Salmon Recovery Funding Board

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member Name:	**Patty Michak/ Michelle Cramer**		
Lead Entity:	**Klickitat**	Project Location:	**Simmons Crk Trib to Snyder Ck**
Project Sponsor:	**Underwood Conservation District**	Project Number:	
Project Name:	**Simmons Creek Restoration**		
Date:	**7/21/07**	Project type:	**In-stream**

Please refer to the criteria listed below or Manual #18, Appendix C, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "Why" area explain your reason for selecting this as a preliminary project of concern.

1. Is this a preliminary project of concern according to the SRFB's criteria?
Yes ☒ No ☐ NMI

Why?

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.
2. Information provided or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

The project purposes to reduce water temperatures in Snyder Creek (upstream from the mill) by increasing in-stream and floodplain retention in a non-salmon-bearing stream reach (Simmons Creek). The project reach is approximately 4 miles upstream from the identified water temperature concerns in Snyder Creek. No monitoring or studies have been done to confirm that Simmons Creek is responsible for elevating temperatures in Snyder Creek. Monitoring should be done first before embarking on this project to ascertain if Simmons Creek is the problem.

Also, the water temperature concerns in Snyder Creek are focused upstream from the mill (this is not clear in the application; it was confirmed at the site visit). A likely larger water temperature concern is where Snyder creek flows through the mill where there is limited riparian and the entire landscape is paved. Future water temperature reduction projects should look at improving the overall water quality and habitat in this reach as well as the upstream reach and to consider projects in the mill reach such as providing more riparian vegetation and breaking through the concrete floor of the flume to provide for more subsurface flow recharge.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Provide landownership map of area and affected landowner willingness forms.
Provide habitat maps in relation to project area, showing where project benefits will occur for salmon.
Discuss within the application the fencing and access of cattle to the area, currently the application implies that the downstream fencing could allow cattle access to the project area.
Briefly discuss the riparian water right availability for the off-channel watering facilities.
Revise budget to include site maintenance for vegetation.
Include woody debris placement cost as a line item.
Consider changing the application type (e.g. Riparian Habitat Cost Estimate) to better address project features.
Clarify in application that cattle cannot access the creek as discussed at the site visit.

Criteria

For restoration and protection-related projects:

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.
2. Information provided or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
3. The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.
4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor and lead entity have failed to justify the cost.
5. The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
6. The project may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments, or restoration actions in the watershed.
7. The project uses a technique that has not been considered successful in the past.
8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives.
9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objective.
10. There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the project is not completed.
11. The project design in not adequate or the project is improperly sited.
12. The stewardship description in insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance and this would likely jeopardize the project's success.
13. The project has not been shown to address an important habitat condition or watershed process in the area.
14. The main focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.

For assessment, design, feasibility, and research projects:

15. It is not clear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing (per the research plan).

16. The project does not address an information need important to understanding the watershed, is not directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will not clearly lead to beneficial projects.
17. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.
18. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits.
19. The assessment or research does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed, may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat assessment or restoration activities, or may be inconsistent with a larger assessment or research need.
20. The assessment uses a technique that has not been proven successful in past applications.
21. There are significant constrains to the implementation of high priority projects following completion of the assessment.
22. It is unclear how the assessment will achieve its stated objectives.
23. It is unlikely that the assessment will achieve its stated objective.
24. The main focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.