

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## POST APPLICATION INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENTS

### PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **SRFB Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Klickitat County**

Project

Sponsor: **Yakama Nation**

Project Name: **Teepee Creek Restoration – Phase II Construction**

Date: **October 30, 2009**

Project  
Location:

**Teepee Creek RM 4.5 to  
5.3, trib to the White  
Creek, trib to the Klickitat**

Project  
Number:

**09-1461R**

Project  
Number:

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?

The applicant has sufficiently addressed early review comments.

### Early application comments from Review Panel

Phase II of Teepee Creek restoration appears to have a high benefit to fish potential based on the success described by the sponsor after several years of post project monitoring of phase one restoration that has improved habitat conditions for rearing juveniles as well as spawning adults. The application would be strengthened by the addition of the information given at the pre-application presentation addressing previous questions about the use of angular rock used during phase one construction. The sponsor is

encouraged to present the cost per unit estimates mentioned at the presentation in the event funding limits require phased construction.

Please also provide monitoring information from pre-application presentation. Detailed cost estimates will be needed for final application.

## 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 is not adequate or the project is improperly sited.
12. The stewardship description is 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 constraints 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.