

## BiOp Project Site Tour Evaluation Summary

Project Name: Catherine Creek Baum Wetland and Rearing Habitat

Date: 4/12/11

Rating (H,M,L) M/H Move to Proposal (Y/N) Yes

Present: TC Members: Bruce Eddy, Jeff Oveson, Jesse Steele, Allen Childs, Timmie Mandish, , Gretchen Sausen, Renee Coxen, Lyle Kuchenbecker,

Others: Craig Schellsmidt, Susan Geer, Chas Hutchins, Dan Gambetta, Tracy Hauser

Base project evaluation on information presented in the prospectus, information presented by the project sponsor, conditions at the site and on-site discussion. Complete and turn in to GRMW at end of site tour.

### Addresses key/limiting environmental attributes (fisheries & water quality)

Consider the anticipated habitat improvements, proximity to salmon or steelhead spawning or rearing stream reaches, affect on salmon, steelhead or bull trout habitat, water quality or quantity, and the need to improve the existing condition.

Creating side channel habitat and wetlands will address identified limiting factors (habitat quantity & diversity, sediment). This reach is especially important for winter rearing.

### Proposed Actions

Do proposed actions address limiting factors. Are actions clearly defined and appropriate to address limiting factors.  
The actions are clearly defined and address limiting factors.

### Technical merit

Is the project is technically sound, i.e., are objectives well defined, do proposed actions address problems identified in the prospectus, are techniques technically sound, are proposed actions cost-efficient.

The proposed design appears to be technically sound.

### Compliments other past, present, or expected restoration projects

Comprehensive, ties in with projects that are completed, on-going or identified in planning documents.

Ties in with many other previous and planned project on Catherine Creek.

### Recommendations for improvement

Design side channel as wide as possible to maximize habitat quantity and still maintain sediment transport.

Set invert of the outlet of the backwater channel to maximize amount of time lower end of channel has water. (elevation of main channel at that point)

Things reviewers liked about the project

High priority area. Ties into other efforts. Willing landowner. Addressing a key limiting factor for this reach (winter rearing).

---

---

---

Things reviewers didn't like about the project

Large volume of excavation, could be expensive.

---

---

---

Misc comment

---

---

---

---

Contingencies

---

---

---

Issues that need to be addressed

No technical issues but need to bring back to TC with a budget.

---

---

---

Next steps

Technical review complete but bring proposal back to TC with a budget.

---

---

---

---