Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Upper Columbia instream habitat assessment
Sponsor	Cascade Fisheries
Primary Contact	Kristen Kirkby
E-Mail Address	kristen@ccfeg.org

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

This assessment will fill a Tier 1 data gap identified by the Monitoring and Data Management Committee and provide data critical to the effective use of UCSRB's prioritization model. Habitat data will be collected in reaches lacking data in priority Assessment Units in the Methow, Entiat, Wenatchee, and Columbia Basins. USFS Level II methodology will be used, enabling the development of Reach-based Ecosystem Indicators (REIs) for these reaches, which may then be used by sponsors in the region to identify habitat limiting factors and develop appropriate restoration concepts. These reaches include spawning and rearing habitat for all three ESA-listed species (spring Chinook, steelhead, and bull trout), and habitat restoration and protection projects developed based on assessment data will benefit all three species.

The goal of this project is to collect Level II habitat data on reaches in priority AUs across the Upper Columbia that currently lack these data, enabling the identification of REIs and Limiting Factors as well as their inclusion in UCSRB's prioritization model to ensure a more comprehensive application of prioritization and to determine the ranking of these reaches for restoration and protection in support of spring Chinook, steelhead, and bull trout recovery. This assessment will enable future restoration and protection projects in these reaches by any interested sponsors, as well as provide immediate benefit to restoration planning, design, and implementation in several specific reaches by CF and other partners already engaged with landowners.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

The objective of this project is to perform Level II surveys and develop associated Reach-based Ecosystem Indicators to enable inclusion in UCSRB's prioritization model for unsurveyed reaches in the Wenatchee, Methow, Entiat, and Columbia Basins. Survey, review, analysis, and summary will be completed over two years and data will be shared with UCSRB for use in Prioritization and to host for public access. UCSRB and the Monitoring and Data Management Committee have identified nearly 300 miles of reaches lacking any data and have further prioritized these. There are also an additional 220 miles of reaches with survey older than 10 years. CF would work from the prioritized list of unsurveyed reaches (and/or consider old reaches in need of resurvey, as directed by UCSRB and the RTT) to conduct two seasons of field work with a crew of technicians. We anticipate two seasons allowing for roughly 75-100 miles of stream survey.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	120000
Tributary Committee - Anticipated or Actual	120000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	240000

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	This project will take place in reaches in priority Assessment Units in the Wenatchee, Entiat, Methow, and Columbia Basins.

Latitude (decimal degrees)	47.663097
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-120.216774
Project subbasin	Multiple Subbasins

Please explain why there are multiple subbasins

UCSRB and the Monitoring and Data Management Committee have identified roughly 170 miles of streams in need of habitat surveys in the Wenatchee, Methow, and Entiat basins with 95 miles ranked priority 1-4 (of 7). In addition, 128 miles of streams have been identified in tributaries in the Columbia River basin, which are also a Tier 1 priority from MaDMC. There are also nearly 220 miles of reaches that have survey that is older than 10 years, which could also be considered for resurvey with support from the RTT. Work would focus on reaches that have received a high priority from UCSRB and MaDMC, while also factoring in access feasibility and potential restoration interest from CF and all regional partners.

Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	Yes
List the additional assessment units directly impacted by this proposal.	Too many to list. There are reaches on the survey list from 50 assessment units, as well as in the Columbia River, which doesn't have assessment units.
Reach(es) Name	The survey list includes 134 reaches in the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Methow basins, plus additional reach length in the Columbia River tributaries.
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.	Multiple reaches (provide details below)

Please detail the reach-ranking of the reaches below

Reaches in this assessment do not have a priority because of the lack of data that this project will address. This assessment would pull from a long list of reaches in need of survey that has been provided by the UCSRB with direction from MaDMC. UCSRB has prioritized these reaches for survey based on a number of different metrics, and that will guide CF in selection of reaches for survey. With roughly 300 miles within the Wenatchee, Entiat, Methow, and Columbia River basins, as well as an additional 220 miles of outdated habitat survey, two seasons of survey are insufficient to cover the entire data gap. CF would anticipate covering roughly 75-100 miles of the reaches in need of survey, focused on those prioritized by UCSRB.

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?	Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout
2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics	Design, Monitoring or Assessment
4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?	No

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

No

6. What category is the project?

Assessment

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

Assessment Proposals

7. What type of assessment are you proposing?

Level 2 habitat assessments in reaches that are currently lacking data for prioritization.

8. Is the assessment identified on the MaDMC monitoring and data gaps list?

Yes

9. Describe how the assessment fills a regional priority and where that priority is identified.

This project is identified in the MaDMC data gaps list as a Tier 1 data gap. The data gap notes state that "Habitat metrics in key Tier 1 reaches are missing in the Prioritization Tool (Level II attributes and associated REI indicators)". This project will cover as many reaches as possible within two summer seasons, with an estimate of 75-100 miles. Reaches will then receive Habitat Quality scores and a prioritization as well as have Reach-based Ecosystem Indicators and Limiting Factors identified for the development of future project concepts. This assessment will allow a more comprehensive application of the regional prioritization model.

10. Methods - What methods will you use in your assessment and how will they achieve your stated objective(s)?

As CF used in the past, USFS level II habitat assessments will be completed on identified reaches throughout the Upper Columbia, as described in the data gap. CF will also reach out to partners such as CTCR to identify whether additional data not collected in level II surveys is needed to support EDT. If this is the case, CF will work to collect additional EDT data wherever feasible. Finally, if CF surveys private land that was not accessible during prior fish-passage barrier surveys, any barriers encountered will be surveyed using WDFW methods.

11. Will a design result from the project?

No

13. Briefly describe why SRFB funds are necessary, rather than other sources of funding.

This project has been identified as a Tier 1 data gap by the UC MaDMC and is a critical need for comprehension application of regional
prioritization. Funding opportunities for this type of assessment work are limited in the Upper Columbia, and UCRSB and the RTT have identified
SRFB funding as an appropriate funding source for regional data gaps. CF will also pursue match from the Tributary Committees.

Protection Proposals

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership? Mixed

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project? No

Please explain

No. With funding support and a timeline for survey work, we'll move forward initiating private landowner outreach. Some amount of outreach to private landowners will be required in certain reaches. While we anticipate some access refusals based on past experience, prior outreach work should facilitate this effort and CF has extensive experience in landowner outreach.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

We will request access permission from private landowners, as noted above. If permission is not given, crews will not survey that parcel and data will either be left as incomplete or extrapolated from the remainder of the reach that was surveyed, depending on the recommendation of the RTT and UCSRB.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

No, we do not anticipate concerns from interest groups since on-the-ground work would be limited to surveys. Outreach to private landowners will provide a good opportunity to follow up with supportive landowners presenting information on current conditions and limiting factors, and initiating discussion about potential future projects.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

After quality checking, data will be passed on to the UCSRB for inclusion in prioritization, long-term storage, and distribution to interested parties.
There are no maintenance needs for this assessment.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite? Don't know

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

There is minimal risk of failure associated with this project, CF has extensive experience running assessments in our region. Private landowner permissions may impact our ability to comprehensively survey identified reaches, however the majority of surveys will be conducted on public land and necessary outreach to private landowners will allow for conversations about potential future projects. If surveys require more time than anticipated or are delayed for unexpected reasons such as wildfire closures, there is potential need for additional time or funding.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

Private landowner outreach will be necessary in several reaches, requiring interaction between CF staff and landowners and allowing for education about current conditions and outreach associated with the project goals and the potential for future restoration. CF will take advantage of these opportunities to engage with landowners, identify concerns, and develop relationships in support of future projects. Similar efforts will be made to identify existing concerns and potential projects on public land, and CF will work with our public landowner partners to move forward with any identified projects.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

This project will support CF staff and seasonal employees in both Okanogan and Chelan Counties. Future projects on private land may provide benefit to landowners, and future projects on public and private land could provide benefit to contractors.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

CF has existing partnerships with the USFS, CTCR, and UCSRB that will all be important for the success of this project. The USFS has supported this work in the past and will receive all data from surveys on USFS land; CF will work with CTCR to identify any additional data
collection needs in support of EDT; and all data will be provided to UCSRB for use in prioritization. Additional partnerships may develop along the way as CF works with private and public landowners and other sponsors interested in work in these reaches. CF will coordinate with partners to promote efficiency and support projects where possible.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions? Yes

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

This project addresses a Tier 1 data gap that was identified by the UCSRB Monitoring and Data Management Committee. Although many of the proposed survey reaches are within Tier 1 Assessment Units for either protection or restoration through Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board's (UCSRB) prioritization process, these reaches currently lack the habitat data necessary for the development of Reach-based Ecosystem Indicators (REIs) and associated Limiting Factors. REIs and Limiting Factors form the foundation for the development of restoration concepts. Survey data also will allow the inclusion of these reaches in the UCSRB prioritization model, ensuring comprehensive modeling of reaches in priority Assessment Units across the region. Without these data we cannot assess the need for and priority of restoration and protection actions in these reaches and so prioritization will not be comprehensive.

2. Describe the limiting factors, and/or ecological concerns, and limiting life stages (by fish species) that your project expects to address.

This assessment project will in fact identify those limiting factors for the reaches to be surveyed. The data that informs the identification of limiting factors is currently unavailable for these reaches, limiting our ability to assess the need for and develop restoration and protection projects. Survey data will be collected, REIs and LFs determined, and the data and these findings will be made publicly available through the UCSRB. Data will enable a more comprehensive application of UCSRB's prioritization and the ranking of surveyed reaches for restoration and protection.

3. What are the project goals? The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired and future condition. Include which species and life stages will benefit from the outcome, and the time of year the benefits will be realized.

The goal of this project is to collect Level II habitat data on reaches across the Upper Columbia that currently lack these data, enabling the identification of REIs and Limiting Factors as well as their inclusion

in UCSRB's prioritization model to ensure a more comprehensive application of prioritization and to determine the ranking of these reaches for restoration and protection in support of spring Chinook, steelhead, and bull trout recovery. This assessment will enable future restoration and protection projects in these reaches by any interested sponsors, as well as provide immediate benefit to restoration planning, design, and implementation in several specific reaches by CF and other partners already engaged with landowners.

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

The objective of this project is to perform Level II surveys and develop associated Limiting Factors and Recommended Actions on as many reaches as possible within two years of survey (2027 and 2028), which CF estimates to be between 75-100 miles. This work will take place in the Wenatchee, Entiat, Methow, and Columbia basins. Survey, review, analysis, and summary will be completed over two years and data will be shared with UCSRB for use in prioritization and to host for public access.

5. Scope of work and deliverables. Provide a detailed description of each project task/element. With each task/element, identify who will be responsible for each, what the deliverables will be, and the schedule for completion.

Level II Survey: 75-100 miles of survey (except in the case of private land access denials) will be completed by Cascade Fisheries over a 2-year period. A longer period would be preferred in light of the possibility of fire closures and other unexpected challenges. This task will take place in the months of May-October (depending on the location in the basin, access, flows, etc.) over a two year period.

Data management: The task of data QAQC and management will initially be completed by Cascade Fisheries over the course of the project; however, final copies of all data will be passed on to UCSRB for long-term storage and sharing. This task will take place throughout the project, with data review concurrent with survey and data management, REI and LF development, and data sharing occurring during the winter and spring months. Depending on funding availability, this could begin during the winter of 2027, and will be completed by December of 2028.

Project identification: CF will pursue the development projects to improve habitat in high-ranking reaches and will identify criteria, options, and a timeline for subsequent projects based on the results of our surveys.

Project administration: Billing and reporting will be completed by Cascade Fisheries over the life of the project. This task will be ongoing throughout the life of the project.

6. What are the assumptions and physical constraints that could impact whether you achieve your objectives? Assumptions and constraints are external conditions that are not under the direct control of the project, but directly impact the outcome of the project. These may include ecological and geomorphic factors, land use constraints, public acceptance of the project, delays, or other factors. How will you address these issues if they arise?

Reaches include parcels of private land. Cascade Fisheries will have to connect with private landowners and receive access permission to enable surveys. While we've had generally good success requesting access in the past, it's likely some landowners will deny access, limiting a complete survey. Other factors such as access challenges and fire closures may delay surveys, but no other major challenges are anticipated.

7. How have lessons learned from completed projects or monitoring studies informed this projects?

Cascade Fisheries has years of experience completing level 2 surveys and fish passage barrier assessments in all three basins, which provides a strong foundation of equipment, crew management experience, and private landowner outreach experience. We have extensive experience working with private landowners as well as regional partners.

8. Describe the alternatives considered and why the preferred was chosen.

There are no alternatives for filling this Tier 1 data gap.

9. How were stakeholders consulted in the development of this project? Identify the stakeholders, their concerns or feedback, and how the concerns were addressed.

In our first round of this assessment work, CF reached out to a number of interested parties including the USFS, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Trout Unlimited, Cascadia Conservation District, and the Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation to facilitate partnership and efficiencies where possible. CF will continue these conversations to ensure that we're focused on partner needs within the context of regional priorities. Where possible, we'll support other data needs identified by partners, such as for EDT modeling.

10. Does your project address or accommodate the anticipated effects of climate change? How will your project be climate resilient given future conditions? How will your project increase species and habitat adaptability?

Not applicable for this assessment project. This project will identify REIs and LFs in 75-100 miles of reaches in high priority AUs, which will allow for the prioritization of restoration and protection on these reaches. Restoration is critical to improving habitat complexity and increasing ecosystem resilience to anthropogenic pressures like climate change. Protection likewise ensures that intact habitat remains to provide critical high-quality refugia in our basins. A number of the identified reaches are also higher up in our basins, and ensuring that these reaches are restored and protected will become increasingly critical as they provide thermal refugia with warm waters moving upstream in our basins.

11. Describe the sponsor's experience managing this type of project. Describe other projects where the sponsors has successfully used a similar approach.

CF completed a level 2 habitat assessment with SRFB and Tributary Committees funding within the last few years. This project would require the same set of skills and experience, with the only difference in the reaches to be surveyed. Included this year would be Columbia River tributaries, which will require (in some cases) different approaches to access. This project is also very similar in implementation to our four fish passage barrier assessments, which were completed in the Methow, Entiat, Wenatchee, and Okanogan watersheds over 6 years. CF has extensive experience with outreach to private landowners to request access permission, as well as experience managing seasonal crews in support of data collection for assessments across our region. Some of the equipment for Level II surveys will be reused from our last assessment.

12. Will veterans (including the veterans conservation corps) be involved in the project? If yes, please describe.

No.

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	2 Channels Acquisition
Sponsor	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
Primary Contact	Ben Woodworth
E-Mail Address	woob@yakamafish-nsn.gov

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

This project will acquire roughly 5 acres of a privately owned property between the towns of Twisp and Winthrop to facilitate riparian habitat conservation and the future development of salmonid habitat restoration projects.

Salmon habitat restoration practitioners frequently encounter challenges with private landowners when exploring suitable areas where habitat restoration can occur, severely inhibiting areas of habitat restoration to state and federally owned land. The 2 Channels area of the Methow River is no exception. However, there is a landowner willing and wanting to sell roughly 90% of their property to the Yakama Nation. This acquisition would allow their parcel to be used for riparian habitat conservation and salmonid habitat restoration to address limiting factors within the Methow River including degraded riparian areas and lack of off-channel alcove habitat.

Future salmonid habitat restoration actions that could potentially occur because of the acquisition of this property include mainstem habitat and complexity uplift, floodplain reconnection, side channel reactivation, and riparian forest establishment and conservation opportunities. A project slated for implementation in 2028 is currently in the conceptual design phase and is planned to supply off-channel alcove habitat, side channel habitat, and mainstem large wood structures for habitat complexity.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

Specific - acquire roughly 50% of parcel #3422310046 to facilitate riparian and salmonid habitat restoration and conservation
Measurable - pay the appropriate amount of funds to the landowner for ownership of roughly 50% of their parcel
Achievable - the landowner is willing and wanting to sell their parcel to the Yakama Nation, approaching our organization in years past about the opportunity
Relevant - obtaining this parcel opens up opportunities for riparian and salmonid habitat restoration and conservation in the Methow River
Time bound - this acquisition could be completed on a timeline that is favorable for the landowner and the Yakama Nation

This project seeks to address degraded riparian habitat and limited off-channel alcove habitat within the Methow River for juvenile and adult spring Chinook and Steelhead by acquiring the majority of a privately owned property adjacent to WDFW property, allowing for current riparian habitat conservation and future salmonid habitat restoration projects to occur to create an estimated 5 acres of Yakama Nation owned land upon implementation in 2027.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	100,000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	100,000

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	The acquisition is of parcel number 3422310046, located in between the towns of Twisp and Winthrop, at approximately RM 45
Latitude (decimal degrees)	48.405975
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-120.137110
Project subbasin	Methow
Methow Assessment Unit(s)	Methow River-Thompson Creek
Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Methow River Thompson 02
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please	Rank 3

reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?

Spring Chinook | Steelhead | Bull Trout | Summer Chinook | Resident Cutthroat Trout, Resident Rainbow Trout, Whitefish

2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics

Acquisition, Easements, Leases

Acquisition, Easements, Leases: Reporting Code

Acres by Acreage Type (easement) and/or Acres by Acreage Type (fee simple)

Floodplain Areas Protected** this reporting metric does not appear in PRISM. Work with the LE to ad this metric upon completion of project.

