

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## Individual Comment Form



<b>Lead Entity:</b>	Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity
<b>Project Number:</b>	15-1321
<b>Project Name:</b>	Asotin IMW Restoration
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	WDFW
<b>Grant Manager:</b>	Kay Caromile

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status<sup>1</sup></b>
Post-Application		
Final	9/23/15	<b>Clear</b>

### PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife seeks funding to support maintenance and increased restoration actions in support of the Asotin Creek Intensively Monitored Watershed project (IMW). The IMW was started in 2008 and is expected to run until 2019. Funds are being requested to maintain previous restoration projects (SRFB #11-1573 and 12-1637) implemented between 2012 and 2014 that used post assisted log structures (PALS) to add LWD to South Fork Asotin Cr (2012), Charley Cr (2013) and North Fork Asotin Cr (2014). We also propose to add a new restoration treatment in the lower 2-4 km of South Fork Asotin Creek to increase the overall treated length to 14-16 km in the IMW to maximize the potential for detecting fish responses. The wood source we had in 2012 was mostly large diameter Douglas-fir that was not optimal for building PALS because it had to be cut into short lengths to carry to the site. We propose to review the current status of all PALS restoration in 2015 and add LWD where needed to maintain or enhance levels of LWD in the treatment sections as per our restoration plan. It is critical at this stage in the Asotin IMW to maintain the high levels of LWD to ensure that the goals of the IMW can be completed: namely, to determine the effectiveness of LWD restoration methods, determine the causal mechanisms of habitat and fish responses, and to provide recommendations for implementing LWD restoration in other watersheds. The maintenance and additional restoration treatment proposed is expected to benefit ESA listed steelhead (the target species) as well as Chinook, and bull trout.

### FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 9/23/15

**Final Project Status:** **Clear**

**Review Panel Member(s):** Full Panel Review

1. If the project is a POC, please identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:
2. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:
3. Other comments:

### POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:**

**Project Status:** Click to choose a status

**Review Panel Member(s):**

---

<sup>1</sup> CLEAR: Cleared to proceed; CONDITIONED: Cleared to proceed with a condition; NMI: Needs More Information; POC: Project of Concern; NOTEWORTHY: Exemplary Project

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## Individual Comment Form



1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:
2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:
3. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:
4. General comments:



### SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

If your project is not cleared (i.e. has a status of NMI, Conditioned, or POC) you must update your proposal, PRISM questions, or attachments as necessary to address the review panel's comments. Use track changes when updating your proposal. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.

### DRAFT APPLICATION / SITE VISIT REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** June 18, 2015

**Project Site Visit?**

☒ Yes ☐ No

**Review Panel Member(s):** Slocum and Tyler

#### 1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria:

Add detail to the scope of work. Identify a schedule and responsible party for each specific task.

Clarify the objectives as they relate to the number and type of structures anticipated for this treatment. In the South Fork Asotin, 200 pieces of LWD will be added to the structures installed in 2012. Is this over a single 4-km treatment reach? Will these be single logs or the addition of whole structures? The second objective states:

"Implement 2-4km of more restoration using the HD LWD approach that has been used in 12 km of Asotin Creek to date. Build approximately 100-150 post-assisted log structures"

Is this an addition of new PALs in the area formerly identified as a control reach? Provide clear objectives on the maintenance effort, specifying if you will replace only single logs that washed away, or replace whole structures.

Will the structures installed in the proposed treatment be maintained over the post-restoration treatment monitoring period or allowed to deteriorate? If the structures will be maintained, specify if a funding source has been identified for the maintenance.

The proposal indicates that the treatment areas are all within the IMW study area as identified in the original restoration treatment plan (Wheaton et al, 2012). However, this is misleading, because supporting documentation (Attachment 07 Map- Area of Potential Effect (APE)) depicts the treatment in the area that was identified as a control reach in the 2012 restoration plan. While this is within the overall area of the IMW study, it is a departure from the restoration treatment plan. Please justify in the proposal 1) why additional treatments are being pursued after the treatments originally proposed have already been completed, and 2) why these treatments will extend into the control reach rather than enlarging the originally installed structures in the treatment reach. The project already has measured a geomorphic response in the treatment reaches, as compared to the control reaches. Won't shifting treatments into the South Fork control reach muddy the evaluation of the treatment's effectiveness?

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## Individual Comment Form



In the field it was explained that the original structures in the S Fork Asotin were considered to be too small and the possibility for detecting a fish response would be enhanced if larger structures were installed—structures comparable in size to those in the North Fork Asotin— however this is not well explained in the proposal. Furthermore, the 2012 restoration plan emphasizes that number, not size, is more important in affecting in-stream habitat, so further rationale is needed to justify this change in approach. Likewise, the restoration treatment plan indicates that a structure failing or washing out is relatively insignificant, thus the proposal would be strengthened by explaining the need for structure maintenance included in this request. The proposal also does not explain why and how the decision was made to move to larger structures than were originally specified in the restoration treatment plan. Nor does the proposal detail the prescribed changes in material size. The restoration plan identified 12-18” logs 4-6’ in length. What size materials are being proposed now? Include a discussion of how the type of structure to be used is identified—excerpting a sentence from the restoration plan (p. 63) would be very helpful for reviewers unfamiliar with the treatment plan.

### **2. Missing Pre-application information:**

### **3. General Comments:**

Principal Investigators indicate that this is the last scoped restoration treatment in this IMW. If the treatment is completed, this would be the first SRFB-funded IMW poised to begin post-restoration monitoring.

### **4. Staff Comments:**

Please be sure to address all comments I provided when I reviewed the application in May/June (if you haven’t already done so), along with completing all other final application requirements listed in Section 3 of RCO Manual 18 [http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual\\_18.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual_18.pdf). All changes to your proposal should be made using “Track Changes” in Word.



### **SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:**

Revise your project proposals using “track changes” and update any relevant PRISM questions and attachments. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.