|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit | 5/25/11 | no | NMI |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/6/2011 |  |  |
| Post Application | 8/2011 |  |  |
| Final |  |  |  |
| Status Options | | | |
| NMI | Need More Information | | |
| POC | Project of Concern (Post Application and Final only) | | |
| FLAGGED | Needs full panel discussion | | |
| CLEAR | Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process. | | |

Lead Entity: Chelan County

Project Number: 11-1347R

Project Name: Nason Creek LWP Coulter Creek Barrier Replacements

Project Sponsor: Chelan County NRD

Grant Manager: Marc Duboiski

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: 5/31/11

Panel Member(s) Name: Tom Slocum and Steve Toth

**Early Project Status:**

Project Site Visit? Yes (5/26/11)

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

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

This project will replace a pair of partial fish passage barrier culverts across Coulter Creek on a private forest road. Coulter Creek will have a higher habitat priority after the downstream barriers are removed as part of the Lower White Pine oxbow reconnection project. This project appears to be a straightforward culvert replacement project and no technical difficulties are anticipated. Please include any relevant design information that may currently be available in the application, as specified in Section 4 (p. 40) of Manual 18. In particular, a channel profile view would be helpful for understanding the design issues. As required in Manual 18, a standard WDFW Barrier Evaluation Form must also be included with the application, as well as a landowner agreement form signed by the Smiths (property owners). While the value of this project is dependent upon completion of the Lower White Pine reconnection work, it appears that the timing for implementation would be roughly the same.

## EARLY APPLICATION Review/Site VISIT - lead entity & project sponsor responses

A. Concisely describe the passage problem (outfall, velocity, slope, etc). Describe the current barrier (age, material, shape, and condition). Is the structure a complete or partial barrier? Describe the amount and quality of habitat to open if the barrier is corrected.

Dual pipe culvert crossing fish passage barrier culvert. These culverts are passage barriers due to a high outfall drop on the 36” squash pipe and a high outfall drop and slope on the 18” relief culvert. This is a partial barrier. The replacement of the barrier culverts with a bottomless arch structure would improve salmonid access to 1.6 miles of potential spawning habitat, of which the first 0.3 miles is low gradient rearing habitat.

B. Project Design

i. If a culvert is proposed, does it employ a stream simulation, no slope, hydraulic, or other design?

The design and engineering for the Coulter Creek culvert/s replacement project will be completed by the US Bureau of Reclamation. Engineering designs will reflect the most current research regarding replacement of barrier culverts and designed for the 100 year flow event. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife “Design of Road Culverts for Fish Passage Manual” was applied in designing the replacement structures. There is not a channel profile view at this time.

ii. Has the project received a Priority Index (PI) Number? If so, provide the PI number and indicate the method used: Physical survey, reduced sample full survey, expanded threshold determination, or Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife generated PI (list source, such as a study or inventory).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Species** | **PI** |
| Spring Chinook | 4.2 |
| Steelhead | 2.3 |
| Rainbow | 2.0 |
| Bull trout | 1.7 |
| Cutthroat | 3.9 |
| Total | 14.1 |

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife generated PI - Inventory completed by:

Harza/BioAnalysts. 2000. Chelan County Fish Barrier Inventory report. Prepared for Chelan County Planning, Wenatchee, WA.

iii. Identify if there are additional fish passage barriers downstream or upstream of this project.

There is a passage barrier downstream at the BNFS railroad prism at the confluence of Nason Creek and Coulter Creek that is also scheduled for removal in 2012.

* Please include a Barrier Evaluation Form with the application –

Attached in Prism

* Please include a landowner agreement form signed by the property owners.

Landowner agreement will be attached in Prism with the final application

**Directions:** Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manager an e-mail.

All Flagged and NMI projects will be reviewed at the July 6th full Review Panel meeting. Sponsor responses received no later than one week prior to the meeting will be considered by the Review Panel.

Response:   
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# JULY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Early Project Status:**

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

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

## JuLY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - lead entity & project sponsor responses

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:   
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# Post Application - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Application Project Status:**

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 (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or 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?

4. Other comments:

## Post application - lead entity & project sponsor responses

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:   
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Final Project Status:**

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 project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or 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?

4. Other comments: