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.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM - DRAFT

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member Name: **Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Upper Columbia** Project Location:

Project Sponsor: **Chelan Co Natural Resource** Project Number: **07-1865 R**

Project Name: **Peshastin Irrigation District Pipeline**

Date: **October 26, 2007** 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?

4. Other comments.

The Review Panel appreciates the applicants response to concerns raised by the RTT.

With implementation of this project, will instream flow at baseflow below the diversion be adequate to provide fish passage?

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENT FORM - DRAFT

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member Name: **Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Upper Columbia** Project Location:

Project Sponsor: **Chelan Co Natural Resource** Project Number: **07-1865 R**

Project Name: **Peshastin Irrigation District Pipeline**

Date: **November 9, 2007** Project type: **Restoration**

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 ☐

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?

4.Other comments.

The Review Panel appreciates the applicants response to concerns raised by the RTT.