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

No

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

No

6. What category is the project?

Protection

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

7. What type of protection are you proposing?

Fee Simple

8. Is this protection project associated with a current or future restoration project?

Yes

9. Placement - Does the project protect important high quality habitat and/or watershed processes and to what degree

Yes, acquisition of this parcel will protect important high quality habitat and watershed processes. On the parcel being proposed for acquisition, there is a seasonally inundated side channel and a large riparian Cottonwood forest. The majority of parcel occupies highly valuable floodplain and off-channel habitat.

10. Freshwater Benefit - What would be the anticipated loss in survival, capacity or distribution for target species at the reach scale if the proposed area is not protected?

Capacity and distribution for target species would decline if this parcel is not acquired and utilized for habitat restoration. Currently, the seasonally inundated side channel only waters up during large volume flow events. The proposed acquisition will optimize the portion of the side channel on this parcel, which connects to the mainstem river, to enhance alcove habitat and increase the likelihood of seasonal inundations.

11. Threat - How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented?

The threat of habitat degradation to the riparian Cottonwood forest and associated floodplain is currently in the 'at risk' stage due to lack of seasonal inundations of the side channel during low water years. The proposed acquisition will enhance and optimize the portion of the side channel on the parcel in order to increase the likelihood of seasonal inundations, enhancing the riparian forest and floodplain habitat conditions.

12. Conditions - Briefly describe if there are any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the protection benefits

There are no conditions regarding the acquisition that would limit the protection benefits of the habitat on this parcel.

13. Will there be public access? Yes

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership? Private

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project? Yes

Please explain

The landowner approached the Yakama Nation in past years initiating the opportunity to purchase a portion of their parcel. They have signed a landowner acknowledgement form stating that they are aware of this grant application moving forward. They are willing and wanting to sell a percentage of their property to the Yakama Nation.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

The landowner would require a lot adjustment to sell an agreed upon percentage of their property. There is a residential house on the parcel which the landowner does not wish to sell. However, roughly 50% of the land is the high quality floodplain and riparian habitat that they would want the Yakama Nation to own.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

There are no potential concerns from other interest groups in the sale of this property, to my knowledge.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

The Yakama Nation will be responsible for management and maintenance of the property.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite?

Don't know

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

There is little risk of failure associated with this acquisition.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

There is no public outreach planned for this acquisition.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

The acquisition represents and opportunity for habitat uplift and conservation.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

There are no partnerships associated with this acquisition. However, WDFW owns many adjacent parcels to this land and is supportive of Yakama Nation doing projects in this area and would likely support this acquisition.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions?

No

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Salmon Creek fish passage barrier design
Sponsor	Cascade Fisheries
Primary Contact	Kristen Kirkby
E-Mail Address	kristen@ccfeg.org

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

The goal of this project is to complete preliminary designs for three County-owned fish-passage barrier road crossings on Salmon Creek in the Okanogan Basin, as well as initiate outreach to landowners of two other non-crossing barriers in the system.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

The objective of the project is to complete three preliminary designs for fish-passable crossing structures to replace barrier structures, allowing for a future project to improve connectivity in this important steelhead system in the Okanogan Basin. Locations for design are site IDs 605279 (67% passable culvert), 605278 (33% passable culvert), and 606489 (33% passable culvert). While adult steelhead passage occurs seasonally, these barriers are likely restricting juvenile passage and the lower may become a full barrier

with a change to a downstream beaver dam that creates a backwater. CF would also undertake outreach to initiate work on two additional barriers in the system, 605289 (33% passable dam) and 606499 (67% passable other). There are relatively few remaining barriers in the Salmon Creek system, and work proposed in this project would create designs or begin initial outreach to address all but one remaining barrier, 950124 (0% passable dam), which the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation are currently working with the USBR to address. We anticipate a preliminary design completed for three culverts by 12/31/2027, allowing for CF to pursue funding for remaining design and implementation in future years.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	100000
Tributary Committee - Anticipated or Actual	100000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	200000

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	This project includes three sites on Salmon Creek in the Okanogan Basin. The downstream sites are roughly at RM 4.5, and the upstream site is at RM 9.0. Additional outreach work will take place for barriers are RM 1.3 and 4.2.
Latitude (decimal degrees)	48.406942
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-119.625683
Project subbasin	Okanogan
Okanogan Assessment Unit(s)	Salmon Creek-Lower
Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Design: Salmon 16-4, Salmon 16-8. Outreach: Salmon 16-1, Salmon 16-4.
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.	Multiple reaches (provide details below)

Please detail the reach-ranking of the reaches below

Reach Rank 1 - Salmon 16-1, Salmon 16-4
Reach Rank 2 - Salmon 16-8

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?

Spring Chinook | Steelhead

2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics

Design, Monitoring or Assessment

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

No

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

Don't Know

6. What category is the project?

Design

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

7. What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?

Preliminary Design

8. Is your project within a completed (or soon-to-be completed) Reach Assessment or other type of assessment (e.g., Rapid Site Assessment, other)?

No

9. Which limiting factors does the project propose to address?

Fish Passage Barriers

10. Which life stages will the proposed project address?

Adult Migration | Fry | Smolt Outmigration | Spawning and Incubation | Summer Rearing | Winter Rearing

11. Freshwater Benefits - Describe how your project will improve survival, capacity and/or distribution for target species at the reach scale?

Fish passage barriers reduce spatial structure, abundance, productivity, and diversity of salmonids and other aquatic species. Barriers such as culverts and dams also degrade fish habitat by altering or limiting the downstream movement of sediment, wood, and other organic materials, and may reduce the upstream extent of nutrient inputs by impeding adult salmon passage. The Upper Columbia spring Chinook, Steelhead, and Bull Trout Recovery Plan, developed by the UCSRB (Lead Entity), states that fixing man made barriers will improve spatial structure and diversity of our listed species.

This project will initiate work to address the remaining fish-passage barriers on Salmon Creek (with the exception of a diversion dam currently being worked on by CTCR). Salmon Creek has historically been the most productive steelhead stream in the Okanogan Basin, per OBMEP reports, and juvenile chinook use has also been documented. Barriers in the project range from 33% passable to 67% passable and are thought to primarily impact juvenile passage in their current state. However, it's believed that loss of a backwater from a beaver dam downstream of the lowest crossing structure proposed for design would

lead to limitations on adult passage at these structures, as well.

The lower two culverts are not included in the Upper Columbia barrier prioritization, though we are not certain why at this time considering known use by steelhead and prioritization ranking upstream of these barriers. Per Ryan Klett with the Colville Tribes, it was an oversight that these culverts were not included in the EDT model run, but they will be included in the next run in summer 2026. The upper culvert, 606489, is included in the prioritization. It is a Tier 2 priority for chinook and Tier 3 for steelhead, with both species receiving an overall prioritization score of 71.

The 2025 Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program report states that the majority of annual outmigrant steelhead originate from Salmon Creek, which accounts for roughly half of the combined estimates for fry and parr O. mykiss in the subbasin. This report also described Salmon Creek as colder than the Okanogan River, with a maximum weekly water temperature lower than the majority of other Okanogan tributaries. Water temperatures are projected to continually warm over the coming decades. The NorWest Stream Temperature Model shows 7-day average summer temperatures in the Okanogan approaching 24 degrees Celsius in 2040, a potentially lethal temperature for salmonids. However, in the upper reaches of Salmon Creek near Conconully, water temperatures remain below 16 degrees Celsius. Establishing unrestricted passage through the barriers identified in this proposal will provide essential access cold water refugia, which may be critical to ensuring the persistence of our ESA-listed salmonids in the Okanogan basin in the future. The 2023 OBMEP report explicitly describes Salmon Creek as the highest priority for protection.

12. Temporal Effect - Briefly describe how and to what extent the project would promote natural stream/watershed process consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?

This project would enable the eventual removal of three fish-passage barrier stream crossings and replacement with fish-passable crossing structures, ensuring the free flow of water, wood, and sediment for the creation and maintenance of downstream habitat, as well as improving fish passage for steelhead and other native species to improve distribution and ensure connectivity to high-quality spawning and rearing habitat.

13. Temporal Effect - How long will it take for the project to achieve its intended response?

Less than or equal to 1 year

14. Temporal Effect - How long will the restoration action and its benefits persist?

50+ years

15. Temporal Effect - What level and/or interval of maintenance is anticipated? What is the plan for any anticipated maintenance?

Replacing fish-passage barriers with fish-passable crossing structures design to accommodate 100-year flow and anticipated hydrologic changes with climate change should ensure that these structures do not require maintenance for decades.

16. Methods - Briefly describe the potential (for design) or proposed restoration methods and how they will achieve project objectives.

CF will work with an accredited engineer to ensure crossing structures meet design requirements. Designs will be guided by specifications described in WDFW's Water Crossing Design Guidelines (2013), with a stream simulation channel design. These methodologies provide the best design approach to ensure long term fish passage for all species and life stages, as well as allowing for natural watershed processes to occur. Partners from CTCR and Okanogan County, as well as funders, will have the opportunity to review and comment on designs.

The project designs will be climate resilient by designing fish passages structure that will pass flood flows, and associated stream bed substrate and wood, that may become more frequent and intense in the future. Predicted future changes to stream hydrology will incorporated into the new structures' design.

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership?

Okanogan County owns the three crossing structures slated for design. The additional structures slated for outreach are a USGS stream gage and a rock weir on land owned by the City of Okanogan.

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project?

Yes

Please explain

CF has reached out to Okanogan County and received initial support to seek funding for design for these culverts. We are currently reaching out to the City of Okanogan and USGS about two additional barriers for which we may pursue later design.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

None known.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

No, this project will benefit both infrastructure and stream health.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

The crossing structures will be owned by Okanogan County. This project will improve existing infrastructure and reduce existing maintenance burden for the County.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite?

Don't know

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

We don't currently anticipate a risk of failure for this project, considering support from Okanogan County and our own extensive experience implementing design and construction for fish-passage projects. A lack of funding for construction is likely the greatest risk for the project; however, CF feels that there are several potential avenues for construction funding in future and the relatively high priority of these reaches suggest that funding would be achievable.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

Not at this point. If there are public use areas associated with these crossing structures, CF would encourage landowners to allow for the placement of an informational outreach sign to educate users on native fish, stream health, and restoration.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

The design phase of this project will support work for a contracted engineer and eventual construction would provide several projects for local contractors.

Replacement of the barriers identified in this project represent and upgrade to Okanogan County infrastructure. These roads provide access to a popular recreation area, which is an important driver of the County's economy. Implementation of this project helps improve climate resilience of these crossings and long-term access to the recreation area.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

CF has been communicating with CTCR and Okanogan County about moving this project forward and has initial support from both. While these structures were initially (and unintentionally) left out of the EDT model for fish passage, CTCR intends to update and include them in summer 2026, as well as provide any information or support in the meantime.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions? Yes

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

Fish passage barriers reduce spatial structure, abundance, productivity, and diversity of salmonids and other aquatic species. Barriers such as culverts and dams also degrade fish habitat by altering or limiting the downstream movement of sediment, wood, and other organic materials, and may reduce the upstream extent of nutrient inputs by impeding adult salmon passage. The Upper Columbia spring Chinook, Steelhead, and Bull Trout Recovery Plan, developed by the UCSRB (Lead Entity), states that fixing man made barriers will improve spatial structure and diversity of our listed species.

This project will initiate work to address the remaining fish-passage barriers on Salmon Creek (with the exception of a diversion dam currently being worked on by CTCR). Salmon Creek has historically been the most productive steelhead stream in the Okanogan Basin, per OBMEP reports, and juvenile chinook use has also been documented. Barriers in the project range from 33% passable to 67% passable and are thought to primarily impact juvenile passage in their current state. However, it's believed that loss of a backwater from a beaver dam downstream of the lowest crossing structure proposed for design would lead to limitations on adult passage at these structures, as well.

The lower two culverts are not included in the Upper Columbia barrier prioritization, though we are not certain why at this time considering known use by steelhead and prioritization ranking upstream of these barriers. Per Ryan Klett with the Colville Tribes, it was an oversight that these culverts were not included in the EDT model run, but they will be included in the next run in summer 2026. The upper culvert, 606489, is included in the prioritization. It is a Tier 2 priority for chinook and Tier 3 for steelhead, with both species receiving an overall prioritization score of 71.

The 2025 Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program report states that the majority of annual outmigrant steelhead originate from Salmon Creek, which accounts for roughly half of the combined estimates for fry and parr O. mykiss in the subbasin. This report also described Salmon Creek as colder than the Okanogan River, with a maximum weekly water temperature lower than the majority of other

Okanogan tributaries. Water temperatures are projected to continually warm over the coming decades. The NorWest Stream Temperature Model shows 7-day average summer temperatures in the Okanogan approaching 24 degrees Celsius in 2040, a potentially lethal temperature for salmonids. However, in the upper reaches of Salmon Creek near Conconully, water temperatures remain below 16 degrees Celsius. Establishing unrestricted passage through the barriers identified in this proposal will provide essential access cold water refugia, which may be critical to ensuring the persistence of our ESA-listed salmonids in the Okanogan basin in the future. The 2023 OBMEP report explicitly describes Salmon Creek as the highest priority for protection.

3. What are the project goals? The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired and future condition. Include which species and life stages will benefit from the outcome, and the time of year the benefits will be realized.

The goal of this project is to complete preliminary designs for three County-owned fish-passage barrier road crossings on Salmon Creek in the Okanogan Basin, as well as initiate outreach to landowners of two other non-crossing barriers in the system. This project would enable the eventual removal of three fish-passage barrier stream crossings and replacement with fish-passable crossing structures, ensuring the free flow of water, wood, and sediment for the creation and maintenance of downstream habitat, as well as improving fish passage for steelhead
and other native species to improve distribution and ensure connectivity to high-quality spawning and rearing habitat.

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

The objective of the project is to complete three preliminary designs for fish-passable crossing structures to replace barrier structures, allowing for a future project to improve connectivity in this important steelhead system in the Okanogan Basin. Locations for design are site IDs 605279 (67% passable culvert), 605278 (33% passable culvert), and 606489 (33% passable culvert). While adult steelhead passage occurs seasonally, these barriers are likely restricting juvenile passage and the lower may become a full barrier with a change to a downstream beaver dam that creates a backwater. CF would also undertake outreach to initiate work on two additional barriers in the system, 605289 (33% passable dam) and 606499 (67% passable other). There are relatively few remaining barriers in the Salmon Creek system, and work proposed in this project would create designs or begin initial outreach to address all but one remaining barrier, 950124 (0% passable dam), which the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation are currently working with the USBR to address. We anticipate a preliminary design completed for three culverts by 12/31/2027, allowing for CF to pursue funding for remaining design and implementation in future years.

5. Scope of work and deliverables. Provide a detailed description of each project task/element. With each task/element, identify who will be responsible for each, what the deliverables will be, and the schedule for completion.

Design - CF will contract with an accredited engineer to develop conceptual and then preliminary designs for three crossing structures. Designs will be guided by specifications described in WDFW's Water Crossing Design Guidelines (2013), with a stream simulation channel design. These methodologies provide the best design approach to ensure long term fish passage for all species and life stages, as well as allowing for natural watershed processes to occur. Partners from CTCR and Okanogan County, as well as funders, will have the opportunity to review and comment on designs.

Survey - CF will contract with a firm to complete geotech survey to inform design.

Project management - CF will manage all aspects of the project, contracting with an engineer, leading outreach with landowners and partners, and communicating and presenting to funders for review.

Administration - CF will be responsible for billing and grant management.

6. What are the assumptions and physical constraints that could impact whether you achieve your objectives? Assumptions and constraints are external conditions that are not under the direct control of the project, but directly impact the outcome of the project. These may include ecological and geomorphic factors, land use constraints, public acceptance of the project, delays, or other factors. How will you address these issues if they arise?

Designs for these sites will be informed by site survey, geotech survey, system hydrology, and a thorough understanding of the site. Close coordination with Okanogan County and project partners in the form of a design team will also ensure thorough review of proposed designs.

7. How have lessons learned from completed projects or monitoring studies informed this projects?

CF has extensive experience leading design and implementation of fish passage barrier projects across our region. We also have a history of strong communication with partners to ensure collaboration and partner/regional support for projects. CF has been communicating with CTCR and Okanogan County about moving this project forward and has initial support from both.

8. Describe the alternatives considered and why the preferred was chosen.

Alternative crossing structures/styles/locations will be considered in the conceptual design phase of this project. Review by CF, the design team, and funders will ensure that an appropriate alternative is selected to take to a preliminary design.

9. How were stakeholders consulted in the development of this project? Identify the stakeholders, their concerns or feedback, and how the concerns were addressed.

CF has held initial discussions with Okanogan County and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, as well as reached out to the City of Okanogan (landowner on the lowest barrier, which is not included in design). Outreach to and engagement with landowners, project partners, and funders will continue throughout the design process to ensure thorough review of and support for design as we move through the process toward implementation.

