Salmon Recovery Funding Board

POST APPPLICATION
INDIVIDIAL PROJECT COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member Name:	**SRFB Review Panel**		
Lead Entity:	**Snake River SRB**	Project Location:	
Project Sponsor:	**Inland Empire Action Coalition**		
Project Name:	**Ford Easement Assessment**	Project Number:	**09-1583N**
Date:	**October 30, 2009**		

OCTOBER COMMENTS (see September Comments below)

SEPTEMBER COMMENTS (September 29, 2009)

Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "Why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

1. Is this a draft project of concern according to the SRFB's criteria?
Yes ☐ **No** ☒
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?
Please elaborate, if possible, on the specific salmon habitat conditions at the site and the utilization of the site by salmonids in order to demonstrate the site's value for attaining salmon recovery goals, in view of the fact that it is not located within a priority reach for restoration or protection under the Snake River SRB's recovery plan.

4. Other comments.
The easement that is the subject of this proposed assessment is well crafted to focus on protecting in-stream habitat, particularly the proposed arrangement of donating the land-development value of the upland portions as cost match. The draft stewardship plan and draft deed that accompany the proposal demonstrate that the applicant has already done considerable preparation, and its inclusion strengthens this well-written proposal.

EARLY APPLICATION COMMENTS (SUMMER 2009)

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member Name:	**Steve Toth and Tom Slocum**		
Lead Entity:	**Snake River Salmon Recovery Board**	Project Location:	**Walla Walla County**
Project Sponsor:	**Inland Empire Action Coalition**	Project Number:	**09-1583A**
Project Name:	**Ford Conservation Easement**		
Date:	**June 22, 2009**		

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

The applicant proposes to acquire a permanent conservation easement on an average 300-foot wide riparian buffer along both banks of about 3.5 miles of the lower Touchet River near Prescott. The site is within the Middle Touchet MSA but is not located within a priority protection or restoration reach. The Review Panel did not visit the project site, but the description in the pre-application states that 95 percent of the site is good quality, functioning riparian habitat. The application is well written with clear objectives and a detailed and clear stewardship plan. The application could be strengthened further by providing a site plan showing the proposed easement relative to existing parcel boundaries and a discussion of how the easement would fit in the context of SRSRB's recovery plan even though it is not within a priority protection or restoration reach. A map or discussion of other protected areas in this reach of the Touchet River could also help provide justification for the easement.

Please note that a cultural resources assessment may be required prior to any ground-disturbing activities that are within the scope of the current grant application (including riparian planting, fencing, etc). If such activities are planned for your site, please consider including the cost of conducting such an assessment.

2. Missing Pre-application information.