. Does the sponsor have the necessary expertise in this area to accomplish the project objectives as scheduled, budgeted, planned and sited?	*10 points possible*
Species	4. Does the project have a multi-species approach, with emphasis on protecting healthy stocks (i.e. chum) and restoring declining stocks (i.e. coho)?	*5 points possible*
Life History	5. Does the project protect an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of salmonid species in the area?	*5 points possible*
Cost	6. Are overall costs reasonable for project type and location? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 7. Does this project represent a sound investment of public funds? *As an example, consider match amount and source as you answer this question.* (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
	PROJECT BENEFIT TOTAL	/50

Category	Criteria for Evaluating Project's Certainty	Score
Scope	8. Is the scale of the project appropriate per the identified need, as outlined by the relevant plan	*10 points possible*

	or model?	
Approach	9. Is the correct protection instrument utilized for the fullest benefit to salmon (easement vs. fee-simple acquisition)? (5 points possible) **-and (*answer both questions*)-** 10.a. Will additional work be necessary to restore the area for fullest salmonid benefit? **-or (award up to 5 points to either 10.a. or 10.b.)-** 10.b. Does the project protect high quality intact habitat?	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Sequence	11. Is the project appropriately sited, adjacent to other protected lands? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 12. Does the project result in long-term benefit that builds, upon other actions, such as creating corridors, that effect land use? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Threat	13. Is the habitat threatened if the project does not proceed?	*10 points possible*
Stewardship	14. Is there a stewardship plan in place following project implementation?	*5 points possible*
Implementation	15. If funded, will the <u>project</u> proceed to implementation with few or no known constraints?	*10 points possible*
	PROJECT CERTAINTY TOTAL	/55
Category	**Criteria for Evaluating Community Support**	**Score**
Partnerships	16. Does the project combine expertise from other groups and/or agencies that benefit the project,	*10 points possible*

	salmonids and future collaboration?	
Community Contribution	17. Does the proposal engage community groups, businesses and/or landowners as project partners or volunteers?	*10 points possible*
Location	18.a. Does the project occur in an area where it can serve as an asset to the community, either for recreation or open space? - **or-** 18.b. Is the project the first in a priority area where it can serve to engage adjacent or pivotal landowners?	*10 points possible*
Education	19. Does the sponsor have a plan to actively highlight the project and its results in the community? (5 points possible) -**and** (*answer both questions*)- 20. Does the project allow for education of the public regarding salmonids and their habitat? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Tribal Support	21. Is the Squaxin Island Tribe supportive of this project? (10 points)	*10 points possible*
Community Benefit	22. Does the project benefit the broader community? For example, offering flood reduction, open space for recreation, etc.	*10 points possible*
	COMMUNITY SUPPORT TOTAL	/60
	Benefit Total (questions 1-7, 50 points possible)	
	Certainty Total (questions 8-15, 55 points possible)	
	Community Support Total (questions 16-22, 60 points possible)	
	OVERALL PROJECT TOTAL (translate this number to a ranked score and carry it to the top right corner of the first page)	**/165**

Overall Rank

WRIA 13 Deschutes Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee 2026 Citizen and Technical Ranking Criteria:

COMBINATION RESTORATION AND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

Applicant	Project Title
Reviewer	Date

GENERAL STREAM PRIORITY	**Tier**		
	A	**B**	**C**
	Deschutes	Adams	Indian – Moxlie
	Green Cove	Ellis	Mission
	McLane	Percival	Other Puget Sound Tribs
		Woodard	
		Woodland	

A higher score indicates greater salmon recovery benefit

Overall Criteria:

Are the landowners aware of the project proposal being considered for funding?
YES NO

Are the landowners willing to have the proposed action occur on their property?
YES NO

Category	Criteria for Evaluating Project's Benefit	Score
Action and Areas	1.a. For saltwater projects: is the project located within a high priority area for restoration and acquisition, according to the project selection tool or equivalent scientific model? -or- 1.b. For freshwater projects: is the project located within a high priority stream according to the stream ranking priority table?	*10 points possible*
Scientific	2. Is there a direct and tangible benefit to salmonids?	*10 points possible*
Feasibility	3. Can the project as it is outlined, accomplish the stated objectives? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 4. Does the sponsor have the necessary expertise in this area to accomplish the project objectives as timed, budgeted, planned and sited? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Species	5. Does the project have a multi-species approach, with emphasis on protecting healthy stocks (i.e. chum) and restoring declining stocks (i.e. coho)?	*5 points possible*
Life History	6. Does the project address an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of salmonid species in the area?	*5 points possible*
Cost	7. Are overall costs reasonable for project type and location? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 8. Does this project represent a sound investment of public funds? *As an example, consider match amount and source as you answer this question.* (5 points possible)	*10 points possible* _____
	PROJECT BENEFIT TOTAL	/50
Category	**Criteria for Evaluating Project's Certainty**	**Score**