10. Does your project address or accommodate the anticipated effects of climate change? How will your project be climate resilient given future conditions? How will your project increase species and habitat adaptability?

The project designs will be climate resilient by designing fish passages structure that will pass flood flows, and associated stream bed substrate and wood, that may become more frequent and intense in the future. Predicted future changes to stream hydrology will incorporated into the new structures' design.

The 2025 Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program report states that the majority of annual outmigrant steelhead originate from Salmon Creek, which accounts for roughly half of the combined estimates for fry and parr O. mykiss in the subbasin. This report also described Salmon Creek as colder than the Okanogan River, with a maximum weekly water temperature lower than the majority of other Okanogan tributaries. Water temperatures are projected to continually warm over the coming decades. The NorWest Stream Temperature Model shows 7-day average summer temperatures in the Okanogan approaching 24 degrees Celsius in 2040, a potentially lethal temperature for salmonids. However, in the upper reaches of Salmon Creek near Conconully, water temperatures remain below 16 degrees Celsius. Establishing unrestricted passage through the barriers identified in this proposal will provide essential access cold water refugia, which may be critical to ensuring the persistence of our ESA-listed salmonids in the Okanogan basin in the future. The 2023 OBMEP report explicitly describes Salmon Creek as the highest priority for protection.

11. Describe the sponsor's experience managing this type of project. Describe other projects where the sponsors has successfully used a similar approach.

CF has extensive experience leading design and implementation of fish passage barrier projects across our region. We also have a history of strong communication with partners to ensure collaboration and partner/regional support for projects. CF has managed many fish-passage barrier projects in the Wenatchee, Methow, and Okanogan basins, working with a range of landowners (private, local, federal) and funders.

12. Will veterans (including the veterans conservation corps) be involved in the project? If yes, please describe.

No.

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Little Siberia Floodplain Connectivity Preliminary Design
Sponsor	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
Primary Contact	Grace Watson
E-Mail Address	grace@methowsalmon.org

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

The Project will produce a conceptual and preliminary design for the development of a floodplain reconnection project that increases biological benefit at low to moderate flows on property acquired in 2025 by Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation (MSRF) on the lower Twisp River. The project site is located in Reach 2 of the lower Twisp River Assessment Unit and within Reach T2a identified in the Lower Twisp River Reach Assessment (Yakama Nation Fisheries Program 2010, pp.29-45) between river miles 1.0-1.5. The site is located at MSRF's Twisp Ponds restoration site, an off-channel system consisting of five ponds and channels, which provides high quality spawning and rearing habitat for UCR Spring Chinook, UCR Steelhead, and other species.

The project builds on the Priest Rapids Tributary Committee sponsored Bartsch property Acquisition completed in 2025, a 7.86 acre parcel which includes the upper pond, channel, and headgate that feeds the Twisp Ponds complex, as well as a house that lies within the floodplain and a levee set back from the river. The recently purchased property is the final parcel that MSRF has been seeking since beginning acquisition and the subsequent restoration of the Twisp Ponds complex beginning in the early 2000s.

Preliminary 2D hydraulic modeling results suggest that partial or full levee removal does not have significant direct effects below the five year flood. However, the preliminary modeling suggests that a more complete levee removal project could be meaningful throughout the entire site if paired with

additional instream actions and riparian restoration to engage the floodplain during low to moderate flows.

The Project will produce conceptual and preliminary design for habitat restoration actions to benefit ESA-listed Upper Columbia Spring Chinook Salmon, UCR Steelhead, and other species including the removal of the house and levee and reconnection of the floodplain with the Twisp Ponds Complex. Habitat actions will show biological benefit at the annual flow without increasing flood risk to downstream or upstream private properties.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

Within two years the Project will produce a conceptual and preliminary design for a floodplain reconnection project which will include a suite of project actions to support meaningful habitat uplift for ESA spring Chinook and UCR steelhead at flows that support juvenile salmonids in the T2A reach of the lower Twisp River at Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation's (MSRF) Twisp Ponds restoration site.

The floodplain reconnection project will be designed to increase floodplain inundation and biological benefit to ESA listed fish species on MSRF owned parcels below the two year flow, without increasing flood risk to upstream or downstream private properties.

The project will evaluate opportunities to floodplain reconnection design that include:
- Instream actions to bring the river up onto the floodplain
- Removal of an earthen berm levee at the upstream end of the property
- Removal of a 2500 square foot house and associated infrastructure from the floodplain
- Riparian Restoration

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	$180,000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	$180,000

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	This project is located in the Twisp River Lower 02 reach and within Reach T2A of the 2010 Twisp River Reach Assessment between approximately RM 1.0-1.5.
Latitude (decimal degrees)	48.3689
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-120.14204
Project subbasin	Methow
Methow Assessment Unit(s)	Lower Twisp River

Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Twisp River Lower 02
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.	Rank 2

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?	Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout, Coho, Pacific Lamprey
2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics	Design, Monitoring or Assessment
4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?	No
5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?	No
6. What category is the project?	Design
If applicable, what is the secondary project category?	N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

7. What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?	Conceptual Design, Preliminary Design
8. Is your project within a completed (or soon-to-be completed) Reach Assessment or other type of assessment (e.g., Rapid Site Assessment, other)?	Yes. Lower Twisp River Reach Assessment, June 2010. Prepared by Interfluve for Yakama Nation Fisheries Program
9. Which limiting factors does the project propose to address?	Cover - Wood, Off-Channel - Floodplain, Off-Channel - Side-Channels, Riparian
10. Which life stages will the proposed project address?	Subadult Rearing (Bull Trout), Fry

Summer Rearing | Winter Rearing

11. Freshwater Benefits - Describe how your project will improve survival, capacity and/or distribution for target species at the reach scale?

The project will provide conceptual and preliminary design for a series of developed project actions designed to improve floodplain and side channel connectivity by removing a levee and house from the floodplain, and reconnecting natural flow paths between the Twisp River and channels and ponds within the Twisp Ponds complex. By increasing off-channel connectivity during annual flow levels, this project will increase the quantity and quality of available habitat in the Lower Twisp River reach, allowing more fish to access floodplain habitat and benefiting ESA listed species. We anticipate the project will increase the capacity and distribution of the project reach to support rearing juvenile fish.

12. Temporal Effect - Briefly describe how and to what extent the project would promote natural stream/watershed process consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?

This project will be designed to be consistent with natural processes and site and reach scale geomorphology. The project elements may include the removal of a house and levee from the floodplain and establishing instream and riparian restoration to reconnect former floodplain flow paths that were disconnected and filled in during flood-fight and development efforts over the last half century. MSRF owns property on the river bank opposite the project location, allowing opportunity for instream elements to be constructed that will initiate floodplain process.

Two current RCO and tributary funded projects are taking place in the Twisp Ponds complex, both designed to promote natural stream process and to support increases in future floodplain connection.
- The Habitat Connectivity project includes culvert removal from the primary channel, ensuring resiliency in flow through the ponds system.
- The Riparian Restoration project will improve water quality to the ponds through bench construction designed to capture runoff from Twisp River Road, increase habitat complexity through wood placement, and decrease pond temperatures through riparian plantings. Both of these projects will benefit from additional actions of a future floodplain connection project.

13. Temporal Effect - How long will it take for the project to achieve its intended response?

1-10 years

14. Temporal Effect - How long will the restoration action and its benefits persist?

10-50 years | 50+ years

15. Temporal Effect - What level and/or interval of maintenance is anticipated? What is the plan for any anticipated maintenance?

The project will produce conceptual and preliminary designs for restoration actions that would increase floodplain connectivity by removing a levee and a house from the floodplain, and reconnecting former channel flow paths. Because the entirety of the project is on property owned by Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation, access for maintenance is assured.

16. Methods - Briefly describe the potential (for design) or proposed restoration methods and how they will achieve project objectives.

The project team will identify opportunities to design multiple features to increase floodplain connectivity and process development, including levee and house removal, engineered mainstem and side channel complexity features, riparian restoration, and/or channel cuts designed to increase floodplain connectivity at the annual flood level. Risks to upstream and downstream properties as well as sediment transport dynamics will be assessed through modeling.

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership? Private

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project? Yes

Please explain

Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation owns all of the parcels on the right bank where the restoration actions will take place as well as all parcels on the left (opposite) bank, up to the boundary of the any owned SOAL land.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation owns all of the parcels where the restoration actions will take place, including all parcels landward of the established ordinary high water mark on both sides of the Twisp River. Actions proposed within the active river channel will be developed in consultation with DNR as the SOAL owner. A comprehensive risk assessment to upstream and downstream landowners will take place as a part of the design process. Actions will be designed to decrease risk to the existing infrastructure within the site. Planting benches in ponds 2-4 done as part of the RCO sponsored Riparian Restoration project will increase the buffer between the county road and the ponds.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

Actions will be designed to decrease risk to upstream and downstream landowners. WDFW currently uses an access road through the property to maintain a rotary screw trap and PIT antenna system on the adjacent mainstem Twisp River. Site access for WDFW employees and infrastructure will be maintained in project design. MSRF maintains a trail system open to the public on the downstream end of the property, which will not be impacted by project design. The project will be designed in compliance with adopted recreational risk guidelines (Reclamation) to not increase recreational risk over existing conditions or alter public access to existing recreational opportunities.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

The project will be designed to minimize long-term maintenance requirements. The project is designed to function within the range of anticipated flows to mimic natural process development - i.e. channel and bank development and evolution - and is not expected to require active project maintenance. MSRF will maintain the project elements where evolution raises potential risks to the public.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite? Yes

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

The project carries a low risk of failure. Preliminary modeling suggests there is potential to design a project that engages additional floodplain throughout the site without increasing risk to existing infrastructure or downstream landowners. MSRF has successfully maintained the ponds site for more than 20 years. By owning all of the underlying property, much of the risk associated with changing landowner requirements in mitigated.

Ensuring that project elements are designed to lower risks to upstream and downstream landowners will be a primary objective during the design process.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

Yes, this project will require outreach to neighboring landowners. Project activities will include posting signage explaining the purpose of the project and the construction phases. The Twisp Ponds site is viewed as a valuable community asset and is used by a large number of individuals and groups as a destination for walking, bird watching, and gatherings. Signage and art installations currently engage visitors and highlight salmon recovery projects throughout the Methow Valley and serve to increase community support for salmon recovery efforts. MSRF plans to present project findings to the Town of Twisp at a public meeting to address any potential public concerns over the project.
Yakama Nation is planning to update their 2010 Reach Assessment and may propose projects upstream or downstream of the reach. MSRF is coordinating directly with the Yakama Nation.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

Yes, this project will directly employ local and regional contractors to complete most aspects of the project assessment, design, and future management. MSRF has built an approved roster of qualified local and regional contractors and prioritizes local contractor preference when possible. MSRF has implemented restoration actions in the Methow Valley for more than 20 years, and the majority of our awarded contracts have been directed to local and regional contractors with consistently high-quality results. Our findings are supported by an economic analysis completed by UCSRB that showed that funds spent on restoration projects cycle through the local community 4 to 7 times, significantly multiplying the local economic benefit.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

This project will be led by MSRF staff who bring a breadth and depth of strengths to the project, including expertise in restoration ecology, community outreach and engagement, permitting, and project management. MSRF will hire a design engineer with expertise in restoration design and hydraulic engineering. MSRF has been actively engaged in habitat restoration in the Methow Valley since 2001 and has successfully served as a project sponsor for many restoration projects in the watershed.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions? No

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	MacPherson Flats Acquisition
Sponsor	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
Primary Contact	Camden Shaw
E-Mail Address	camden@methowsalmon.org

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

The proposed acquisition of the MacPherson Flats property would allow for a substantially developed floodplain to be restored to its natural condition allowing for side channel and floodplain restoration, including removal of an existing flood levee, buildings and roads, adjacent protected public land.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

The project objective is to remove the existing private development that prevents the MacPherson side channel from functioning as a perennial floodplain and side channel. This project seeks to acquire and protect an 8.7 acre parcel adjacent public land along the Chewuch River. The parcel includes an existing home site and commercial excavation and trucking yard and shop adjacent to WDFW land and Okanogan National Forest. The property includes approximately 680 feet of the 3,500' long MacPherson side channel

that is fed by the Skyline diversion intake from the Chewuch River as a year-round side channel. The acquisition would remove all buildings and provide permanent protection necessary to restore and maintain this section of the MacPherson side channel and connected floodplain for anadromous fish use.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	597,000
Anticipated or Actual Other Funding	199,000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	796,000

Other Funding Source(s), please note if funding is anticipated or actual.

MSRF is planning to request the other funding from PRCC

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	This proposed acquisition is located at Chewuch RM 7.7 within Chewuch River Pearrygin 08
Latitude (decimal degrees)	48.56811
Longitude (decimal degrees)	120.17680
Project subbasin	Methow
Methow Assessment Unit(s)	Chewuch River-Pearrygin Creek
Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Chewuch River Pearrygin 08
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.	Rank 3

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?	Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout
2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics	Acquisition, Easements, Leases

Acquisition, Easements, Leases: Reporting Code

Acres by Acreage Type (easement) and/or Acres by Acreage Type (fee simple)

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

No

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

No

6. What category is the project?

Protection

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

7. What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?

Conceptual Design

8. Is your project within a completed (or soon-to-be completed) Reach Assessment or other type of assessment (e.g., Rapid Site Assessment, other)?

Lower Chewuch Reach Assessment

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

7. What type of protection are you proposing?

Fee Simple

8. Is this protection project associated with a current or future restoration project?

Yes

9. Placement - Does the project protect important high quality habitat and/or watershed processes and to what degree

Yes, this project would permanently protect approximately 680 feet of perennial side channel along the Chewuch River. The project protects floodplain reconnection, riparian restoration and side channel and off-channel habitat, which are all actions identified in the 2025 Lower Chewuch Reach Assessment to address unacceptable and at-risk conditions.

The project is located downstream of an upgraded irrigation delivery project (Skyline) that was completed in 2025. That project eliminated the risk of fish stranding in past irrigation infrastructure ensuring safe passage to and from the Chewuch River year round in the MacPherson side channel that crosses the MacPherson Flats property. Removing the home and infrastructure along the side channel will allow for significant riparian planting and encourage natural regeneration of cottonwood, pine and riparian shrub species on 20% of the side channel length and on the 8.7 acre floodplain.

10. Freshwater Benefit - What would be the anticipated loss in survival, capacity or distribution for target species at the reach scale if the proposed area is not protected?

This project would result in permanent protection of approximately 680 feet of a Chewuch River perennial side channel controlled by a flood levee that also burned in the Cub Creek fire (2021). By not protecting this area and removing the infrastructure, natural riparian regeneration and future restoration opportunities along the side channel and floodplain would be restricted. Reduced survival of target species on the MacPherson Flats property could be high due to reduced side channel health for summer and winter rearing specifically. Spring Chinook, Summer Steelhead and Bull Trout all use the Lower Chewuch river year round. Spring Chinook summer and winter rearing rank high in the life stage ranking in the 2025 Lower Chewuch Reach Assessment. The reach also supports a diverse aquatic food web that supports ESA listed species.

11. Threat - How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented?

The floodplain property, including the side channel, is managed by the landowners for access and human use including a commercial shop, equipment yard and landscaping. The site use has resulted in on-going degradation based on the required flood levee and the heavy commercial use. After the Cub Creek fire in 2021, many of the mature pine and cottonwood trees along the side channel and throughout the floodplain were burned and are subsequently falling over. Without removing the home and commercial business infrastructure, the riparian trees and shrubs will not be able to fully revegetate the property and maintain a functioning riparian along the side channel and on the floodplain.

12. Conditions - Briefly describe if there are any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the protection benefits

The only condition that would limit the protection of the property would be the cost to remove the home and infrastructure necessary to revegetate and allow for natural regeneration of the floodplain. The property is surrounded by state and federal land, ensuring its long term protection. Restoration is limited to site clean up, home removal and targeted planting where natural regeneration is compromised from years of human impacts.

