

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Snake River Salmon Rec Bd LE
Project Number:	19-1499
Project Name:	Increase Wood Densities in Asotin IMW Restoration
Project Sponsor:	Asotin Co Conservation Dist
Grant Manager:	Rubin, Alice
Review Panel Members	Patrick Powers, Steve Toth

	Date	Status¹
Post-Application		
Final	9/18/19	CLEAR

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

The Asotin County Conservation District is sponsoring this restoration project to add more wood to sections of Charley Creek, North Fork Asotin Creek, and South Fork Asotin Creek. These creeks are in the Asotin Creek watershed approximately 10 km south of Clarkston, WA and are part of an Intensively Monitored Watershed project (IMW). The goal of the IMW is to test if adding large woody debris can increase abundance and productivity of wild juvenile steelhead. The goal of the proposed project is to implement the adaptive management plan of the IMW and add more wood to sections of stream that have been previously restored in order to increase the density of wood and create more habitat complexity and floodplain connection. The project will use monitoring data from the IMW to identify areas where wood density is low and/or where habitat change is limited and target those areas to add more wood. The total area is 14 km long and we anticipate adding several hundred pieces of wood to each stream using the low-tech process-based restoration method developed in this IMW using post-assisted log structures (PALS). The project should result in higher wood density and improved rearing and spawning conditions for wild summer run steelhead and improve the ability of the IMW to test conclusively if large wood additions can increase steelhead productivity in small wadeable streams.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 9/18/19

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:

Review Panel Member(s):

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.

¹ 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



DRAFT APPLICATION / SITE VISIT REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 6/5/2019

Project Site Visit?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Review Panel Member(s): Powers, Toth

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

Provide a more detailed map of the proposed treatment area. The 4 KM treatment areas are shown on the work plan, but a more detailed site map showing existing and proposed area of higher LWD density would be helpful.

The project objectives mention promoting overland flow by causing aggradation of sediment in the bed. Is there habitat-based objective that can be a measure of aggradation or floodplain connection? For example, provide an estimate for the expected increase in average channel bed elevation or estimate how many additional acres of floodplain or the percent increase in floodplain inundation that will occur during a 2-year flow. See page 98 of Manual 18 for examples of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) objectives. SMART objectives provide a measure for evaluating the success of the project in meeting its overall goal(s).

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. General Comments:

Seems like a very low-cost restoration proposal given the high potential benefits which can be realized. The proposed work is critical to maintain wood densities in the treatment reaches of study.

4. Staff Comments:

See instructions below on how to respond the comments on this form.

Final draft applications and revised materials must be submitted in PRISM Online by July 9. Please refer to [Manual 18](#) and the [final application check list](#) to ensure all required materials have been completed and submitted. Incomplete applications or applications not submitted by the LE final application due date will be ineligible to be considered for funding. Contact your LE Coordinator or RCO Grants Manager if you have any questions about completing the application.

PRISM Online Application

- 1) Please revise the project description. There is a lot of focus on the IMW and not much focus on salmon benefit. The IMW may be the guiding plans/designs, but we still need to understand the recovery problems.
- 2) Worksites and properties page: The project will require a different worksite for each stream where work will occur. From what I understand about the project, I would assume there should be 3 worksites.
- 3) Worksite and property descriptions: I realize that scientific method relies on the metric system, but all of the SRFB metrics are on the English measurements. For easier comprehension for all who read this information and consistency with other application materials, please keep metrics to miles, acres, etc.
- 4) Property details – be more brief to keep within character limitation. Don't need to restate info that is in the worksite description. Also, you indicate that the landowner agreement will be in perpetuity. This is not appropriate. The ownership may be in perpetuity, but there is not an expectation for project work to be maintained in perpetuity.
- 5) Restoration Metrics: because this project is going back to a previously reported project area, there may need to be some adjustments to the treatment area metrics. I am going to have to talk with our funder to know the appropriate way to handle those metrics. I'll let you know the outcome of that inquiry.
- 6) Overall Project Metrics: RCO has strict guidance for when equipment may be eligible to be counted toward match. I am concerned that the equipment being used does not meet these requirements and could be

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



ineligible. Even without this amount the project will still be above the minimum match requirement. From Manual 8 for Reimbursements (p 10):

If you use your organization's equipment or tools, you may be allowed to claim some of the costs as a non-reimbursable amount. If the lower of the purchase price or fair market value of the equipment or tool is equal to at least \$1,000, you may claim a use allowance. The use allowance is either an established rental rate or your own calculation, but that may not exceed the current rental rate for equivalent equipment or tools in the project area.

Equipment purchased with RCO assistance is not allowed to be claimed as equipment use allowance.

When reporting use allowance, you must consider all past RCO projects where the equipment was used. The total use allowance reported on all RCO projects combined cannot exceed the lower of the purchase price or the fair market value of the equipment or tools. You must track the time and date of use, location of use, and identification information (make, model, serial number, description, etc.) to be provided upon request. For donated equipment or tool use information see below. ... (p12)

Donated Equipment or Tool Use

Donated equipment or tool use occurs when a third party donates the use of equipment or tools with a replacement value of at least \$1,000. The maximum rate allowable may not exceed the rental rate for comparable equipment or tools in the project area. The total amount reported to all RCO projects combined cannot exceed the replacement value of the equipment or tools.

Donated equipment or tool use does not include operator services. Operator services are reported separately.

- 7) Attachments: The cultural resources review materials provided to not demonstrate that the project areas, specifically on the NF and SF Asotin Rivers, have had previous review. The reviewed areas only include section 22, but not 9, 10, 15, 16, or 21. If you have other items (or RCO project numbers) where these areas have been reviewed, please provide that info. Otherwise, RCO will conduct cultural resources review for these areas. In speaking with Kay, it sounds like there was a problem with cultural resources review covering the entire previous project area. You will need to coordinate with WDFW to get the remaining project areas reviewed prior to beginning work. You may want to consider adding some funds to the budget (and metrics) to cover this work.

It would be helpful to provide a map that shows where current structures are already installed and where you expect to install structures for this project.



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.