Scope	9. Is the scope of the work proposed appropriate to meet the project's goals and objectives? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 10. Is the scale of the project appropriate per the identified need, as outlined by the relevant plan or model? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Approach	11. Is there a high likelihood of project success, based upon modeling and/or experience? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 12. Does the sponsor have a project adaptive management plan in place for the project? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Sequence	13. Does the project address habitat features in the appropriate order and if not, is there adequate justification for why not? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 14. Does the project build upon other projects within the watershed? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Threat	15. Is the habitat threatened if the project does not proceed?	*10 points possible*
Stewardship	16. Is there a stewardship plan in place following project implementation?	*5 points possible*
Implementation	17. If funded, will the project proceed to implementation with few or no known constraints?	*10 points possible*
	PROJECT CERTAINTY TOTAL	/55
Category	**Criteria for Evaluating Community Support**	**Score**
Partnerships	18. Does the project combine expertise from other groups and/or agencies that benefit the project, salmonids and future collaboration? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible*

	-and (*answer both questions*)- 19. Does the proposal engage community groups, businesses and/or landowners as project partners? (5 points possible)	_____
Community Contribution	20. Does the proposal engage community groups, businesses and/or landowners as project partners or volunteers?	*10 points possible*
Location	21.a. Does the project occur in an area where it can serve as an effective outreach tool to engage landowners? - **or-** 22.b. Is the project the first in a priority area where it can serve to engage adjacent landowners or is the landowner pivotal to obtaining community engagement?	*10 points possible*
Education	23. Does the sponsor have a plan to highlight the project and its results in the community? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 24. Will the site / landowner allow for more active education, in the form of signage, field trips, site visits, etc? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Tribal Support	25. Is the Squaxin Island Tribe supportive of this project?	*10 points possible*
Community Benefit	26. Does the project benefit the broader community? For example, offering flood reduction, open space for recreation, etc.	*10 points possible*
	COMMUNITY SUPPORT TOTAL	**/60**
	Benefit Total (questions 1-8, 50 points possible)	
	Certainty Total (questions 9-17, 55 points possible)	
	Community Support Total (questions 18-26, 60 points possible)	
	OVERALL PROJECT TOTAL (translate this number to a ranked number and carry that number to the top right corner of the first page)	**/165**

Overall Rank

WRIA 13 Deschutes Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee 2026 Citizen and Technical Ranking Criteria:

PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT PROJECTS

Applicant	Project Title
Reviewer	Date

GENERAL STREAM PRIORITY	**Tier**		
	A	**B**	**C**
	Deschutes	Adams	Indian – Moxlie
	Green Cove	Ellis	Mission
	McLane	Percival	Other Puget Sound Tribs
		Woodard	
		Woodland	

A higher score indicates greater salmon recovery benefit

Overall Criteria:

Are the landowners aware of the project proposal being considered for funding?
YES NO

Are the landowners willing to have the proposed action occur on their property?
YES NO

Category	Criteria for Evaluating Project's Benefit	Score
Eligibility	1.a. Will the project fill a priority data gap that has been identified in the strategy or relevant plan? **- or -** 1.b. Will the project lead directly to project identification and/or development?	*5 points possible* _____
Action and Areas	2.a. For saltwater projects: is the project located within a high priority area for restoration, according to the project selection tool or equivalent scientific model? **-or-** 2.b. For freshwater projects: is the project located within a high priority stream according to the stream ranking priority table?	*5 points possible*
Scientific	3. Is there a direct and tangible benefit to salmonids?	*10 points possible*
Feasibility	4. Can the project as it is outlined, accomplish the stated objectives? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 5. Does the sponsor have the necessary expertise in this area to accomplish the project objectives as timed, budgeted, planned and sited? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Species	6. Does the project have a multi-species approach, with emphasis on protecting healthy stocks (i.e. chum) and restoring declining stocks (i.e. coho)?	*5 points possible*
Life History	7. Does the project address an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of salmonid species in the area?	*5 points possible*
Cost	8. Are overall costs reasonable for project type and location? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)-	*Total 10 points possible*