13. Will there be public access? Yes

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership? Private

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project? Yes

Please explain

Chris Johnson was contacted by the landowner to ask if the Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation would be interested in acquiring the property for protection.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

There are no landowner requirements to the acquisition.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

No, this project is unlikely to raise potential concerns with any interest group of the community at large. This project compliments two decades of work accomplished by the Skyline ditch company, Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation, WDFW, USFWS and BOR to protect side channel habitat for endangered

species on the Chewuch River.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation will be responsible for land management.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite? Yes

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

There is no risk of failure associated with this project.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

There is no public outreach planned during acquisition. After the property is acquired the restoration efforts and clean up of the property would be a significant opportunity to show the public the ecological and community benefits to floodplain restoration and protection.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

It is anticipated that future restoration will be developed following acquisition to take advantage of the opportunities identified in the reach assessment. All future restoration actions, including removal of the infrastructure, will use local sub contractors to increase economic benefits from state and federal restoration dollars circulation within the local and regional economy. The project also allows for public access to the Chewuch River from the county road giving recreational users access to the riparian forest.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

Chris Johnson, the executive director of MSRF, has had a personal relationship with the MacPherson Flats property owners for two decades. The Skyline ditch company, which diverts irrigation water just upstream, is working with MSRF to secure funding for more upgrades to their irrigation delivery infrastructure and is currently completing an upgrade of 6,000 feet of new pipe and replacing a wooden trestle with a new bridge across Cub Creek with funding from USFWS and PRCC. In 2025, WDFW, BPA, and PRCC funded a project that successfully improved the fish screen and 600' of irrigation delivery, eliminating the risk of stranding salmonids after ditch shutdown.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions? No

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Beaver Creek Confluence Acquisitions
Sponsor	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
Primary Contact	Brian Fisher
E-Mail Address	brian@methowsalmon.org

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation proposes to acquire two parcels near RM 36 of the Methow River to protect and allow restoration of the Beaver Creek confluence reach of the Methow River.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

The project would acquire two parcels (3322270015 and the floodplain portion of 3322270017) along the Methow River near the confluence with Beaver Creek. Parcels would be acquired within one year, and would set the stage for a restoration project in this reach (Methow Alder 4 &5), which includes low floodplain, active bars and backchannel areas.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	$175,000
Tributary Committee - Anticipated or Actual	$50,000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	$225,000

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	This project will occur on the Methow River between RM 35.9 to RM 36.5
Latitude (decimal degrees)	48.3267
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-120.0667
Project subbasin	Methow
Methow Assessment Unit(s)	Methow River-Alder Creek
Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Methow River Alder 04 & Methow River Alder 05
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.	Rank 1 Rank 2 Multiple reaches (provide details below)

Please detail the reach-ranking of the reaches below

Methow River Alder 05 is reach rank 1; Methow River Alder 04 is reach rank 2.

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?	Spring Chinook Steelhead Bull Trout Lamprey
2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics	Acquisition, Easements, Leases
Acquisition, Easements, Leases: Reporting Code	Miles of streambank and/or Shoreline Protected by Land or Easement Acquisition

Acres by Acreage Type (easement) and/or Acres by Acreage Type (fee simple)

Floodplain Areas Protected** this reporting metric does not appear in PRISM. Work with the LE to ad this metric upon completion of project.

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

No

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

No

6. What category is the project?

Protection

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

7. What type of protection are you proposing?

Fee Simple

8. Is this protection project associated with a current or future restoration project?

Yes

9. Placement - Does the project protect important high quality habitat and/or watershed processes and to what degree

This project would protect some high quality rearing habitat in the form of deep pools with cover near the confluence with Beaver Creek, as well as low Methow River floodplain in the Twisp to Carlton reach. The project would also protect and allow active restoration of parafluvial bars in this active reach.

10. Freshwater Benefit - What would be the anticipated loss in survival, capacity or distribution for target species at the reach scale if the proposed area is not protected?

This reach of the Methow River is used extensively for rearing spring Chinook, spawning and rearing Steelhead, and has high quality holding habitat used by bull trout and steelhead.

11. Threat - How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented?

The owners of both properties are actively marketing them for sale, and if purchased could be cleared and developed for recreational purposes. Development of either one of these parcels would limit restoration options in this reach of river.

12. Conditions - Briefly describe if there are any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the protection benefits

There are no conditions preventing fee simple acquisition and protection of these parcels.

13. Will there be public access? Yes

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership? Private, Cemetary District

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project? Yes

Please explain

The owners of the two properties are actively marketing them for sale, and they have agreed to a conservation sale at appraised value.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

No requirements, intervening property is private common area with supportive landowners.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

No known concerns.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

We are proposing acquiring the property on fee simple basis. Once acquired, these parcels would facilitate active restoration of bars, islands and floodplains. In their current conditions, these parcels do not carry significant unique maintenance requirements.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite? No

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

Failure to acquire the parcels could limit future restoration opportunities at the confluence of this important tributary. The project is low risk, with both landowners supportive of selling at appraised value. The largest risk to this project is that one or both of the parcels appraise significantly higher than expected. Costs for acquisition are estimated based on current assessed value and professional opinion, but one of the parcels includes both an upland parcel and disjunct floodplain area, and the assessed value is not segregable.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

As part of this project MSRF would work with adjacent landowners to develop opportunities for additional opportunities for both restoration or protection.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

It is anticipated that future restoration will be developed following acquisition to take advantage of the opportunities identified in the reach assessment. All future restoration actions, including removal of the infrastructure, will use local sub contractors to increase economic benefits from state and federal restoration dollars circulation within the local and regional economy. The project also allows for public access to the Chewuch River from the county road giving recreational users access to the riparian forest.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation has over twenty years of managing and completing both acquisition and restoration projects. MSRF staff will coordinate with the appointed appraiser. Chris Johnson would work with the Cemetary district to complete a public purposes segregation to allow independent sale of the riparian and floodplain portion of that parcel.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions?	No

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Nason Creek Floodplain Restoration: PUD Transmission Line Relocation Conceptual Design
Sponsor	CCNRD
Primary Contact	Mike Kane
E-Mail Address	mike.kane@co.chelan.wa.us

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

The CC-SM project area follows a portion of the Chelan PUD Coles Corner to Summit Line 115kv transmission line corridor as it parallels and crosses Nason Creek, US Highway 2, BPA transmission line, the BNSF rail line, and numerous private and public properties. The primary goals for the project are to conduct a feasibility assessment and conceptual designs for relocation of the Chelan PUD Chelan PUD McKenzie to Beverly 115kV line (CC-SM) in a three-mile reach of Nason Creek to allow for floodplain restoration and connectivity, restoring habitat function in a critical Tier 1 salmon recovery area in the Wenatchee watershed. There are multiple floodplain restoration and reconnection opportunities identified in the project reach as identified by previous studies that could be implemented with the re-location of the transmission lines. The design project will include a review of existing geomorphic, hydraulic, and habitat assessments, limiting factors and updated floodplain restoration opportunities based on on-the-ground evaluations, and coordination with CCNRD, Chelan PUD, and transmission line engineers.
The CC-SM transmission line is located largely within the floodplain of Nason Creek and/or riparian areas in close proximity to Nason Creek and largely within regulatory land use buffer zones, so land use regulations would not allow for development within restored riparian and floodplain areas. Relocation of the transmission lines, even without floodplain restoration actions, would allow for restoration of the riparian areas and eliminate the current active management and vegetation removal in these areas by the PUD. There are multiple transmission poles in the active floodplain that have been fortified with bank

armoring or are at risk from actively eroding banks that will need bank stabilization for protection.

This project seeks to address temperature, habitat quality and quantity, and channel complexity for migrating, holding and spawning for ESA listed salmonids; spring and summer chinook, steelhead, and bull trout by relocating three miles of transmission line out of the floodplain of Nason Creek.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

Implementation of the project will include the following objectives: an estimated 1.5 miles of shading, 15-30 acres of restored riparian habitat, reconnection of up to 40 acres of floodplain, and re-meander 0.5 miles of channelized reaches of the creek.
The project goal is to conduct an alternatives analysis and conceptual designs for the relocation of a three-mile section of the Chelan PUD Mckenzie to Beverly 115kV line (Coles Corner to Summit line [CC-SM]) out of the floodplain of Nason Creek and an alternatives analysis for potential stream restoration work after transmission line removal. Conceptual designs will be developed for a portion of the 3 mile stream segment. Metrics will be refined as part of the design process.

This project seeks to address temperature, habitat quality and quantity, and channel complexity for migrating, holding and spawning for ESA listed salmonids; spring and summer chinook, steelhead, and bull trout by relocating three miles of transmission line out of the floodplain of Nason Creek.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	$276,250
Anticipated Request - Targeted Investment	0
Tributary Committee - Anticipated or Actual	$48,750
Anticipated or Actual Other Funding	0
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	$325,000

Other Funding Source(s), please note if funding is anticipated or actual.

N/A

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	This project is located between RM 9.5 – RM 13.3 (9.2-12.7 UCSRB) of Nason Creek roughly between the Cole's Corner Rest Area and the Ray Rock Knife Store, (US 2, MP 78.4-81.4).
Latitude (decimal degrees)	47 46'08.31" N
Longitude (decimal degrees)	120 48'05.35" W

Project subbasin

Wenatchee

Wenatchee Assessment Unit(s)

Lower Nason Creek

Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?

No

Reach(es) Name

lower Nason 9-12

Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.

Multiple reaches (provide details below)

Please detail the reach-ranking of the reaches below

Reach: Nason Creek Lower 9 - Rank 1; Nason Creek Lower 10 - Rank 1; Nason Creek Lower 11 - Rank 1; Nason Creek Lower 12 - Rank 1.

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?

Spring Chinook | Steelhead | Bull Trout

2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics

Design, Monitoring or Assessment

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

Don't Know

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

Yes

Please explain which process(es) and how this proposal differs from the previous submission (e.g., different phase, modified scope, etc.)

Submitted to SRFB in 2023.
This proposal does is essentially the same except for cost increases.
It did exist in PRISM, but likely in wastebasket since it was not selected for funding.

6. What category is the project?

Design

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

7. What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?

Conceptual Design

8. Is your project within a completed (or soon-to-be completed) Reach Assessment or other type of assessment (e.g., Rapid Site Assessment, other)?

Yes. Lower & Middle Nason Creek Reach Assessment & Restoration Strategy Update Final Report. YN. 2026

9. Which limiting factors does the project propose to address?

Cover - Boulder | Cover - Wood | Off-Channel - Floodplain | Off-Channel - Side-Channels | Pool Quantity & Quality | Pools - Deep Pools | Riparian | Riparian - Canopy Cover | Riparian - Structure | Temperature - Adult Holding | Temperature - Adult Spawning | Temperature - Rearing

10. Which life stages will the proposed project address?

Adult Migration | Adult Non-Spawning (Bull Trout) | Natal Rearing (Bull Trout) | Subadult Rearing (Bull Trout) | Fry | Holding and Maturation | Spawning and Incubation | Summer Rearing | Winter Rearing

11. Freshwater Benefits - Describe how your project will improve survival, capacity and/or distribution for target species at the reach scale?

Nason Creek is critical to spawning and rearing salmonids and is identified in the Upper Columbia Salmon, Steelhead and Bull Trout Recovery Plan as the highest priority tributary in the Wenatchee basin for habitat restoration of spring Chinook (ESA-listed, Endangered), steelhead (ESA-listed, Threatened), bull trout (ESA-listed, Threatened), summer chinook (SRKW priority species) and resident fish. Overwintering habitat is limited in Nason Creek because of reduced habitat quality from straightening and other significant modifications from the creek's historic alignment by construction and maintenance of the BNSF railroad, US 2, and the CC-SM transmission line. Additionally, the creek is currently listed on the 303(d) list for temperature. Portions of the three-mile reach being addressed under this proposal are subject to rapid heating during spring Chinook spawning in late July-August, due to of a lack of riparian shading and channel modifications (Roumasset 2020). Straightened reaches with a lack of riparian cover in the Wenatchee sub-basin often exhibit this pattern of rapid heating. Implementation of this project would result in increased riparian vegetation within the corridor, channel modifications to improve shading and floodplain connection, providing peripheral and transitional habitat in Nason Creek and improving overall habitat quality and overwintering use, addressing the highest priority ecological concerns within the Nason Creek watershed (UCRTT 2013).

Relocation of the transmission lines, even without floodplain restoration actions, would allow for restoration of the riparian areas and eliminate the current active management and vegetation removal in these areas by the CCPUD. CCNRD staff estimated that over 30 acres of riparian cover could be restored simply by re-planting in the transmission line corridor after relocation, which would greatly enhance the shade cover for this reach of Nason Creek. There are multiple transmission poles in the active floodplain that have been fortified with bank armoring or are at risk from actively eroding banks that will need additional bank stabilization for protection. Moving the alignment of a section of the CC-SM corridor out of the Nason Creek historic flood plain would reduce challenges associated with maintenance (discussed

more in the Economic Benefit question) and would allow for re-meandering of the simplified stream channel and rehabilitation of the stream corridor. This project will be designed to improve access to portions of the historic floodplain wetland, which in turn will provide high flow and winter rearing habitat, thermal and high flow refugia for spring Chinook and steelhead juveniles. Providing rearing habitat during winter and high flow conditions is important so that juvenile fry that emerge from redds are not prematurely flushed downstream. Additionally, the relocation of CC-SM would allow for other habitat improvement restoration activities to begin, further addressing the lack of shade, channel complexity, and floodplain access.

12. Temporal Effect - Briefly describe how and to what extent the project would promote natural stream/watershed process consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?

The section of Nason Creek that will be addressed under this proposal has had the most significant impacts to its channel and floodplain connectivity as a result of construction and maintenance of the BNSF railroad, US-2, and the CC-SM transmission line. As a result, the creek was rerouted and channelized, and both banks of the creek were isolated from its floodplain because of the armoring that protects the railroad and power lines. All of which have contributed to the degradation of this section of Nason Creek. Wood recruitment potential is low because of ongoing transmission line vegetation maintenance, and because of the channelization wood is more likely to be transported downstream rather than retained, decreasing channel complexity. By relocating the CC-SM line out of the floodplain partial restoration of natural stream processes would be possible. The relocation alone would allow for 30 acres of riparian restoration in the former powerline corridor. Partially restoring this section of the creek to its natural geomorphic state.

13. Temporal Effect - How long will it take for the project to achieve its intended response?

1-10 years

14. Temporal Effect - How long will the restoration action and its benefits persist?

50+ years

15. Temporal Effect - What level and/or interval of maintenance is anticipated? What is the plan for any anticipated maintenance?

Since this is an early design phase of the project, there is not yet a plan for anticipated maintenance. Full project implementation could include re-routing sections of the stream corridor and extensive riparian planting, so a detailed monitoring and maintenance plan would be developed at a later design stage and annual maintenance would be expected for 3-5 years post construction to address plantings and possible channel adjustments.

16. Methods - Briefly describe the potential (for design) or proposed restoration methods and how they will achieve project objectives.

CCNRD will work with a consultant and project partners to complete the alternatives assessment and conceptual design process for rerouting the transmission line corridor. Simultaneously, CCNRD will work with a separate consultant to review of the Bureau of Reclamation and Yakama Nation reach assessments and other pertinent data (including a review of limiting factors for this reach), conduct site inventories, identify constraints and restoration opportunities based on rerouting transmission line, develop hydraulic models based on 2022 Bathymetric LiDAR and develop a habitat assessment and restoration strategy, including an outline of design opportunities.

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership?

Property ownership in this reach is a combination of private and public (CCPUD, WSDOT, USFS, and CDLT).

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project?

Yes

Please explain

CCNRD has been meeting with CCPUD discussing this project. We have had recent meetings with CCPUD, WSDOT, USFS, CDLT and some private landowners to discuss the project and have support to move forward with the initial feasibility phase of the project. Landowner acknowledgement forms will be forthcoming for the large landowners. Part of the feasibility project will include outreach to private landowners as well.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

Landowner requirements will be determined as part of the design process. Since this is a large scale utility corridor project, part of the feasibility will be focused on these issues. This is the initial design phase of the project, and CCNRD and CCPUD are working together to secure landowner access to the private parcels.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

The project will raise potential concerns for local landowners as it includes moving a transmission line corridor that currently crosses around 40 private parcels. For most of these landowners it will probably be considered an opportunity more than an issue, but there will be other landowners who could have concerns based on changes associated with a preferred new location. Additionally, this project has the potential to contribute to the resilience of the power grid and as such could be seen as a benefit. The section of line being proposed for relocation is difficult to access during floods, storm events, and wildfires. Relocating the CC-SM along SR-2 would improve access for maintaining service for the long term. This is not a heavily used recreational corridor, so at this time, we do not anticipate any recreation issues or concerns.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

Chelan County Natural Resources will be managing the development of the feasibility and design assessment and will continue to collaborate with partners. Since this phase of the project is a feasibility and conceptual design phase, there will be no required management and maintenance by current landowners. Post-implementation, CCPUD would be managing the transmission line corridor and CCNRD or other project sponsors would have short-term responsibility to maintain restoration sites.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite?

