

APPENDIX I: Citizen Committee Matrix and Guidance

Background:

The Citizen Committee evaluates projects proposed for SRFB funding based on their value to local communities. The Citizen Committee is made up of four representatives from each county in the lead entity (Kittitas, Yakima, and Benton) and the Yakama Nation, for a total of 16 members. Participants may represent counties, cities, conservation districts, tribes, environmental groups, business interests, landowners, citizens, volunteer groups, regional fish enhancement groups, and other stakeholder groups.

The Citizen Committee ensures that projects identified as biological priorities also have the community support they need to succeed. The committee works together to evaluate how the community's social, cultural and economic values are incorporated into salmon recovery projects. This is a vital part of ensuring that community support for salmon recovery increases over time. Additionally, the Citizen Committee evaluates the proposed project's overall organization, partnerships, and community support.

The Citizen Committee develops the final ranked funding list that is then approved by the Board and submitted to the SRFB for funding. The Citizen Committee takes the recommendations of the TAG into consideration, but is not obligated to maintain the TAG's ranking if the Committee determines that the social, cultural, and economic values of a project warrant changing its position in the ranked list. Committee decisions are usually made by consensus; however, when consensus cannot be reached, the Citizen Committee shall use a super-majority vote of 65% for decision-making purposes. Note that the Board can remand the list to the Citizen Committee for reconsideration, but the Board cannot re-rank projects. 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 solid, address priority issues, and are broadly supported by diverse community groups.

Scoring:

Citizen Committee members use the Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix to determine how projects rate for multiple criteria in each of four categories; cultural and social, economic, context and organization, and partnerships and community support.

In this matrix, each criterion will be scored with a +2, +1, 0, -1, or -2 assigned as follows:

- +2 = Project has a significant positive effect
- +1 = Project has a slight positive effect
- 0 = Project has no significant net effect
- -1 = Project has a slight negative effect
- -2 = Project has a significant negative effect

Scores are added to determine an overall positive or negative total for each project. The Citizen Committee uses these scores to consider adjusting the project ranks assigned by the TAG. A positive score means that a project has high community value, and may be a candidate to move higher up the ranked list. A negative score means that a project may have less community value, and may be a candidate for moving lower in the ranked list. Note that a project with a total of zero (0) points may well be a solid project, the Citizen Committee score of 0 simply means that there is not a clear indication that the project's rank should be either raised or lowered.

Citizen Committee Matrix:

1. How does the project affect the Yakima Nation and their members?
2. How does the project affect agricultural interests?
3. How does the project affect other community members and partners within the Basin?
4. How will the project change ESA liabilities for community members?
5. Does the project include substantive and compelling education and outreach components?
6. Are there economic effects associated with this project?
7. Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project?
8. At the current stage of the proposed project, how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?
9. Is the project timely?
10. How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?
11. Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there significant uncertainties?
12. Are the right partners involved to make the project succeed?
13. Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?
14. At the current stage of the proposed project, is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?

Guidance for Specific Questions:

Cultural & Social Considerations

1. How does the project affect the Yakama Nation and its members?

Citizen Committee members should consider project impacts to the protection of cultural resources, access for traditional activities and other benefits or issues of concern.

2. How does the project affect agricultural interests?

For agricultural operations, Citizen Committee members should consider project impacts to agricultural infrastructure, impacts on adjacent landowners, removal of land from agricultural production, effect on water quantity/quality, and other benefits or issues of concern. This is the space to evaluate whether there will be flood impacts that increase or decrease because of this project.

3. How does the project affect other community members and partners within the Basin?

This question should foster discussion on how the project affects other community members and partners within the Basin, including recreational opportunities.

For recreational opportunities, Citizen Committee members should consider whether the project impacts access to recreational areas, impacts anglers, increases or reduces risk for recreationalists, and other benefits or issues of concern.

Citizen Committee members should consider whether there are other members of the community who are significantly affected by this project.

4. How will the project change ESA liabilities for community members?

Citizen Committee members should focus on whether the project increases or decreases specific parties' potential liability for 'take' under the federal Endangered Species List (defined as harming of a listed species) – for example, installation of a fish screen may have a positive impact by reducing potential take by water users who do not have to worry any more about sucking fish into irrigation systems.

This is not the place to evaluate the broader biological benefits of the project to target species.

5. Does the project include substantive and compelling education and outreach components?

Consider whether the project proposes to involve students and the public in the project implementation, provide educational signage, serve as sites for outreach events and tours, or otherwise serve as a venue where the public can learn about and become engaged in salmon recovery. An example would be a project that hosts a classroom tour to learn about salmon recovery and/or habitat restoration projects.