	9. Does this project represent a sound investment of public funds? *As an example, consider match amount and source as you answer this question.* (5 points possible)	_____
	PROJECT BENEFIT TOTAL	/50
Category	**Criteria for Evaluating Project's Certainty**	**Score**
Scope	10. Is the scope of the work proposed appropriate to meet the project's goals and objectives? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 11. Is the scope of the project appropriate per the identified need, as outlined by the relevant plan or model? (5 points possible)	*10 points possible* _____
Approach	12. Is there a high likelihood of project success, based upon modeling and/or experience?	*10 points possible*
Sequence	13. Are future projects contingent upon completion of this project? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 14. Does the project build upon other projects within the watershed? (5 points possible)	*10 points possible* _____
Threat	15. Is species recovery at risk if the project does not proceed?	*5 points possible*
Stewardship	16. Is there a mechanism to share information and projects identified with partner organizations?	*10 points possible*
Implementation	17. If funded, will the project proceed with few or no known constraints?	*10 points possible*
	PROJECT CERTAINTY TOTAL	/55
Category	**Criteria for Evaluating Community Support**	**Score**

Partnerships	18. Does the project combine expertise from other groups and/or agencies that benefit the project, salmonids and future collaboration? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 19. Does the proposal engage community groups, businesses and/or landowners as project partners or volunteers? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Community Contribution	20. Does the proposal engage community groups, businesses and/or landowners as project partners or volunteers?	*10 points possible*
Location	21.a. Does the project occur in an area where it can serve as an effective outreach tool to engage landowners? - or- 21.b. Is the project the first in a priority area where it can serve to engage adjacent landowners or is the landowner pivotal to obtaining community engagement?	*10 points possible*
Education	22. Does the sponsor have a plan to highlight the project and its results in the community? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 23. Will the site / landowner allow for more active education, in the form of signage, field trips, site visits, etc? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Tribal Support	24. Is the Squaxin Island Tribe supportive of this project?	*10 points possible*
Community Benefit	25. Does the project benefit the broader community? For example, offering flood reduction, open space for recreation, etc.	*10 points possible*

	COMMUNITY SUPPORT TOTAL	/60
	Benefit Total (questions 1-9, 50 points possible)	
	Certainty Total (questions 10-17, 55 points possible)	
	Community Support Total (questions 18-25, 60 points possible)	
	OVERALL PROJECT TOTAL (translate this number to a ranked score and carry it to the top right corner of the first page)	**/165**

Overall Rank

WRIA 13 Deschutes Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee 2026 Citizen and Technical Ranking Criteria:

RESTORATION PROJECTS

Applicant	Project Title
Reviewer	Date

GENERAL STREAM PRIORITY	**Tier**		
	A	**B**	**C**
	Deschutes	Adams	Indian – Moxlie
	Green Cove	Ellis	Mission
	McLane	Percival	Other Puget Sound Tribs
		Woodard	
		Woodland	

A higher score indicates greater salmon recovery benefit

Overall Criteria:

Are the landowners aware of the project proposal being considered for funding?
YES NO
Are the landowners willing to have the proposed action occur on their property?
YES NO

Category	Criteria for Evaluating Project's Benefit	Score
Action and Areas	1.a. For saltwater projects: is the project located within a high priority area for restoration, according to the project selection tool or equivalent scientific model? **-or-** 1.b. For freshwater projects: is the project located within a high priority stream according to the stream ranking priority table?	*10 points possible*
Scientific	2. Is there a direct and tangible benefit to salmonids?	*10 points possible*
Feasibility	3. Can the project as it is outlined, accomplish the stated objectives? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 4. Does the sponsor have the necessary expertise in this area to accomplish the project objectives as timed, budgeted, planned and sited? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Species	5. Does the project have a multi-species approach, With emphasis on protecting healthy stocks (i.e. chum) and restoring declining stocks (i.e. coho)?	*5 points possible*
Life History	6. Does the project address an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of salmonid species in the area?	*5 points possible*
Cost	7. Are overall costs reasonable for project type and location? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 8. Does this project represent a sound investment of public funds? *As an example, consider match amount and source as you answer this question.* (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
	PROJECT BENEFIT TOTAL	/50
Category	**Criteria for Evaluating Project's Certainty**	**Score**