Yes

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

There is little to no risk of failure for the first phase of this project, as we have broad support from landowners. The main risk for this project would be securing funding for implementation. It is a large-scale infrastructure project so there are inherent risks, but given warming temperatures for this reach during spring chinook spawning there are also risks in not addressing the issues associated with existing conditions.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

Yes, CCNRD will host their watershed community outreach meetings during the design process and after implementation. The project does build on community support for salmon recovery efforts. There are multiple forums within which the partners on this project collaborate. There is a monthly Wenatchee Watershed Action Team for salmon recovery and river restoration practitioners to convene and discuss coordination, collaboration and implementation of initiatives and projects, including floodplain restoration, fish barrier removal, riparian restoration, instream flow improvements and education and community engagement. Additionally, across the Wenatchee watershed, project sponsors collaborate extensively on project opportunities. Multiple organizations meet regularly to discuss coordination, including Cascade Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group, Cascadia Conservation District, Yakama Nation, Colville Confederated Tribes, Chelan County Natural Resource Department, Trout Unlimited, Washington Water Trust and Chelan-Douglas Land Trust. The current proposal arose from these partnership meetings, recognizing that multiple opportunities exist for floodplain restoration with the relocation of the transmission line. Public outreach will be planned after this initial feasibility and conceptual design phase and may include, but not be limited to: a public scoping letter, an informational postcard mailer sent to nearby residents, and one-two Nason Creek community meetings.
A number of public documents identify and support the project, including the following:
a) Chelan County Multi-Jurisdiction Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (2012)
The multi-jurisdiction plan adopted by Chelan County and the Cities of Cashmere, Chelan, Entiat, Leavenworth and Wenatchee through an extensive public process identifies Chelan PUD critical infrastructure in the Stevens Pass areas and notes concern about voltage capacity in the future, indicating the need to upgrade and expansion of the system. Relocating the transmission line out of the floodplain prior to an upgrade and/or expansion will assure that the relocation will occur. Additionally, the plan specifically recommends the identification of "feasible mitigation options or possible purchase and relocation opportunities" in flood-prone areas such as Nason Creek and identifies the history of flooding and flood-related damages in the upper Wenatchee basin.
b) Wenatchee Watershed (WRIA 45) Management Plan (2006)
The watershed plan adopted by the County Commission in 2006 identifies Nason Creek as the highest priority habitat restoration subbasin in the Wenatchee watershed and specifically identifies the high priority for restoration and floodplain reconnection in the project area. The plan was unanimously approved by the Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit after two years of public review and extensive community outreach.
c) NOAA Fisheries Upper Columbia Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan (2008)

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

This proposal is a good investment of public funds because it not only supports salmon recovery, but would add climate resiliency to the power grid. The project addresses critical long-term changes such as, increased wildfire risk and storm severity, warming stream temperatures, and increased sediment loading. First, the Nason Creek watershed is a dry-side site and will be subject to increasing wildfire risk and "mega-fires," which will increase the risk of infrastructure damage and total loss. Relocation of the powerlines to another corridor (along SR-2) will include upgrading the CC-SM power poles from wood to a more fire-resistant material, steel. The new location would be easily accessible from USFS White Pine Road and SR-2 compared to the existing location in the floodplain of Nason Creek, where staff have reported having trouble accessing the powerlines because of flooding, storms, and wildfires. Second, modeling by the UW Climate Impacts Group shows that warming water temperatures in this area may reach critical levels. Floodplain restoration can improve groundwater connectivity, increasing hyporheic exchange and thus keeping the water cooler for longer. Maintaining cooler temperatures is critical for salmonid habitat. Third, we expect climate change to increase the severity of flooding and thus erosion and sedimentation will also increase. By reconnecting historic floodplains, the impacts of intense flood events and sedimentation would be reduced, enhancing salmonid habitat and reducing erosion damage to infrastructure. Increased flood storage capacity decreases potential flood damage to the BNSF railroad, SR-2, and SR-207. Reducing hazards to roads and railroads saves costs associated with disruptions to interstate commerce and infrastructure protection, and increases reliability of these systems. In summary, the relocation of the CC-SM transmission line will save future operation and maintenance costs, increases accessibility, and enhance emergency response times for repairs to this section of line.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

This effort builds on the Upper White Pine Floodplain Restoration Project. The Upper White Pine project successfully relocated an upstream section of the transmission line out of the floodplain and included levee removal, stream sinuosity and significant riparian restoration. Perhaps most importantly, the relationships and trust built during that project between CCNRD, CCPUD, USFS, and WSDOT now allow for this partnership to explore additional transmission line relocation opportunities. Similarly, there were multiple funders of the Upper White Pine Project who would be interested in investing in this project.

This project will work at the reach level and include collaboration between many organizations including: CCNRD, WSDOT, CCPUD, Yakama Nation (YN), USFS, Chelan-Douglas Land Trust (CDLT), Cascade Fisheries, US Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), private landowners, BNSF, BPA and funders, including SRFB, CCPUD, Tributary Committee, Grant PUD Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee, and others. However, the main contributors for this initial design phase are CCNRD, CCPUD, and WSDOT. Specific roles and contributions from key partners will be defined by the final application deadline.

Some of these partners have already implemented projects in this reach and removal of the Transmission line corridor would allow for further improvements to existing investments in salmon habitat.

CCNRD has been at the forefront of the development and implementation of habitat improvement projects for listed salmonids in the Wenatchee since the adoption of the Wenatchee Watershed Management and Implementation Plans in 2008. CCNRD has successfully planned, developed, designed, permitted, coordinated, and constructed over 75 salmon habitat improvement projects, including the Upper White Pine Floodplain Restoration Project described above. Additionally, CCNRD has demonstrated the ability to implement floodplain re-connection projects while working with nearby infrastructure in Nason Creek. This includes two oxbow re-connections under SR 207 and the BNSF bridge that re-connects the Coulter and Roaring drainages. Through these experiences CCNRD has seen how floodplain reconnection projects result in improved streamflow, habitat complexity, and overall improved stream quality. CCNRD staff have extensive experience in project management, landowner coordination, and contractor management.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions?	No

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Nason Creek and State Route 207 Re-Alignment Fish Habitat Enhancement Project - Phases 1 & Phase 2
Sponsor	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
Primary Contact	Chris Butler
E-Mail Address	butlerc@yakamafish-nsn.gov

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

The Yakama Nation has developed a large scale habitat and fish passage restoration action within its Treaty Ceded Area that offers a rare opportunity to accomplish multiple resource objectives in a manner that truly restores natural processes that create and sustain Pacific Coast anadromous fish runs. Through the development of key partnerships with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the United States Forest Service (U. S. Forest Service) Okanogan/Wenatchee Nation Forest (OWNF), this project proposes to remove 0.65 miles of WSDOT managed highway (State Route 207) out of the creek corridor and floodplain so that over 1.4 miles of stream habitat can be protected and restored as productive spawning and rearing habitat for endangered spring Chinook salmon and steelhead. This project will remove floodplain habitat fish passage impediments caused by State Route 207 and restore connectivity of roughly 14 acres of floodplain habitat, including groundwater fed side channels. Multiple WSDOT Chronic Environmental Deficiency sites identified along State Route 207 will be fully removed from the Nason Creek corridor, three non-fish passable culverts will be fully removed, and habitat restoration including the placement of many large habitat wood structures and improvement of 0.5 miles of side channel will occur.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

Collaborative agency goals between the Yakama Nation, U.S. Forest Service, and WSDOT for this project include: 1) restoring quality salmon habitat, fish passage, and habitat sustaining natural processes by addressing regionally identified top priority ecological concerns in a cost effective manner; 2) reducing or eliminating stream system impacts to the SR 207 roadway in a manner that preserves roadway integrity and protects the traveling public; 3) addressing WSDOT CED sites along SR 207 so that stream habitat and the roadway are no longer in conflict with each other; and 4) preventing unnatural creek channel avulsions from occurring adjacent to SR 207 so that productive spawning and rearing habitats can be maintained and enhanced in the broader project reach.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	$750,000
Anticipated Request - Targeted Investment	$3,000,000
Anticipated or Actual Other Funding	$12,155,594
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	$15,905,594

Other Funding Source(s), please note if funding is anticipated or actual.

Actual - The YN has agreements for additional funding with Bonneville Power Admiration, Bureau of Reclamation, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, NOAA-Restoration Center, WSDOT - Federal Highway Administration, and United States Forest Service.

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	This project will occur in Chelan County near Coles Corner along Nason Creek between River Mile 3.9 and 4.6 and between mile post 0.20 to 0.85 along State Route 207.
Latitude (decimal degrees)	47.46'08"
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-120.43'27"
Project subbasin	Wenatchee
Wenatchee Assessment Unit(s)	Lower Nason Creek
Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Nason Creek Lower 03

Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.

Rank 2

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?

Spring Chinook | Steelhead | Bull Trout | Summer Chinook | Sockeye

2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics

Instream Habitat (Includes Floodplain & Off-Channel Reconnection) | Water Quality | Wetlands

Instream Habitat: Reporting Code

Total miles of instream habitat treated | Miles of off-channel stream created or connected | Acres of channel/off-channel connected or added | Number of structures placed in channel | Pools created through channel structure placement | Miles of streambank stabilized

Water Quality: Reporting Code

Total acres feet of water treated for water quality

Wetlands: Reporting Code

Acres of wetland improvement/enhancement

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

Yes

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

Yes

Please explain which process(es) and how this proposal differs from the previous submission (e.g., different phase, modified scope, etc.)

The previous project submittals were in the 2023 and 2024 SRFB Grant Rounds. In this 2026 grant round, the YN intends to submit for grant funding for both the SRFB funding and Targeted funding. The following identifies the differing of the past submission of 2023 & 2024 to that of what is being submitted for 2026: 1. Two funding opportunities exist for this project in the 2024 grant round which include the normal SRFB Grant funding and Targeted Grant funding, 2. For the SRFB funding, the YN received funds to secure 100% roadway final designs, and some additional funding for Mobilization and Clearing and Grubbing of the new

roadway alignment outside the floodplain, Phase 1 construction, 3. The Targeted funding is identified for constructing the new roadway alignment in the uplands outside the floodplain, and the removal of the current old highway alignment and utilities out of the floodplain. 4. To aid in our descriptions of work, we will refer to each funding opportunity as either (SRFB) or (Target) prior to the response of our discussion when and where it is appropriate and needed for this application process. 5. The YNF-UCHRP will submit a budget for each grant opportunity that is labeled either, (SFRB budget) or (Target budget).

(SRFB) - This portion of the application is different as we will be requesting funding toward funds for Phase 1 Construction which includes additional funding towards clearing and grubbing, preloading, and storm water collection that ultimately benefits the local Ecosystem.

(Target) - The differing of this proposal than that of 2023 and 2024 request is the phase 1 portion of this project has additional completed test boring exploration and 60% designs and will have 100% Phase 1 completed design by the end of May 2026. Additionally, the YNF-UCHRP has received 3 million dollars from the NFWF - America the Beautiful for construction, 500 thousand dollars from BOR - WaterSMART for design of Phase 1, 6 million from the NOAA-Restoration Center for Phase 1 and Phase 2 for design and construction, 5 million from BPA for Phase 1 and Phase 2 design and construction funding, 1.2 million from the FHWA for Phase 1 for construction, and 500 thousand from USFS for Phase 1 construction. This project will be transitioning to 100% designs for the road relocation out of the floodplain by April 2026. Phase 1 of this project is the relocation of the SR 207out of the floodplain to an upland area in 2026 and 2027. Phase 2 of this project is the removal of the old highway alignment and utilities out of the floodplain and is planned for construction 2028.

6. What category is the project?

Restoration

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

7. What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?

Construction

8. Is your project within a completed (or soon-to-be completed) Reach Assessment or other type of assessment (e.g., Rapid Site Assessment, other)?

Multiple assessments have been completed for the project area, including: • Upper Columbia Spring Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan, 2007 • A Biological Strategy to Protect and Restore Salmonid Habitat in the Upper Columbia Region, September 2021• Lower & Middle Nason Creek Reach Assessment & Restoration Strategy Update, January 2026 • Nason Creek Tributary Assessment, Bureau of Reclamation 2008 • Lower Nason Assessment of Geomorphic and Ecologic Indicators Nason Creek, Wenatchee Subbasin, Bureau of Reclamation 2011 • Nason Creek, RM 3.4- 4.6 Floodplain Enhancement, Interfluve Inc. 2019 • Feasibility Analysis SR 207 Realignment, Perteet 2021 • Nason Creek RM 3.3 to 4.6 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, Interfluve Inc. 2022 • Nason Creek Watershed Analysis, USFS 1996, • Salmon and Steelhead Biological Assessment for the Nason Creek N1 Floodplain Reconnection Project, ICF International 2012 • Nason Creek N1/KDIZ3 Alternatives Analysis Report, CCNRD 2011 • Nason Creek River Mile 3.3-4.6 Feasibility Study, CCNRD 2012

9. Which limiting factors does the project propose to address?

Cover - Wood

Off-Channel - Floodplain

Off-Channel - Side-Channels

Pool Quantity & Quality

Temperature - Adult Holding

Temperature - Adult Spawning | Temperature - Rearing

10. Which life stages will the proposed project address?

Adult Migration | Subadult Rearing (Bull Trout)

Holding and Maturation | Summer Rearing

Winter Rearing

11. Freshwater Benefits - Describe how your project will improve survival, capacity and/or distribution for target species at the reach scale?

The project is being designed to remove a portion of State Route 207 from the floodplain and river corridor, which will eliminate hardened infrastructure from the aquatic environment and restore more natural physical habitat conditions that better support fish survival and production. In addition, extensive instream and floodplain restoration will occur meant to increase the quantity and quality of holding, spawning, and rearing habitats in the project reach, including increasing the amount of cover habitat, floodplain side channels and wetlands. Currently the existing highway and road protection infrastructure and on-going roadway management decreases vegetation cover, decreases stream bank roughness and complexity, introduces roadway contaminants from rainfall runoff and snow removal, and prohibits fish access to floodplain habitats such as side channels and wetlands where productive off-channel rearing habitats exist. The project will increase the active floodplain size and level of connectivity, increase ground water storage, create channel length and allow for the development of new meanders. Flood water attenuation and sediment storage capacity will increase; as will riparian vegetation cover over and adjacent to fish bearing waters. The amount of diverse and complex stream habitat will be significantly increased. All of these benefits should significantly increase the capacity of Nason Creek to support more rearing juvenile salmonids and more holding and spawning adults due to the increase in habitat availability and habitat quality.

In addition, the project will help prevent the likelihood of an unnatural channel avulsion occurring near the middle CED site, which is currently an elevated risk with on-going road and powerline maintenance at this location. If Nason Creek were to avulse into the current river right side channel downstream of the BPA power lines, significant productive spawning and rearing habitat would be lost, and the large oxbow side channel connected by the 2007 Chelan County NRD culverts would likely be disconnected. It is imperative from a habitat protection standpoint that this avulsion risk be addressed as soon as possible in coordination with removing the highway out of the floodplain so that maximum freshwater benefits can be obtained.

Lastly, this project will improve water quality over time for Nason Creek. Implementation of SR 207 in 1943 was prior to any stormwater, tire dust, or road grime toxics collection or treatment. Currently, SR 207 is not required to deal with stormwater, snow, or road grime issues. These identified toxins within the floodplain currently flow directly into Nason Creek or into the riparian zone where buildup of elements is filtered out by way of ground water filtration. The removal of a portion of SR 207 from the floodplain corridor must meet current guidelines for stormwater removal from the WSDOT's Design Approval, Manual M-22-01.23 and the America Association of State Highway and Transportation Office. This will ultimately improve water conditions for aquatic residents of Nason Creek over time due to 100% stormwater collection and treatment.

12. Temporal Effect - Briefly describe how and to what extent the project would promote natural stream/watershed process consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?

The geomorphology of Nason Creek in the project area has become artificially constrained and the river has been artificially straitened due to the placement of State Route 207 into the Nason Creek corridor and floodplain in 1943. The roadway is forcing Nason Creek's energy and velocity into a direction that is not stable at these two locations. This has had a direct result of chronic highway and floodway interactions, which has resulted in extensive road damage and continuous road maintenance, as well as continuous negative impacts on fish habitat. This project seeks to remove the artificial geomorphic constraints imposed by SR 207 along Nason Creek so that natural stream/watershed processes that create and

sustain quality salmon and steelhead habitat can be restored.

13. Temporal Effect - How long will it take for the project to achieve its intended response?

Less than or equal to 1 year | 1-10 years

14. Temporal Effect - How long will the restoration action and its benefits persist?

50+ years

15. Temporal Effect - What level and/or interval of maintenance is anticipated? What is the plan for any anticipated maintenance?

Once the overall construction is completed in 2027, the Phase 1 work, (realignment of State Route 207 and stormwater collection) will be maintained by the Washington State Department of Transportation. The new highway alignment will occur outside of the Nason Creek floodplain, so roadway surface and embankment maintenance requirements should be substantially reduced compared to existing conditions at the current alignment of SR 207.
Phase 2 work, (stream restoration) will incorporate restoration efforts that are self-maintaining or similar to what you would expect to see naturally occurring in this type of landscape under a more natural unaltered setting. We expect annual maintenance needs to be low. Most of this work will occur on lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service, where the Yakama Nation and U.S. Forest Service will work cooperatively to ensure restored features are functioning as designed and accomplishing habitat restoration targets. The Yakama Nation will conduct monitoring at the site for up to five years to determine if any maintenance or construction interventions are needed to achieve project performance and objectives.

16. Methods - Briefly describe the potential (for design) or proposed restoration methods and how they will achieve project objectives.

The design for Phase 1 work, (realignment of State Route 207) will include mobilizing a qualified construction contractor to construct a new highway segment for SR 207 that circumvents the Nason Creek floodplain from highway mile 0.20 to roughly 0.85. The new roadway will be constructed to meet WSDOT's Design Approval and the AASHTO criteria and traffic will be rerouted once the new roadway alignment and utilities of Phase 1 construction are complete. These actions should be completed by December 31, 2027. Completion of this phase in 2027 will allow Phase 2 restoration work to take place in 2028, utilizing the old highway alignment as access into the floodplain and instream restoration zone to not disrupt the flow of traffic for SR 207, prior to the removal of the old highway alignment.
Phase 2 work, (Instream and floodplain restoration) will include mobilizing a qualified construction contractor to construct the restoration plans as designed by Professional Engineers, and adherence to BMPs and standard Conservation Measures described in the U.S. Forest Service Aquatic Restoration Biological Opinion (ARBO) and WDFW's Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines. All of these actions should be completed by July 31, 2028. Phase 2 construction will include the removal of the existing alignment of SR 207 out of the floodplain, excavation and construction of new side channels and wetland areas, placement of engineered log structures and wood habitat cover features, excavation of new pool habitat, and planting of native riparian vegetation in all disturbed areas and will be completed by December 31, 2028. This work will ensure the project's intended habitat benefits are achieved and that the intended hydraulics created that will restore natural habitat forming processes and reduce unnatural channel avulsions risks downstream of the Phase 2 project area.

