

# 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.

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

### Pre-Meeting Review

#### PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Klickitat**

Project  
Location:

Project Sponsor: **Underwood Conservation Dist**

Project  
Number: **07-1722 R**

Project Name: **Simmons Creek Restoration**

Date: **October**

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. 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.
8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives.
9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objective.

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

The project purposes to reduce erosion and sedimentation, and increase groundwater recharge and storage in Simmons Creek, resulting in increased summer instream flow in Snyder Creek. The project reach is approximately four miles upstream of the identified concerns in Snyder Creek. No monitoring or studies have been done to confirm the extent to which restoration of the meadows in Simmons Creek would improve flow and temperature in Snyder Creek.

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

4. Other comments. Provide habitat maps in relation to project area, showing where project benefits will occur for salmon. If off-channel cattle watering systems are not successful in keeping the cattle out of the restoration area is fencing the entire restoration area an option?

The Review Panel recognizes that meadow restoration is important, however given the proposal's limited scope and distance to fish-bearing streams, utilizing Salmon Recovery funds is not warranted.

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM

**DRAFT**

### PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member  
Name: **Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Klickitat**

Project  
Location:

Project Sponsor: **Underwood Conservation Dist**

Project  
Number: **07-1722 R**

Project Name: **Simmons Creek Restoration**

Date: **November 9, 2007**

Project type: **Restoration & Assessment**

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 draft project of concern.

1. Is this a draft project of concern according to the SRFB's criteria?

Yes ☐ No ☒ NMI ☐ Conditioned

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?

CONDITION: The project scope and budget needs to be expanded to develop a strategic program that will help guide future development of projects in the Snyder Creek basin (or other higher priority basins) to reduce sediment delivery and improve base flows in the reaches that support ESA-listed salmonids. This strategic approach should be quantitative and consider all primary sources of sediment in the basin and evaluate their relative contribution to Snyder Creek. A similar comprehensive evaluation of meadow areas and their potential role in improving baseflows in Snyder Creek is also warranted.

4. Other comments.