Scope	9. Is the scope of the work proposed appropriate to meet the project's goals and objectives? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 10. Is the scale of the project appropriate per the identified need, as outlined by the relevant plan or model? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Approach	11. Is there a high likelihood of project success, based upon modeling and/or experience? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 12. Does the sponsor have a project adaptive management plan in place for the project, or a monitoring plan to determine success of the project? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Sequence	13. Does the project address habitat features in the appropriate order and if not, is there adequate justification for why not? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 14. Does the project build upon other projects within the watershed? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Threat	15. Is the habitat threatened if the project does not proceed?	*10 points possible*
Stewardship	16. Is there a stewardship plan in place following project implementation (who will be maintaining the project)?	*5 points possible*
Implementation	17. If funded, will the <u>project</u> proceed to implementation with few or no known constraints?	*10 points possible*
	PROJECT CERTAINTY TOTAL	/55
Category	**Criteria for Evaluating Community Support**	**Score**
Partnerships	18. Does the project combine expertise from other groups and/or agencies that benefit the project,	*10 points possible*

	salmonids and future collaboration?	
Community Contribution	19. Does the proposal engage community groups, businesses and/or landowners as project partners or volunteers?	*10 points possible*
Location	20.a. Does the project occur in an area where it can serve as an effective demonstration project? - or - 20.b. Is the project the first in a priority area where it can serve to engage adjacent landowners or is the landowner pivotal to obtaining community engagement?	*10 points possible*
Education	21. Does the sponsor have a plan to highlight the project and its results in the community? (5 points possible) -and (*answer both questions*)- 22. Will the site / landowner allow for more active education, in the form of signage, field trips, site visits, etc.? (5 points possible)	*Total 10 points possible* _____
Tribal Support	23. Is the Squaxin Island Tribe supportive of this project?	*10 points possible*
Community Benefit	24. Does the project benefit the broader community? For example, offering flood reduction, open space for recreation, etc.	*10 points possible*
	COMMUNITY SUPPORT TOTAL	/60
	Benefit Total (questions 1-8, 50 points possible)	
	Certainty Total (questions 9-18, 55 points possible)	
	Community Support Total (questions 19-24, 60 points possible)	
	OVERALL PROJECT TOTAL (translate this number to a ranked number and carry that number to the top right corner of the first page)	**/165**

Public Comment Opportunities

This document outlines opportunities for public comment during the 2016 Lead Entity grant round including specific comment submission time periods for each phase of the LE process. The WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee meetings also provide opportunities for general public comment throughout the year. For more information on meeting dates, please see the timeline contained within this document. The Lead Entity Coordinator can also be contacted at any time to discuss general questions or comments regarding the WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee Lead Entity process.

Phase I: Process Guide, 4-Year-Work-Program Update, and Letters of Intent

The 2026 Process Guide will be posted on the Thurston Regional Planning Council website after LE Committee approval.

- Comments accepted until adopted for the current year's process guide
- General comments are accepted year round
- Point of contact: Amy Hatch-Winecka; hwamy@trpc.org and 360.741.2524

In addition, Letters of Intent will be published on the Thurston Regional Planning Council website after they are submitted and until final drafts are submitted.

Upon completion, the current year's 4-Year-Work-Program will be on the website as well.

Phase II: Final Application Drafts

Project final drafts are posted in PRISM by April 1, 2026. Comments or questions regarding proposal content can be directed to the project sponsors or Amy Hatch-Winecka. Additionally, the general public is invited to attend project presentations/site visits on April 8, 2026.

Phase III: Combined Technical and Citizen Committee Ranking

The technical and citizen advisory groups meet jointly to hear final presentations and rank the proposals for funding on May 27, 2026 (either virtual or in-person). The committee uses the numerical scoring as a starting point for further discussion. Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting and provide comments during the designated public comment periods at the beginning and end of the meeting. Information and an agenda will be available on the Thurston Regional Planning council website.

Phase IV: SRFB Review and Funding

The SRFB Funding Recommendation Report is available for public review early November and can be found on the Recreation and Conservation Office's (RCO) website. The report will list to whom, when and where to provide comments. SRFB

funding decisions are announced at a public meeting in December. An open comment period is provided for the public and project sponsors.

- Public meeting September 15-16, 2026
- Please see RCO website for more information on comment submittal
- Point of contact: RCO, SRFB project manager

Contact Information and Websites

- Amy Hatch-Winecka (Lead Entity Coordinator): hwamy@trpc.org
- Thurston Regional Planning Council website: https://www.trpc.org
- Kate McLaughlin: kate.mclaughlin@rco.wa.gov
- Salmon Recovery Portal website: https://srp.rco.wa.gov/
- Salmon Recovery Funding Board website: http://www.rco.wa.gov/boards/srfb.shtml