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership?

United States Forest Service and Washington State Department of Transportation

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project?

Yes

Please explain

The Yakama Nation has two project partners, the United States Forest Service, and the Washington Department of Transportation. Both project partners are supportive of this restoration action due to the environmental benefits contained in the project and the ability of the project to assist each agency in achieving regional environmental policy goals. Additionally, project partners have contributed land and funding for to this project.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

The project has been proposed on federal lands managed by the United States Forest Service and within an easement managed by the Washington State Department of Transportation. Both entities are supportive of the project and are willing to engage in agreements and proceedings that may be needed to support the project action legally moving forward. Additionally, there are also powerline and utility franchises within the WSDOT ROW (CCPUD) and for Utility (Ziply Fiber and T-Mobile) that will require access permission and realignment once the new road alignment location is resolved. One other additional ROW easement within the jurisdiction of this project area is BPA power lines. All entities are working with one another to accomplish the goals of this project.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

The Yakama Nation is engaging in a public outreach campaign to raise awareness about this project, and to solicit feedback from interested parties regarding the proposed highway realignment. We expect both positive and negative responses from interested parties because of the magnitude of the project action, and the visible effect on the popular highway that accesses the Lake Wenatchee area. The Yakama Nation is using a documented supplemental alternatives analysis requested by the Chelan County Commissioners to demonstrate to the public the need for the project action, and why this particular highway realignment is the best alternative for resolving multiple existing conflicts including poor habitat conditions and an unstable transportation corridor caused by incessant flood/roadway interactions.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

The SR 207 realignment roadway will be built to WSDOTS Manual and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, (AASHTO) standards and this will become the management and responsibility of Washington State Department of Transportation. The United States Forest Service will manage the reconnected floodplain areas in conjunction with similar floodplain and upland lands that are currently managed by the Wenatchee River Ranger District in this project area.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite?

Yes

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

Risk of failure for SR 207 realignment is low due to the support provided by USFS and WSDOT. The new highway segment will be engineered, designed, and constructed out of the floodplain to meet WSDOT and AASHTO standards to ensure public safety and longevity of the project. Funding is the largest hurdle for Phase 1 due to the high project cost. However, funding from the 2026 SRFB Grant round along with YN, WSDOT, NFWF, NOAA-RC, BOR, BPA, RCO, and USFS funding makes this project feasible.
A negative reaction from the public for this project could prevent the land management agencies from going forward, however the public will be informed that a “no action” alternative at these CED sites is a very high risk to causing further damage to the river and the highway. Through our public meetings and

comment periods, the YN has received the public support for this project. This is due to the balanced approach as we have provided all the project history and a list of all of the options that have been considered for this area.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

The Yakama Nation and project partners had a public meeting on March 21, 2023 and July 1, 2025 to inform the public of the project area, project history, feasibility analysis, and supplemental alternatives analysis. We have presented the project concept at Wenatchee Watershed coordination meetings and to the Chelan County Commissioners. Chelan County, at that time, requested we create the supplemental alternatives analysis for the project that could be used to further demonstrate the project need and the appropriateness of the proposed action. The NOAA-RC has taken the federal lead for National Environmental Policy Act, which will additionally satisfy ESA Section 7 Consultation, and NHPA Section 106 Consultation for this project. The Yakama Nation and project partners will be engaging with the broader public about the outcomes of our NEPA process, the completed 60% designs for the roadway alignment and the restoration designs and the opportunity of another comment period.
This additional public meeting is planned for April or May of 2026 with our project partners to inform the public on project development and funds that are secured.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

Current conditions in the project area routinely degrade fish habitat and cause damage to the Highway 207 road prism and embankment, necessitating constant maintenance spending by WSDOT. The proposed road realignment will reduce the maintenance cost burden of Highway 207 to WSDOT, which will benefit the WSDOT program budget and state taxpayers. In addition, local contractors will be hired to complete both the road construction and restoration construction work associated with this project, which will generate at least temporary economic benefits to Chelan County and the local community.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

The Yakama Nation has 2 partnerships for this project, Washington State Department of Transportation and the United States Forest. The WSDOT has contributed both money and expertise to this project. The USFS has contributed the land, agreements, management, and funding towards Phase 1 of this project. Additionally, the Yakama Nation Fisheries has received 3 million dollars toward Phase 1 design and construction from NFWF, 500 thousand dollars from BOR-WaterSMart for phase 1 design, 5 million dollars toward Phase 1 and Phase 2 design and construction from BPA, 6 million dollars toward Phase 1 and Phase 2 for design and construction from NOAA-RC, and 1.2 million from the Federal Highway Administration for Phase 1 and Phase 2 Construction.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions? Yes

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

Nason Creek has historically been a critically productive spring Chinook salmon and steelhead spawning and rearing tributary in the Wenatchee Subbasin. The reduction of salmonid abundance in the Wenatchee Subbasin correlates closely with increased habitat impairments induced in Nason Creek during railway, powerline, highway, logging, and residential development over the past century. Given its historic

importance and high geomorphic intrinsic potential to be productive salmonid habitat, the Lower Nason Creek Assessment Unit has consistently been identified as a logical top priority stream system to focus salmon habitat restoration efforts within the Upper Columbia Basin salmon recovery framework. The current Biological Strategy to Protect and Restore Salmonid Habitat in the Upper Columbia Region (UCRTT, 2021) identifies channel complexity restoration, floodplain reconnection, and side channel and off-channel habitat restoration as top priority restoration action categories needed in Nason Creek to contribute to improved status of the viable salmonid population parameters for spring Chinook salmon and steelhead.
In the proposed project area, Nason Creek has become significantly artificially constrained and cutoff from historically productive side channel and floodplain habitats by the placement of State Route 207 in the floodway in 1943. In total, the 1943 roadway project cutoff some 70 acres of floodplain and side channel habitats, although some previous restoration work has partially restored stream connectivity to around forty acres of habitat north of the BPA powerline crossing. The location and down valley alignment of State Route 207 in the floodway has become increasingly problematic in recent decades as the creek has attempted to naturally meander in the historic floodplain corridor. Repeated flood events starting in 1950's caused the natural channel migration trends to increasingly encounter the roadway prism which has now actively destroyed two different segments of the two-lane highway, causing the Department of Transportation to create new rock fortified streambanks along hundreds of feet of the creek body which diminish instream habitat quality and impede riparian vegetation growth. On average there are 2 to 3 emergency responses per-decade which results in more fortified rock and less aquatic habitat. Without some level of continued intervention that can decrease floodwater interactions with the roadway prism, it is expected and predicted that unnatural creek channel avulsions will occur along and adjacent to the roadway surface that will further degrade aquatic habitats and cause additional roadway damage.
This project seeks to provide practical long-term solutions to these problems by removing a substantially constricting component of State Route 207 infrastructure from the Nason Creek floodway so that 14.74 acres of cutoff floodplain and side channel habitat can be restored as viable fish and riparian habitat and the risks of future artificially induced creek avulsions can be prevented.

2. Describe the limiting factors, and/or ecological concerns, and limiting life stages (by fish species) that your project expects to address.

Limiting Life Stages and Limiting Factors from a Biological Strategy to Protect and Restore Salmonid Habitat in the Upper Columbia Region - Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin, 2021:
Nason Creek Lower 03 Reach Priority Life Stages:
spawning and incubation,
winter rearing,
summer rearing,
holding and maturation
Assessment Unit Life Stage Priorities:
Spring Chinook:
holding: high priority
spawning: high priority
summer rearing: high priority
winter rearing: high priority
Steelhead:
spawning: medium priority
winter rearing: high priority
Nason Creek Lower 03 Reach Limiting Factors Addressed:
temperature (rearing), temperature (adult spawning), temperature (adult holding), bank stability, floodplain connectivity, riparian (canopy cover), channel substrate (percent fines and embeddedness) Nason Creek Lower 03 Reach Priority Action Categories:
bank restoration, channel complexity restoration, channel modification, fine sediment management, floodplain reconnection, riparian restoration and management, side channel and off-channel habitat restoration, upland management, water quality improvement
Limiting Factors from a Biological Strategy to Protect and Restore Salmonid Habitat in the Upper Columbia Region, 2017:
1. Peripheral and Transitional Habitat (Side Channel and Wetland Connections)
2. Channel structure and form (Bed and Channel Form)
3. Riparian Condition (Riparian Condition)
4. Channel structure and form (Instream Structural Complexity)

5. Food (Altered Primary Productivity)
6. Sediment Conditions (Increased Sediment Quantity)

3. What are the project goals? The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired and future condition. Include which species and life stages will benefit from the outcome, and the time of year the benefits will be realized.

1. Restore quality salmon habitat & habitat sustaining natural processes by addressing the ecological concerns in a cost effective manner by;
- Restoring winter & summer low flow connectivity to available peripheral and transitional habitats necessary for rearing juvenile ESA listed species.
- Increase mainstem habitat complexity & channel roughness to increase surface water connectivity with adjacent floodplain for year round habitat availability.
- Increase surface water contributions to the disconnected floodplain to improve riparian & wetland vegetation conditions, & to enhance groundwater storage & hyporheic discharge.
- Decrease energy & velocities which will increase sediment fallout & improve spawning areas for returning adults.
2. Reduce or eliminate stream system impacts to the SR 207 roadway in a manner that preserves roadway integrity and protects the traveling public.
- Realign a 0.65 mile length of SR 207 infrastructure from out the floodplain.
- Collect and treat roadway stormwater runoff.
- Realign powerline & utilities infrastructure from the floodplain.
3. Address WSDOT CED sites along SR 207 Deficiency
- Remove 2 of WSDOT CED sites along Nason Creek with the proposed alignment.
4. Prevent unnatural creek channel avulsions from occurring adjacent to SR 207 so that productive spawning & rearing habitats can be maintained & enhanced in the broader project reach.
-Use habitat complexity treatments and new channel meander paths to stabilize hydraulic function.

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

1. (SRFB) - Complete final construction designs for Phases 1 based upon agreements between the project partners. (Addresses all Goals)
2. (SRFB) - Begin mobilization and clearing and grubbing of the roadway alignment out of the floodplain in late 2025. (Addresses all Goals)
3. (Target) - Begin and complete construction of the roadway alignment out of the floodplain between mile posts 0.20 and 0.85 while the original roadway remains in place for traffic access. This action includes realignment of utilities sited along the roadway once the new roadway construction is mostly completed. (Addresses Goals 2 & 3)
4. (Target) - Commission the new SR 207 segment for public use. (Addresses Goals 2 & 3)
5. (Target) - Removal of old highway bank protection and roadway fill from the floodplain (0.65 miles of fill removal) (Addresses Goals 2 & 3).
6. Begin all instream and floodplain habitat restoration actions in the Phase 2 project area, which includes, 10 habitat log structures, 10 pools, side channel and alcove construction (0.5 miles of reconnected and enhanced channels), 14.74 acres of floodplain reconnected to natural flood processes, elimination of two registered WSDOT CED sites, riparian vegetation and wetland plantings (5.5 acres of new native plantings), 0.5 miles of spawning habitat protected by preventing unnatural channel avulsions, and another 1 mile of side channel rearing habitat protected by preventing further unnatural channel avulsions. (Addresses all Goals).

5. Scope of work and deliverables. Provide a detailed description of each project task/element. With each task/element, identify who will be responsible for each, what the deliverables will be, and the schedule for completion.

(All items with “**” are tasks that include SRFB funding. All items with "***" are tasks for Target funding. All other tasks are funded by match funding)
- Engineer’s Design of the New Roadway, Phase 1 - 60% Preliminary design through 100% final Design - This work is being complete YN – spring 2026

- Engineer's Design of Instream Habitat Restoration, Phase 2 – 60% Preliminary design through 100% final Design – This work is already contracted by the YN – Spring 2026
- Public Outreach Process – Public meetings and outreach products – YN will be the lead along with WSDOT, and USFS – 2023 through 2028
- Review, and Acceptance of Phase 1, 30% Designs – The YN, BPA, WSDOT, and USFS – March 2024
- Utility realignment planning – The YN will lead the discussions and coordinate the work with WSDOT, and USFS - 2023- 2027
- WSDOT Easement Realignment on USFS Lands, (this includes franchise ROW) - USFS, WSDOT, and Utilities 2024-2027
- NEPA, ESA Section 7 Consultation, and NHPA Section 106 Consultation - The YN, BPA, and USFS – Spring or Summer 2026
- Review, Comment, and Acceptance of Phase 1, 60% Designs – The YN, BPA, WSDOT, and USFS – March 2026
- Review, Comment, and Acceptance of Phase 2, 60% Designs – The YN, BPA, and USFS – March 2026
- Environmental Permitting through WDFW, USCOE, WDOE, and Chelan County - The YN and WSDOT, USFS – 2025 through 2027
- Phase 1, Construction Contracting - The YN will create a competitive bid and hire a roadway construction contractor by August 2026.
- Begin Phase 1 by Mobilizing, Clearing and Grubbing - Construction Contractor with YN as Owner, Fall of 2026

** Begin Phase 1 construction Activities for building the new road segment – Construction contractor with YN as the Owner, Fall of 2026-2027.
*** Relocate utilities along the right of way – CCPUD, Ziply Fiber and T-Mobile - spring and fall 2026 - 2028.
** &*** Complete roadway construction and commission new roadway alignment for public use - YN and WSDOT – fall 2027.

- Phase 2, Construction Contracting - The YN will create competitive bid and hire a habitat restoration construction contractor by March 2028.

** &*** Phase 2, Begin Construction Activities for Instream Habitat Restoration – Construction contractor with YN as the Owner summer 2028.
*** Phase 2, Remove obsolete SR 207 original roadway alignment and Utilities from the Nason Creek Floodplain – summer and fall 2028.

- Site stabilization and plantings - The contractor hired by the YN will plant, seed and restore all staging areas, access routes and riparian areas – October/April 2027-2029.

6. What are the assumptions and physical constraints that could impact whether you achieve your objectives? Assumptions and constraints are external conditions that are not under the direct control of the project, but directly impact the outcome of the project. These may include ecological and geomorphic factors, land use constraints, public acceptance of the project, delays, or other factors. How will you address these issues if they arise?

1st constraint is funding. The current projected cost for planning/design and implementation of Phases 1 and 2 total to $15,905,594.00, hence a large contribution of SRFB Targeted funding to the project is necessary to ensure project feasibility. Yakama Nation Fisheries is also securing funding from WSDOT (CED funding), USFS (CWI, CFLRP, and BIL funding), BPA Fish Accords funding, NFWF-America the Beautiful, BOR-WaterSMART, NOAA-RC funding, USFS funding, and other potential funding sources. Current funding towards the project totals $12,155,594.00, but SRFB funding remains a critical piece of the funding puzzle for this project that will ensure full project feasibility.

2nd constraint is public support. The Yakama Nation is currently engaging in direct public outreach to raise awareness and solicit feedback from interested parties and the public about the full restoration proposal. Currently the project is being evaluated through NEPA and soon the SEPA processes where the project funders and land management agencies will have to make decisions on how to proceed based on public feedback. This project proposal has been developed in close coordination with the likely NEPA and SEPA leads, and we believe the purpose, needs, and cost/benefits of the proposal are clear and will be supported by the public. We are using a documented alternatives analysis requested by the Chelan County Commissioners to demonstrate the purpose, needs, and cost/benefits of the proposal, which should be very helpful in communicating this proposal to the public through the NEPA and SEPA processes.

3rd constraint is unforeseen environmental permitting requirements. The current road realignment

proposal has taken into account likely impacts to sensitive areas like wetlands which could influence project construction techniques, project footprint standards, or require compensatory mitigation.

7. How have lessons learned from completed projects or monitoring studies informed this projects?

Regional and local project effectiveness monitoring consistently shows that properly placed floodplain and side channel reconnection work benefits ESA listed salmonids in the Upper Columbia Basin: Beechie et al. 2010; Beechie et al. 2013; Bellmore et al. 2013; Paillex et al. 2015; Roni et al. 2008; Hillman et al. 2016; Castella et al. 2015; Kaushal et al.2008; and Helfield et al. 2012. Yakama Nation Fisheries has been implementing salmon restoration projects in the Columbia Basin for more than a decade, and we utilize information gained from our project histories in all new projects. This Phase 1 project is being proposed based on our experience that the best biological outcomes from restoration will require that artificial infrastructure be removed from the floodplain so that natural hydraulic dynamics, flood water attenuation, and sediment transport can operate in an unimpeded manner which creates better habitat resiliency. In addition, our experience indicates that this segment of Nason Creek is at high-risk avulsion which could further capture the thread of Nason Creek directly along a longer portion of the highway 207 embankment. Yakama Nation Fisheries is proposing this project in part to prevent this channel avulsion scenario from happening so that more habitats can be restored and additional further habitat degradation can be avoided.

