|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit | 5/25/11 | no | CLEAR |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/6/2011 |  |  |
| Post Application | 8/2011 |  |  |
| Final | 10/7/2011 |  | CLEAR |
| 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: 11-1336R

Project Name: Nason Creek LWP Reconnection B+ Connection Construction

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 large-scale project is intended to provide hydraulic and fish passage connection between Nason Creek and in conjunction with a separate downstream connection project about 38 percent of the total floodplain and relict channel area of the Upper Nason Creek basin that was cut off by the construction of the railroad in the late 19th Century. Because Nason Creek has incised in the intervening century, the relict channel beds are at a higher elevation, so the reconnection project will only result in reactivation of the project area during high water stage on Nason Creek, which is estimated to be 4 to 6 weeks a year.

The project design team completed a thorough alternatives analysis and selected the “B+” alignment as the preferred alternative. A profile drawing showing the differences in thalweg elevation between Nason Creek and the isolated oxbow, and the various water stages at which the oxbow and isolated floodplain will become reactivated, would also help reviewers to understand why the B+ alignment is the best location. Likewise, please include relevant Bureau of Reclamation design drawings or reports as may be available as attachments to the proposal. Please explain why techniques for raising the water surface elevation of Nason Creek at the oxbow inlet location to increase the duration of flow into the reconnected habitat (for example, using ELJs ) were not included in the preferred design alternative. Does the project have specific hydraulic design objectives in the reactivate oxbow, such as water velocity and depth, or is the rationale that any additional flow is better than the current situation? It would be helpful for reviewers also to explain what considerations have been taken for sediment transport in the inlet design.

In the final proposal, please discuss contingencies for working out potential disagreements with BNSF railroad management. For example, what happens if BNSF does not approve the final design? What leverage do the project sponsors have for negotiating design elements, bonding, maintenance fees and other project issues with BNSF?

We suggest that the sponsors review the design of the “Blue Slough Side Channel Reconnection” project, SRFB Project 09-1389, which implemented a similar breach in a railroad grade to reactivate a relic oxbow of the North Fork Stillaguamish River, for useful design analogies.

The project stakeholders have done an excellent job of navigating the complexities associated with reconnecting the floodplain through the railroad and power line infrastructure. The proposal has the potential to be considered a noteworthy project both for the amount of habitat being opened up and for establishing a working relationship with BNSF.

## EARLY APPLICATION Review/Site VISIT - 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 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: 10/7/2011

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

**Final Project Status: CLEAR**

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? 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:

**This is an excellent and noteworthy project. The project sponsor has addressed the previous comments, and the application is cleared to proceed for funding.**