



REGIONAL TECHNICAL TEAM MEETING FINAL SEPTEMBER MEETING SUMMARY

Date: Wednesday, 9 September 2026

Time: 9:00 AM to 11:57 AM

Location: Webinar

Members Present: Steve Fortney (Gray & Osborne Inc.), Catherine Willard (Chelan PUD), Tom Kahler (Douglas PUD), Hans Smith (YN), Tom Desgroseillier (WDFW), John Arterburn (CTCR), Carlos Polivka (USFS), and Tracy Hillman (BioAnalysts, Chair)

Others Present: Ariel Edwards (UCSRB), Meghan Camp (UCSRB), Jeff Jorgensen (NOAA), Mike Kane (CCNRD), Amee Bahr (RCO), Ben Woodworth (YN), Ann Grote (USFWS), Greg Fraser (USFWS), Aaron Rosenblum (CF), Charles Frady (USFWS), Jesse Wilson (BPA), and Greer Maier (GSRO)

Tracy Hillman welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the draft agenda. RTT members present approved the agenda.

The RTT welcomed Tom Desgroseillier (WDFW) to the RTT.

Tracy Hillman reviewed the July draft meeting notes, and the RTT members present approved the notes as final. The RTT also reviewed their action items.

RTT & UCSRB Updates

The UCSRB is currently looking for a new Science Program Manager. The position is still open, but initial interviews began this week. They are hopeful they will find a good fit soon.

Ariel Edwards informed the group that the next SRFB meeting is on 15 September. The ranked lists will be approved and funded at that meeting. The SRFB will also discuss options for delayed PCSRF funds, but a final decision will not be made until December. UCSRB will keep the Upper Columbia updated with any pertinent information from the meeting.

Tracy Hillman reported that the last barrier prioritization meeting did not happen because of low attendance. Tracy noted he will work with UCSRB staff to reschedule the meeting this year.

Carlos Polivka noted that the next MaDMC meeting has not been scheduled yet. He will assess whether one or two more meetings are needed this year.

Decisions:

- None

Action Items:

- **The Board staff will send out a doodle poll to schedule the next barrier prioritization meeting.**
- **Carlos Polivka will evaluate the need for one or two more MaDMC meetings this year.**

Monitoring Grant Round

Ariel reviewed the proposed plan and schedule for the 2027 Monitoring grant round (see Attachment 1).

Tracy H also reviewed updates that were recently discussed at the Science Advisory Panel meeting for the 2027 Monitoring round. Those included:

- Regional organizations or a regionally designated partner are the only eligible sponsors.
- A regional organization may not submit more than two applications.
- This year, \$973,855 will be available for monitoring projects.
- The strategic priorities for this year are salmon and steelhead life stage bottlenecks, limiting factors, and effectiveness monitoring.
- An applicant may request between \$5,000 and \$300,000.
- Regional organizations are encouraged to collaborate on projects. A project that benefits multiple regions may exceed \$300,000.
- No match is required.
- The monitoring project must be completed in three years. If work is not, the grant recipient, also called the project sponsor, may request a one-year, no-cost time extension or submit a new application to continue the project.
- An application must be submitted electronically through PRISM Online.

Tracy H also reported that some monitoring may be complex, require extensive data collection and analysis over a longer time period, or require substantial funding to be successful. These “phased” projects that are part of a regional monitoring program are subject to the following:

- Each phase must be submitted as a separate application with a vision for future phases whenever possible.
- Each phase should be able to stand alone in terms of its public benefits.
- Each phase must have a scope of work the applicant can afford and complete given the amount of SRFB funding requested.
- Funding approval of any single phase is limited to that phase. No endorsement or approval is given or implied toward future phases.
- The Science Panel may consider progress in earlier phases when reviewing current proposals, including review of deliverables from previously funded work.

The Science Panel is currently developing evaluation criteria for phased projects.

John Arterburn asked whether there is a separate pot of money for phased projects. Tracy H said, no. Both “one-off” and “phased” projects will compete for the available funding (\$973,855).

As a final note, Tracy H asked RTT members whether they are okay with non-RTT MaDMC members scoring monitoring proposals provided they are not conflicted. All RTT members present approved non-RTT MaDMC members scoring monitoring projects if they do not have conflicts of interest.

Decisions:

- RTT members approved the Monitoring Grant Round 2027 plan.
- RTT members approved non-RTT MaDMC members scoring monitoring proposals.

Action Items:

- None.

Entiat Fish Kill

Tom Desgroseillier (WDFW) presented on the fish kill that occurred last month in the Entiat River basin. On 13-14 August, a significant rainfall event occurred on the then active Little Giant Fire, causing a substantial sediment pulse/debris flow. This resulted in a significant mortality event in the Entiat River, including the loss of 107 adult summer Chinook and numerous other adult and juvenile fish species. For more details, please see the presentation, which is located on the UCSRB website.

Decisions:

- None

Action Items:

- None

RTT Scoring Criteria Discussion

Last month, the RTT discussed the need to update assessment unit and reach scoring criteria in the pre-proposal and full proposal scoring criteria documents.

Update Reach Scoring Criteria

Meghan presented proposed language that would allow for more flexible reach-rank scoring criteria. Several RTT members noted that they appreciated the flexibility the proposed language provides but noted that keeping track of these changes and deciding how they feedback into prioritization would be important to consider. Some members also noted that it may be important for sponsors to share any data they have that would inform a change in reach ranks. A member also suggested that an “expert opinion” column could be added to our prioritization spreadsheet. The column would be fill in when expert opinion varies from prioritization scores.