8. Describe the alternatives considered and why the preferred was chosen.

The Yakama Nation recently completed an updated Alternatives Analysis for this project area documenting many of the considerations that have been taken into account to support why this project is the preferred restoration alternative. Many other restoration alternatives have been conceptualized and evaluated by Yakama Nation Fisheries, Chelan County, WSDOT, USFS, WDFW, and others over the past decade. In short summary, this specific highway realignment alternative is being selected for implementation because it is the project that best addresses the biological impairments in a high impact manner while also avoiding previously identified constraints such as roadway safety, private land impacts, wetland/waterbody impacts, extremely high implementation and/or infrastructure maintenance costs, and other similar project feasibility factors. Please review the attached Nason Creek RM 3.3 to 4.6 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis report for more in-depth detail regarding our alternative selection process.

The project will completely remove 2 WSDOT CED sites from the Nason Creek floodway and will reconnect 14.74 acres of floodplain and side channel habitat. In addition, the project will help Yakama Nation Fisheries to prevent a negative channel avulsion event and will set the stage for possibly removing other segments of Highway 207 from the Nason Creek flood way if future conditions for upland roadway development and adequate funding allow.

Finally, when implementing projects such as this one that includes new roadway segments near waterbodies, the standard WSDOT's Manual and of the America Association of State Highway and Transportation Office (AASHTO) must be implemented and followed. This results in a new alignment segment being built to address stormwater and road grime/toxics. Ultimately this will improve water quality and water runoff to Nason Creek and or the floodplain.

9. How were stakeholders consulted in the development of this project? Identify the stakeholders, their concerns or feedback, and how the concerns were addressed.

WSDOT and USFS have been directly involved in all project design decisions undertaken since YN began developing restoration actions at this site in 2018. All of these entities are supportive of the proposed highway realignment alternative and are planning to engage in any NEPA/SEPA processes to inform their final decisions about the project as the project development moves forward.

Utilities in the project area have been informed and are working towards meeting the objectives of this project by spring of 2028.

Over the last several years YN has been coordinating with Chelan County regarding the highway realignment and habitat restoration proposals. The 2022 Nason Creek RM 3.3 to 4.6 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis report was created in direct response to feedback from the Chelan County

Commissioners for this project. YN is now working directly with Chelan County Natural Resources Department to develop restoration actions proposed to take place on the Nason Ridge Community Forest lands adjacent to the project area.

The Yakama Nation is currently engaged in a public outreach campaign to inform the public about this project action. We have had two public meetings, and we have an upcoming public meeting scheduled and we have previously presented the project concept at Wenatchee Watershed coordination meetings and to the Chelan County Commissioners.

10. Does your project address or accommodate the anticipated effects of climate change? How will your project be climate resilient given future conditions? How will your project increase species and habitat adaptability?

a. The project will remove a portion of SR 207 from the floodplain and river corridor, which will eliminate hardened infrastructure from the aquatic environment and restore a more natural physical habitat condition that better support fish survival, production, and water storerage through floodplain connection. Currently, the existing highway and road protection infrastructure and management decreases floodplain connection, decreases vegetation cover, decreases stream bank roughness and complexity, introduces roadway contaminants, and prohibits fish access to floodplain habitats. All of these benefits will combat climate change.

b. The project will restore more natural geomorphic conditions in a mile-long segment of Nason Creek in a manner that will remove infrastructure impediments from the creek channel and recover connectivity with the historic floodplain. 14.74 acres of floodplain and side channel habitat will be reconnected to the creek, resulting in 0.29 miles of side channel habitat becoming connected and available for rearing salmon. The project will increase 5.5 acres of wetland and off-channel habitat availability and will boost trophic productivity throughout the reach. Vegetation responses to the road removal will benefit riparian conditions which in turn will benefit aquatic habitats at the site through increased shading, wood recruitment, and increased allochthonous inputs. Flood water attenuation and sediment storage capacity will increase, improving localized and downstream habitat resiliency.

11. Describe the sponsor's experience managing this type of project. Describe other projects where the sponsors has successfully used a similar approach.

The Yakama Nation Fisheries completed the Skinney Creek channel reconstruction project in the Wenatchee Subbasin under a similar partnership framework with USFS and WSDOT. That project reconstructed 0.5 miles of highly sinuous Skinney Creek channel with inset vegetated floodplains in an old Highway 2 roadway alignment, and the project included replacing failed grade control weirs in a WSDOT wetland mitigation area with new constructed riffles that improved fish passage. In addition, in 2018 the YNF worked in the WSDOT right-of-way and road embankment on State Highway 20 along Beaver Creek to restore a WSDOT CED site and replace an undersized private bridge. Yakama Nation Fisheries has also conducted multiple levee removal projects in the Upper Columbia Basin including the Twisp Ponds Floodplain Restoration Project in 2017 and Horseshoe Side Channel Project in 2018.

12. Will veterans (including the veterans conservation corps) be involved in the project? If yes, please describe.

No, unless they are employed by one of the many subcontractors that is needed for this entire project scope of work.

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Lower Chiwawa Area D, Implementation
Sponsor	Chelan County Natural Resource Department
Primary Contact	Scott Bailey
E-Mail Address	scott.bailey@co.chelan.wa.us

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

This project addresses identified habitat limiting factors for high- and medium-priority spring Chinook and steelhead life stages (i.e., holding, summer and winter rearing, and fry colonization) in Reach 4 of the Lower Chiwawa River AU including Floodplain Connectivity, Off-channel Side-channels, Riparian Canopy Cover, Instream Cover (wood), Deep Pools, and Temperature (rearing). This phase of the project will execute contracts for project construction, vegetation planting, and construction oversite; complete all tasks needed to implement the restoration project as designed; and complete post-implementation tasks needed to close out the project including preparation of as-built drawings, and reporting as required to comply with permits and funding agreements. The completed project will improve conditions along ~0.6 miles of mainstem channel; create ~0.2 miles of side-channel habitat; enhance a cold water tributary confluence; and consolidate/reduce dispersed camping, decommission up to 1,000 lf of unauthorized roads, and reduce potential for future impacts and enhance vegetation within ~15 streamside acres.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

Objectives of the proposed project are:

Within 24 months of funding

1. Execute all contracts needed to implement the project and provide engineering oversite.

2. Construct a restoration project as identified in construction-ready design documents that will:
(a) add large wood structures and other habitat features along ~0.6 miles of mainstem channel (and at the mouth of a cold water tributary) that will increase wood loading to greater than 70 pieces of wood per mile, improve cover and increase pool quantity and quality, redirect flows and increase inundation of the river left floodplain, and improve habitat quality and access at the tributary confluence.
(b) add up to 0.2 miles of side-channel habitat to increase side channel area in project reach to greater than 5% of total channel area.
(c) decommission approximately 1,000 lf of forest roads, consolidate camp sites/control access, and plant native trees, shrubs, grasses and forbs to improve conditions within ~15 streamside acres.

3.Complete post-implementation tasks including as-built drawings, reporting required by funders and permitting agencies, and close out of all contracts and agreements.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	$500,000
Tributary Committee - Anticipated or Actual	$500,000
Anticipated or Actual Other Funding	$1,000,000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	$2,000,000

Other Funding Source(s), please note if funding is anticipated or actual.

We intend to request additional funds for this implementation effort from Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee, Colville Tribes Fish & Wildlife Department, and/or one or more other sources. No other applications have been submitted yet. Funding is anticipated, not secured.

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	The project site is located along the lower Chiwawa River from ~0.6 miles downstream of the Chiwawa River Road bridge upstream to the Alder Creek confluence, approximately RM 6.6-7.25
Latitude (decimal degrees)	47.8396
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-120.6638

Project subbasin	Wenatchee
Wenatchee Assessment Unit(s)	Lower Chiwawa River
Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Reach 04
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.	Rank 2

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?	Spring Chinook Steelhead Bull Trout
2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics	Instream Habitat (Includes Floodplain & Off-Channel Reconnection) Riparian Habitat Upland Habitat
Instream Habitat: Reporting Code	Total miles of instream habitat treated Miles of off-channel stream created or connected Acres of channel/off-channel connected or added Number of structures placed in channel Pools created through channel structure placement
Riparian Habitat: Reporting Code	Total riparian miles streambank treated Total riparian acres treated
Upland Habitat: Reporting Code	Acres of upland habitat treated Number of erosion/ Sediment control installations Miles of road abandoned

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

Yes

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

Yes

Please explain which process(es) and how this proposal differs from the previous submission (e.g., different phase, modified scope, etc.)

Two design phases for this Area D project have been funded by SRFB: the Preliminary Design phase was funded through the 2022 grant round, and the Final Design phase was funded through the 2025 SRFB grant round. The Final Design agreement is still active, and work under this 2025 SRFB agreement is expected to continue through fall 2026. Previous design documents (Conceptual and Preliminary designs) and other work products have been uploaded to PRISM during these previous phases, and newly produced work products also will be uploaded to PRISM for the 2025 agreement.

The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) also has provided financial support during both design phases. During the Preliminary Design phase, BOR contracted directly with the design firm that is designing the in-stream restoration treatments. The Final Design phase is being funded, in part, through a BOR WaterSMART Aquatic Ecosystems Restoration Projects (WaterSMART AERP) agreement that CCNRD received in 2025.

Unlike these previous agreements, this proposal is requesting funding for project implementation (not project design).

6. What category is the project?

Restoration

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

N/A

Design and Restoration Proposals

7. What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?

Construction

8. Is your project within a completed (or soon-to-be completed) Reach Assessment or other type of assessment (e.g., Rapid Site Assessment, other)?

Lower Chiwawa River Assessment (InterFluve, 2023) and Upper Wenatchee Pilot Project: Aquatic Habitat Assessment and Restoration Strategy Report (Cramer Fish Sciences, 2019)

9. Which limiting factors does the project propose to address?

Cover - Wood
Off-Channel - Floodplain
Off-Channel - Side-Channels
Pool Quantity & Quality
Pools - Deep Pools
Riparian - Canopy Cover
Riparian - Disturbance
Temperature - Adult Holding
Temperature - Rearing

10. Which life stages will the proposed project address?

Fry
Holding and Maturation
Summer Rearing

Winter Rearing

11. Freshwater Benefits - Describe how your project will improve survival, capacity and/or distribution for target species at the reach scale?

Currently, floodplain connectivity, side-channels, cover wood, riparian canopy cover, and temperature are classified as Unacceptable, and deep pools are classified as At-risk, for Reach 4 of the lower Chiwawa River (UCRTT 2020). Based on the Upper Wenatchee Pilot Project: Aquatic Habitat Assessment and Restoration Strategy Report (Cramer Fish Sciences, 2019), streambed substrate is dominated by cobbles and boulder and LWD is rare along this reach. Overall pool frequency was rated Adequate, but the reach was rated At-risk for pools due to a limited number of deep pools. Riparian road densities were rated Moderately High and this resulted in a riparian condition rating of At-risk. Channel dynamics were rated Poor in this reach due to a high bankfull width to depth ratios, low entrenchment ratio, and low side channel percentages compared to predicted meandering and braided channel forms.

This project is intended to improve habitat quality for target species life stages including holding, fry, summer rearing, and winter rearing. The proposed project will improve habitat quality at the Alder Creek confluence(by adding a pool and large wood structure); increase the length of side channel habitats (by excavating an ~1,000 lf river-left side-channel that will include habitat wood), the number of deep pools and amount of LWD present along ~0.6 miles of mainstem channel (through construction of eight mainstem ELJs); and treat historical and ongoing recreational impacts to riparian and upland vegetation and water quality (and minimize potential for future impacts) along the project reach (by treating impacts, creating structures and planting native plants in three dispersed camping areas adjacent to the river).

Through the aforementioned work, this project will enhance the quantity and quality of habitats along the project reach. We expect that this will increase capacity for holding, incubation, fry and summer and winter rearing life stages, which we expect to improve survival, reproduction and fitness for target species.

12. Temporal Effect - Briefly describe how and to what extent the project would promote natural stream/watershed process consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?

The lower Chiwawa River has been impacted by historical land use practices, particularly timber harvest practices that used the stream corridor to transport logs. This has resulted in a simplified, plane bed channel that is wide and shallow and disconnected from its historical floodplain. As a result, the streambed is well-armored and large cobbles and small boulders dominate the bed substrate. Pools and persistent LWD structures are rare. In addition, dispersed camping in the area has adversely affected riparian and upland vegetation, resulted in a web of social roads and trails and a proliferation of garbage and unauthorized latrines. These impact water quality and stream and forest health (and create management issues for USFS).

The project will treat ~0.6 miles of in-stream habitats and ~15 acres of adjacent riparian and upland habitats and will restore habitat values, promote natural processes, minimize future recreational impacts, and facilitate USFS management of the area. The design process has been supported by extensive data collection and modeling, anticipates the projected effects of global climate change and is consistent with reach-scale geomorphology and USFS planning and management efforts. The project also is consistent with guidance provided by the UCRTT in its recent restoration prioritization update which promulgates the following recommendations for the project reach: Improve cover wood, Improve off-channel side channels, Improve off-channel floodplain, and Improve temperatures.

Treatments associated with the proposed project will promote natural stream/watershed processes. Selective grading and the addition of wood structures in the mainstem channel and lower Alder Creek (a cold water tributary) and on adjacent floodplain surfaces will:
(1) more regularly connect the stream channel to its floodplain,
(2) enhance hydraulic and habitat diversity,
(3) initiate horizontal and vertical scour that will mobilize sediments and organic materials,
(4) create off-channel habitats, and
(4) facilitate deposition of naturally occurring LWD and streambed materials along the project reach.

In addition to reducing potential for future recreational impacts to the area, treatments for past

anthropogenic impacts in recreation areas adjacent to the river will:
(1) improve streamside vegetation (which will facilitate recruitment of organic matter and other allochthonous inputs and increase shade);
(2) enhance infiltration in upland and riparian areas; and
(3) reduce runoff and delivery of fine sediments, garbage, fecal coliform bacteria, and other contaminants to the stream.

13. Temporal Effect - How long will it take for the project to achieve its intended response?

Less than or equal to 1 year | 1-10 years

14. Temporal Effect - How long will the restoration action and its benefits persist?

10-50 years

15. Temporal Effect - What level and/or interval of maintenance is anticipated? What is the plan for any anticipated maintenance?

It is our intent that the project will be self-maintaining and require little or no further human intervention once construction is completed. That said, we will work with USFS to monitor the project post-construction and will complete maintenance as needed to ensure the project continues to function as designed.

This request funds project construction, but this grant program does not provide funds for post-construction monitoring and maintenance. As a result, should maintenance needs be identified it is likely that a new fundraising effort will be required to secure funds in support of that work.

16. Methods - Briefly describe the potential (for design) or proposed restoration methods and how they will achieve project objectives.

This project is designed to improve in-stream and floodplain habitat quality, quantity and diversity; improve flow connectivity and juvenile fish access to off-channel habitats; and promote stream processes including scour, sediment deposition and sorting, organic matter recruitment, and others. Restoration treatments associated with the project include mainstem and tributary ELJs (apex, bank-attached, and side-channel confluence structures), habitat tree placement, selective grading, and recreation area treatments including selective grading, wood/rock structures, and vegetation planting. The current 60% plan set depicting these restoration treatments will be uploaded to PRISM in support of this application (and has been uploaded under previous RCO agreements that have funded design work for this project), and the final design iteration is expected by September 2026 (it also will be uploaded to PRISM).

The project includes a total of nine ELJs, all of which will be machine-built. There are two apex ELJs, six bank-buried ELJs, and one side-channel confluence ELJ. All of these structures will include excavated pools, and the excavated streambed materials will be used to backfill the structures (supplemented with excavated materials from the side-channel, if needed). The fill material will be planted with live stakes and a native seed mix to facilitate establishment of vegetation on the structures.

The Apex ELJs will be constructed at a mid-channel location and a flow split location (side-channel inlet) in the mainstem channel. These structures are designed to enhance hydraulic complexity, initiate lateral channel processes, and provide pool habitat and cover at all flows. They will be stabilized via mechanical connections to vertical piles either driven or dug into the channel bed (17-20 piles - 16"dbh and 25' length), and will include 30-37 rootwad logs (18" dbh and 40' length), 6-8 whole trees and ~15-30 CY of salvaged slash (as racking materials).

The bank-buried ELJs will be constructed at several locations along river-left and are designed to add pools/enhance pool quality and provide cover and refuge areas at all flows. They will each include approximately 20 rootwad logs (18" dbh and 40' length), eight piles (16" dbh and 25' length), two whole trees and ~10-15 CY of slash (as racking materials). These structures will be stabilized by burying a large portion of the rootwad logs under at least two feet of backfill, with additional support provided by mechanical connections to driven or dug piles.

