# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

### PROJECT INFORMATION

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Panel Member Name: | **Scott Nicolai** | | |
| Lead Entity: | **Chelan County** | Project Location: | |
| Project Sponsor: | **Chelan County NRD** | Project Number: | |
| Project Name: | **Peshastin Irrigation District Pipeline** | | |
| Date: | **7/7/07** | Project type: | |

**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?**

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

**3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**
Can the saved water be spread to new ground once the WCC contract expires? Can the saved water be placed in trust for permanent protection, or at least for the life of the pipeline?

**4. Other comments.**
Thie proposal provides funding to pipe 9,000 feet in the lower section of the ditch which is currently earthen. Estimated conveyance savings is 3 cfs. Cost share from the WCC requires a 20-year contract.

## 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.