Tracy, Ariel, and Meghan will work together on the language for reach scoring criteria and share it with the RTT for edits and comments.

Projects that Span Multiple Assessment Units and Reaches

Based on RTT discussions during the last meeting, Ariel Edwards presented new wording to codify how the RTT scores projects that span multiple Reaches and/or Assessment Units.

The RTT agreed with the following proposed language for projects spanning multiple AUs:

- *Any proposed project that spans multiple Assessment Units will be scored by the RTT as follows:*
 - *If the project spans two contiguous AUs, the RTT will use the higher of the two AU rank.*

- *If the project spans more than two AUs, or the AUs are not contiguous, then the RTT will average the AU ranks.*

The RTT agreed with the following proposed language for projects spanning multiple reaches:

- *Any proposed project that spans multiple reaches will be scored by the RTT as follows:*
 - *If the project spans two or more contiguous reaches, the RTT will take the higher reach rank.*
 - *If the project spans two or more non-contiguous reaches, the RTT will average the reach ranks.*

Ariel, Tracy, and Meghan will update the scoring criteria documents and share them with the RTT for final review.

Protection Project Scoring

Finally, Ariel presented the issue of scoring protection projects. The RTT has noted in the past that there are two distinct types of protection projects: (1) protection of high-quality habitat and (2) protection of degraded habitat for the purposes of restoration. It was proposed that the RTT create a separate scoring pathway for protection projects that aim to restore habitat conditions. The group agreed that this would be beneficial.

Decisions:

- **RTT members approved the following changes to the scoring criteria regarding projects that span multiple AUs or Reaches:**
 - ***Any proposed project that spans multiple Assessment Units will be scored by the RTT as follows:***
 - ***If the project spans two contiguous AUs, the RTT will use the higher of the two AU rank.***
 - ***If the project spans more than two AUs, or the AUs are not contiguous, then the RTT will average the AU ranks.***
 - ***Any proposed project that spans multiple reaches will be scored by the RTT as follows:***
 - ***If the project spans two or more contiguous reaches, the RTT will take the higher reach rank.***
 - ***If the project spans two or more non-contiguous reaches, the RTT will average the reach ranks.***

Action Items:

- **Ariel Edwards, Meghan Camp, and Tracy Hillman will draft scoring criteria for protection projects, where the intent of the protection project is to restore habitat conditions.**
- **Ariel Edwards, Meghan Camp, and Tracy Hillman will edit the reach ranking language in the Scoring Criteria documents to reflect how projects spanning more than one reach will be scored.**

- Ariel Edwards, Meghan Camp, and Tracy Hillman will edit the assessment unit ranking language in the Scoring Criteria documents to reflect how projects spanning more than one assessment unit will be scored.

Meeting adjourned at 11:57 am

Attachment 1

2027 Monitoring Grant Round Plan

This plan outlines the regional process for reviewing, scoring, and recommending monitoring grant proposals before eligible projects move forward to RCO and the state-level Science Advisory Panel review.

1. Establish the Regional Scoring Committee

By January, UCSRB will identify the RTT and MaDMC members who are not participating as applicants in the monitoring grant round and are therefore eligible to score projects. UCSRB will confirm the regional scoring committee members and clarify expectations for reviewing materials, attending the presentation meeting, and scoring the pre-proposals.

2. Collect Pre-Proposal Materials

Require sponsors to submit both a monitoring pre-proposal through Jotform and a Letter of Intent in early March. The Letter of Intent is required by RCO to determine initial eligibility and must be submitted to RCO by March 31. The regional scoring committee will use both documents to assess project scope, eligibility, monitoring objectives, and regional fit.

3. Conduct Regional Review and Presentations

Convene a monitoring review meeting with the regional scoring committee in mid-March, ideally one to two weeks before SRFB pre-proposal presentations. Potential dates include March 10 during the regular RTT meeting, March 11, or March 18. At this meeting, sponsors will present their monitoring proposals, and the scoring committee will ask questions and review the pre-proposal, Letter of Intent, and supporting proposal materials together.

4. Score and Rank Monitoring Proposals

The monitoring scoring committee will score pre-proposals using the RTT Monitoring scoring criteria. If more than two pre-proposals are submitted, the region must identify the top two for recommendation to the RCO monitoring grant round. If two or fewer projects are submitted, the group will still score the proposals and provide feedback to strengthen the applications before they are submitted to RCO.

5. Recommend Projects to RCO

After regional scoring is complete, UCSRB will refer the top two monitoring proposals to RCO. RCO will use the Letter(s) of Intent to confirm eligibility and initiate eligible projects in PRISM. Sponsors will then complete the full application in PRISM according to the monitoring grant schedule.

6. Support Final Application Development and State Review

Following regional recommendations, sponsors will use feedback from the scoring committee to refine their applications before final submittal. Final scoring and review will occur at the state level through the Science Advisory Panel process.

Proposed Timeline

Timeframe	Action	Purpose
By January	Confirm regional scoring committee membership	Identify eligible RTT and MaDMC members who will review, score, and provide feedback.
Early March	Collect pre-proposals and Letters of Intent	Provide the regional scoring committee with proposal materials before the presentation and scoring meeting.
Mid-March	Hold sponsor presentations and regional scoring meeting	Regional scoring committee review proposals, ask questions, score projects, and identify regional priorities.
By March 31	Ensure Letters of Intent are submitted to RCO	Allow RCO to determine eligibility and initiate eligible project proposals in PRISM.
After regional scoring	Recommend top two monitoring proposals to RCO	Move the highest-ranked regional proposals into the state monitoring grant process.
State review period	Science Advisory Panel review and final scoring	Complete state-level evaluation and funding recommendations.