The side-channel confluence structure will be constructed at the downstream end of the constructed side-channel. It is intended to maintain a pool at the channel outlet and provide cover and refuge habitat at all flows. It will include 25 rootwad logs (18" dbh and 40' length), 12 piles (16" dbh and 25' length), five whole trees and ~15-25 CY of slash (as racking material). This structure will be stabilized by burying a large portion of the rootwad logs under at least three feet of backfill, with additional support provided by mechanical connections to driven or dug piles.

The project also will construct an approximately 1000 lf, river-left, side-channel. The channel will have a bottom width of ~15 ft and typical excavation depths will be 4-6 ft. It will have an average longitudinal gradient of 0.7 percent. It will be excavated with heavy equipment and will generate approximately 4,300 CY of excavated materials, which will be used as supplemental backfill for ELJs and in the recreation area treatments above ordinary high water. The side-channel is designed to convey flow perennially and will include ~100 pieces of large wood to provide cover and in-stream complexity. Large wood will be stabilized by burial or by bracing the logs with partially buried upright logs or standing trees. No ferrous connections are anticipated for this woody material. The channel alignment was identified using LiDAR and surveyed tree locations, and the path it follows was designed to minimize impacts to large standing trees. Additional field fitting and variable side slopes may be employed during construction to further limit impacts to large trees.

Finally, the project includes a suite of treatments in three separate streamside areas used primarily for dispersed camping. This work is intended to treat impacts from historical and ongoing recreational use in these areas and limit potential future impacts associated with this use. Ground-based equipment including excavators and dump trucks will be used for this work. Soils will be de-compacted; large wood and boulders will be placed as roughness features throughout these areas to improve habitat quality, create barriers impassable to vehicle travel, and delineate camping areas. We will also enhance native vegetation throughout these three areas. A crew with hand tools will plant a variety of native trees and shrubs (~2,100 plants), and we will contract with a hydroseeding company to seed/mulch (with a native grass/forb mix) a total of approximately 7 acres throughout these three areas .

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership? US Forest Service

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project? Yes

Please explain

We currently have a signed Landowner Acknowledgement Form from the USFS for the current project design phase, and will secure an acknowledgement for this proposal prior to submitting the final application. The project is on USFS's work plan and we also will obtain a signed Landowner Agreement from them prior to project implementation.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

Project must avoid impacting nearby long-term lease cabins, Goose Creek Campground, and the Chiwawa River Road bridge that crosses the river just downstream of the Alder Creek confluence. The design process has considered these constraints and we do not anticipate any adverse impacts to these features.

Dispersed camping consolidation/reduction and road decommissioning follows USFS guidelines and

standards, and in-stream restoration is consistent with design criteria and conservation measures promulgated under ARBO II (Programmatic Conference and Biological Opinion and Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Essential Fish Habitat Consultation for Aquatic Restoration Activities in the States of Oregon and Washington) and the Upper Wenatchee Pilot Project Environmental Assessment.

None of these constraints, requirements, or permit conservation measures are expected to adversely affect the project because the project was designed with these considerations in mind, and because safety considerations and following established guidelines and standards is commonplace in stream restoration design.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

We have not received any specific feedback from interested parties expressing concern for the project or the proposed treatments. However, campers who use the dispersed camping areas to be treated at this project site may raise concerns about the reduction in camping sites that will result from this project. In addition, in-stream projects often raise concerns for recreational boaters, adjacent property owners, and other interested parties.

Our recreation area treatments are designed to improve habitat conditions in the dispersed camping areas and reduce potential for future user-created impacts to the stream and adjacent habitats. The treatments (which have been approved by USFS) will bring the areas into better agreement with USFS standards and guidelines for dispersed camping areas. In addition, they are expected to enhance user experience by reducing the total number of campers at any given time and increasing the distance between campsites (enhancing privacy).

Our in-stream treatment designs take public safety and project risk to into account through the use of the Bureau of Reclamation's Large Woody Material - Risk Based Design Guidelines (which assesses risks to property and public safety). In addition, we have commissioned a recreational safety assessment that identified risks to non-motorized boaters in the Lower Chiwawa River and provided recommendations for minimizing risks associated with stream restoration efforts. This work also has informed the design of this project.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

This proposal supports project construction within a National Forest unit. CCNRD will work with USFS to monitor the site post-construction. As a public land manager USFS is ultimately responsible for maintenance and management of the lands and waterways it administers. However, CCNRD will work with USFS to determine if maintenance is needed and seek additional funding should we determine that adaptive management actions are necessary.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite?

No

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

There is always risk associated with stream restoration projects, but with good data collection, careful design and modeling, and implementation that follows the designs and utilizes construction best management practices, potential for failure is low.

For this project, we have worked with licensed engineers, landscape architects and other technical staff employed by reputable companies with extensive experience in river restoration and recreation area treatments. The design effort considered applicable design criteria and conservation measures, and has included extensive technical review and revision. Finally, we will contract for implementation in a manner that assures that the project is constructed by a firm with demonstrated experience in river restoration and work in and around sensitive environments. Collectively, these steps assure a high factor of safety and minimize potential for failure.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

We will work with USFS to continue and expand outreach that began during the design phase of this project to assure that local residents and forest users are aware of the project and its potential effects and benefits. Outreach will be structured such that it meets USFS standards and needs and informs the public about the type of restoration actions being implemented, emphasizes the need for and benefits of stream restoration, and builds support for salmon recovery efforts.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

Yes, this project represents an opportunity for economic benefit. The proposal supports project construction. As a result, it will employ design consultants, agency staff, construction contractors and material providers. Kellon and Hesselgrave (2014) have reported that restoration efforts support 19-24 jobs for every $1-million invested (depending on labor intensity), money spent on restoration projects generates substantial additional spending and economic output (roughly double the amount of the original investment), and 80% of funds spent on restoration efforts stay in the county where the project is located (with 90% staying in state). While their study focused on restoration projects in Oregon, economic benefits of restoration are almost certainly similar for Washington state.

Cathy P. Kellon and Taylor Hesselgrave, “Oregon’s Restoration Economy: How investing in natural assets benefits communities and the regional economy”, S.A.P.I.EN.S [Online], 7.2 | 2014, URL: http://journals.openedition.org/sapiens/1599 (link confirmed March 3, 2025)

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

Chelan County NRD has extensive experience implementing construction efforts such as the one proposed, and is well situated to complete the proposed implementation effort on-time and on budget and achieve the expected results

We have worked with USFS on several stream restoration projects, and have partnered with them over the course of this project effort. USFS has reviewed and commented on the designs, and the project has been designed accordingly. In addition, we have worked extensively with the Bureau of Reclamation, RCO, and the Tributary Committees. These entities have provided funding throughout the design phase of this project.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions?	No

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Entiat Roaring Creek Fee Acquisition
Sponsor	Chelan-Douglas Land Trust
Primary Contact	Mickey Fleming
E-Mail Address	mickey@cdlandtrust.org

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

The goal is to permanently protect 796.25 acres of habitat, including one mile of Roaring Creek on both sides, 2 miles of streambank total. Roaring Creek is a tributary of the Entiat River, and is an important spawning and rearing stream for steelhead. This property is located in Roaring Creek Reaches 1 and 2, both Tier 2 for protection and restoration for steelhead, and Tier 3 for protection and restoration of bull trout. It is immediately downstream of Cascadia Conservation District's current application for a "Stage 0" restoration project on USFS lands (SRFB #25-1232). The property would be permanently held and managed for conservation and restoration purposes.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

The objective is to protect 796.25 acres of habitat, including one mile of Roaring Creek on both sides, 2

miles of streambank in total, by the end of 2027.Reaches 1 and 2 of Roaring Creek have documented spawning activity in WDFW redd surveys and is categorized as a high priority assessment unit for adult migration, spawning, fry colonization, and summer rearing. Low summer base flows are listed as an unacceptable limiting factor. Channel modification, instream enhancement, and upland management are identified as actions.
Permanent protection of this property will prevent degradation from; fragmentation into private parcels, wells and septic systems, and removing riparian vegetation. It will facilitate future restoration of Roaring Creek by Upper Columbia restoration partners on projects to improve floodplain reconnection and side channel habitat.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	350,000
Anticipated or Actual Other Funding	450,000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	800,000

Other Funding Source(s), please note if funding is anticipated or actual.

Anticipated funding from Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee is approved.

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	The project is located between RM .5 and 1.5 of Roaring Creek above the confluence at RM 6 of the Entiat River
Latitude (decimal degrees)	47.675
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-120.353
Project subbasin	Entiat
Entiat Assessment Unit(s)	Roaring Creek
Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Roaring Creek Entiat 01 and 02
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.	Multiple reaches (provide details below)

Please detail the reach-ranking of the reaches below

Roaring Creek Entiat 01 has Reach Rank 1
Roaring Creek Entiat 02 has Reach Rank 2

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?

Steelhead | Bull Trout

2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics

Acquisition, Easements, Leases

Acquisition, Easements, Leases: Reporting Code

Miles of streambank and/or Shoreline Protected by Land or Easement Acquisition

Acres by Acreage Type (easement) and/or Acres by Acreage Type (fee simple)

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

No

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

No

6. What category is the project?

Protection

Design and Restoration Proposals

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

7. What type of protection are you proposing?

Fee Simple

8. Is this protection project associated with a current or future restoration project?

Maybe

9. Placement - Does the project protect important high quality habitat and/or watershed processes and to what degree

The project would permanently protect the largest private parcel on Roaring Creek with an exceptional amount of streambank. The upstream sections are entirely within forest service ownership. Restoration projects upstream, and on this section of Roaring Creek could have a significant impact in watershed restoration. Projects could include channel modification, instream enhancement, and upland management. Roaring Creek is an important cold water tributary for the Entiat River.

10. Freshwater Benefit - What would be the anticipated loss in survival, capacity or distribution for target species at the reach scale if the proposed area is not protected?

If Roaring Creek is not protected, there could be residential development all along this section of Roaring Creek. Failure to protect and restore Roaring Creek could lead to further stream degradation and incision, reduced riparian vegetation, and an increase in water temperature.

11. Threat - How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented?

Eighty acres of the parcel along Roaring Creek are zoned RR10 and could be developed for attractive streamside recreation parcels with direct impacts to Roaring Creek (wells and septic, removing riparian vegetation, diversion of water, etc...). The remaining acres are zoned RR20 and could also be developed.

12. Conditions - Briefly describe if there are any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the protection benefits

CDLT acknowledges that there is significant upland acreage in these parcels. The landowners have inquired with public agencies regarding acquisition, without success. CDLT recently inquired about whether WA DNR would be interested in taking a portion of these parcels, but the DNR declined. These parcels are adjoined to the west by USFS, WA DNR to the north and south, and BLM to the east. CDLT would be interested in transferring the upland portions to one of these public agencies prior to acquisition if any of them were willing. The landowner wants to sell the parcels all together and is not interested in retaining any portion of the property.

13. Will there be public access? Yes

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership? Private

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project? Yes

Please explain

The landowner is willing to sell CDLT these parcels, pending a favorable appraisal, and has signed the Landowner Acknowledgement. Landowner is currently in the process of divesting from their various landholdings.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

None.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

None known.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

CDLT will own and manage the property in perpetuity. There is currently a stream gauge located on the property.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite? Yes

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

There is always the risk that the landowner will not be satisfied with the appraisal results. CDLT believes that would be the only stumbling block for this project.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

This project would make future salmon recovery projects possible and we will work with our Upper Columbia restoration partners for restoration of Roaring Creek.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

Our communities, watersheds, and environments benefit significantly from healthy salmon populations. The funds necessary for acquisition will make further investments and recovery projects possible.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

We are already discussing extending Cascadia Conservation District's restoration work in upper Roaring Creek downstream to this project area. CCD has done extensive salmon recovery work throughout the region. Mark Ingman of CCD has offered to support this acquisition project however he can.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions? No

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources

Contact Information

2026 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2026 (COB)

*Complete SRFB applications due in PRISM April 17, 2026 (COB)

*Revised SRFB proposals due in PRISM May 27, 2026 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 22, 2026 (noon)

Project Title	Lower Icicle Conservation Easements
Sponsor	Chelan-Douglas Land Trust
Primary Contact	Mickey Fleming
E-Mail Address	mickey@cdlandtrust.org

Project Summary

Please provide a description or summary of the proposed project, including project goals. The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition.

The goal is to permanently protect approximately 75 acres of floodplain along the lower Icicle River near Leavenworth, WA. There will be two conservation easements over two adjacent parcels owned by related but distinct landowners. Acquiring these conservation easements will ensure these sensitive riparian zones will not be filled and developed, and facilitate future restoration activities.

What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

The project will accomplish protection of valuable riparian habitat in the Lower Icicle Assessment Unit by placing two conservation easements over 75 acres of floodplain, including .92 river miles by the end of 2028. The Lower Icicle is Rank 1 for protection of Steelhead, and Rank 3 for protection of Spring Chinook and Bull Trout. The Lower Icicle is Rank 1 for restoration of Steelhead and Bull Trout, and Rank 2 for

restoration of Spring Chinook.

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB	600,000
Tributary Committee - Anticipated or Actual	600,000
Anticipated or Actual Other Funding	1,400,000
Anticipated TOTAL Budget	2,600,000

Other Funding Source(s), please note if funding is anticipated or actual.

Anticipated Other Funding would be from the RCO WWRP Riparian Protection grant program.

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project	The properties are located between RM 0 and RM 1.5 of Icicle Creek.
Latitude (decimal degrees)	47.573815
Longitude (decimal degrees)	-120.661968
Project subbasin	Wenatchee
Wenatchee Assessment Unit(s)	Lower Icicle Creek
Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units?	No
Reach(es) Name	Icicle Creek Lower 01
Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/.	Rank 1

Project Information

1. What species will the project benefit?	Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout
2. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics	Acquisition, Easements, Leases
Acquisition, Easements, Leases: Reporting Code	Acres by Acreage Type (easement) and/or Acres by

Acreage Type (fee simple)

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

No

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

Yes

6. What category is the project?

Protection

Design and Restoration Proposals

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

7. What type of protection are you proposing?

Conservation Easement

8. Is this protection project associated with a current or future restoration project?

No

9. Placement - Does the project protect important high quality habitat and/or watershed processes and to what degree

Yes, the project protects two of the few remaining large undeveloped sections of Lower Icicle Creek, including nearly a mile of stream frontage. The conservation easements will ensure that landowners can only use the conserved properties in accordance with the conservation values of the easement and will forbid residential development, harmful agricultural practices (runoff), and will explicitly provide for restoration of the riparian zones.

10. Freshwater Benefit - What would be the anticipated loss in survival, capacity or distribution for target species at the reach scale if the proposed area is not protected?

If the property is developed, farmed, or grazed, there could be significant harm to the target species, including loss of riparian vegetation, contaminated runoff, destruction of streambanks and shaded pools, and increased recreation impacts to the river and riverbanks.

11. Threat - How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented?

The largest parcel of land is currently owned in an LLC controlled by 5 older family members. If the property is not protected, the land will pass to the next generation with dozens of members, many of whom have less interest in conservation. The current owners believe that if the land is not protected, the next generation will either chop up the parcel into lots for individual ownership or sell the property for development. The property is zoned for 10-acre parcels and Chelan County has a fill ordinance that would allow a developer to fill and raise the floodplain for dvelopment..

12. Conditions - Briefly describe if there are any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the protection benefits

CDLT will need to thoroughly negotiate the terms of the conservation easement to ensure that retained rights (allowed uses) are limited as much as possible, and that any retained rights are not in conflict the conservation values of the property.

13. Will there be public access? No

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership? Private (one lot by a married couple, one lot by a family LLC)

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project? Yes

Please explain

Landowners have agreed to sign landowner acknowledgement forms.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

Landowners have from time-to-time leased a portion of the property during wildfires for a helicopter base of the large firefighting helicopters, a service that benefits the community. If the landowners want to retain the ability to lease the property for such a purpose, that will need to be addressed in the conservation easement, and limited to areas outside of the riparian corridors.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

None known.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

CDLT will be responsible for monitoring the property and enforcing the terms of the conservation easements. The landowners will be bound by the terms of the conservation and will be responsible for managing and maintaining the property.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite? Don't know

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

The LLC Members will need to vote to accept the appraisal value as the purchase price for the conservation easement. If the vote does not pass, the project cannot move forward.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

Acquisition generally projects must stay confidential until closing, but CDLT regularly participates in regular watershed meetings regarding protection of Icicle Creek. Placing a conservation easement over these properties will make future salmon recovery projects more likely.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

This property has been farmed and grazed in the past, at a cost to Icicle Creek. Those costs include loss of instream flow, channelization of the creek, loss of riparian vegetation, channel migration, agricultural runoff, and habitat degradation from cattle in the creek and on the banks. There is a benefit in the removal of all these negative influences. This project demonstrates how landowners with former agricultural lands near salmon streams can permanently protect that land and facilitate restoration. Without conservation, the only economic alternative is to sell the land for riverfront development.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

CDLT will work with the landowners and our salmon restoration partners to carry out future stream and riparian restoration projects.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM (SRFB applications only)

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application for SRFB projects. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April x, 2026

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions?	No

Supporting Documents

Upper Columbia Process Guide 2026

SRFB Manual 18 (2026)

RCO Application Resources