Economic Considerations

6. Are there economic effects associated with this project?

Consider whether the project will create jobs during the construction phase, create opportunities for local contractors and businesses, and/or negatively impact any local economic interests during the implementation phase

Consider whether the long-term presence of the project has economic impacts such as significantly changing local infrastructure, recreational fishery spending, creating new economic opportunities, or negatively affecting other economic interests.

Please use the below matrix as a guide for determining a score on economic effects.

		Certainty of short-term economic benefits		
		Low	Med	High
Cost of long-term economic benefits	High	-2	-1	0
	Med	-1	0	+1
	Low	0	+1	+2

7. Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project?

Consider the project assessment, design, and implementation.

Consider if a proposed budget is too low or too high and if it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding. A positive point indicates a clear and reasonable budget, while a negative point indicates that a budget appears to be either highly uncertain or unreasonable given what is proposed.

8. At the current stage of the proposed project, how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

Consider the project assessment, design, and implementation.

Consider if the proposed cost of the project is reasonable compared with the level of benefit from the expected outcome? This is a qualitative evaluation of the benefit of the project compared to the cost to SRFB and is not intended to require quantification of benefits. Projects with an average benefit/cost should be scored 0.

		Certainty of fish & habitat benefits		
		Low	Med	High
Cost of the proposed project	High	-2	-1	0
	Med	-1	0	+1
	Low	0	+1	+2

Project Context & Organization Considerations

9. How is the project coordinated with other past, present, and future salmon recovery actions?

Consider whether the project's benefits are dependent upon the sequencing of other projects. A project should receive a positive point (+2) if it is clearly the next step in a series of projects for a reach, and a negative point (-2) if other projects need to be completed before the fish benefits will be realized. Intermediate points (i.e., -1, +1) may be used to score projects in which sequencing is unclear.

10. Is the project timely?

Consider whether a project is timely. If the project is not funded, would we lose a significant funding match? Project should receive a positive point (+2) if there is a compelling reason for moving forward without delay, and a negative point (-2) if it does not seem ready to move ahead. Projects that could be completed with equal amount of benefit/certainty now or later should score a 0.

11. Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?

Consider the likelihood that the project can ultimately deliver the anticipated fish and habitat benefits, given possible barriers to success. First, consider if the project is likely to be implemented as proposed;

Then consider if the project is implemented as proposed: is the project likely to deliver the anticipated benefits for fish and habitat?

The following table is an example of how the two elements of certainty of success can be combined to derive a positive/neutral/negative score.

		Certainty of fish & habitat benefits		
		Low	Med	High
Certainty of successful implementation	Low	-2	-1	0
	Med	-1	0	+1
	High	0	+1	+2

Partnerships & Community Support Considerations

12. Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?

Consider positive/neutral/negative aspects of the partnerships demonstrated in the proposal. Appropriate partners might be a water trust, conservation trust, riparian restoration experts, etc.

This is also an opportunity for Citizen Committee members to consider community involvement in the project. For example, a project that is not only involving the right partners but also has strong community support may warrant a positive point (+2), whereas a project with the right partners and limited community support may warrant a slightly positive score (+1).

The following table is an example of how the two elements can be combined to derive a positive/neutral/negative score.

		Community Support and Involvement		
		Low	Med	High
Certainty that the right partners are involved	Low	-2	-1	0
	Med	-2	0	+1
	High	0	+1	+2

13. Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?

A proposal with strong landowner participation in the form of obvious involvement in the project development, in-kind, or cash support should receive a positive score (+2). A proposal with limited or mixed landowner participation (perhaps one landowner is on-board but not all) should receive a slightly positive score (+1). A proposal with signed landowner acknowledgement forms should receive a neutral score (0). A proposal that is missing the landowner acknowledgement forms as of the date of the TAG review

should receive a slightly negative score (-1) and proposals with landowner opposition should receive a negative score of (-2).

14. At the current stage of the proposed project, is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?

Consider the project assessment, design, and implementation.

The project should receive a positive point (+2) if the sponsor demonstrates that they are using SRFB funds to leverage significant amounts from other funding sources (only 15% of which needs to be claimed for match within the SRFB grant), and/or the sponsor shows that they have received significant in-kind and/or financial support from the landowner or other source not generally dedicated to salmon recovery. A +1 can be utilized for projects that have included funding above the required amount but are typical sources or not a high percentage more. (Example: a project that has acquired 35% in matching funds, the majority of which are not traditional salmon recovery funding dollars would receive a +2, where a project that has acquired 23% in matching funds all from frequently used sources for salmon recovery would receive a +1). An average match should receive a neutral point (0). This is the only question in which only a neutral or positive score are an option.