|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date** | **Status** |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit | 5/21/2012 | Reviewed |
| July Review Panel Mtg. |  |  |
| **Status Options** | | |
| **REVIEWED** | Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments. | |
| **REVIEWED & FLAGGED** | Review Panel has flagged this project as needing full panel discussion. | |
|  | Date | Status |
| Post Application | 10/5/2012 | POC |
| Final | 10/26/2012 | CLEAR |
| **Status Options** | | |
| **POC** | Project of Concern | |
| **CLEAR** | Project is clear | |

**Lead Entity:**  Chelan County

**Project Number:**  12-1447

**Project Name:**  Peshastin RM 8.8 Side Channel Reconnection Design

**Project Sponsor:** Chelan Co. Natural Resource

**Grant Manager:** Marc Duboiski

**Project Summary**: This design-only project proposes to complete landowner outreach, alternative analysis, preliminary and final design documents for reconnection of side-channel habitat in Peshastin Creek in the vicinity of RM 8.4 – 9.1through culvert replacements under SR 97 between MP 177.1 and 177.8.

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:** 5/21/2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Kelley Jorgensen and Paul Schlenger

**Early Project Status: Reviewed**

**Project Site Visit?** Yes

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

*Comment Updates following Proposal Presentation on June 13:*

All comments provided based on pre-application and site visit need to be addressed in final proposal.

The review panel has some concern about restoration in this reach being compatible with existing land uses – while the current rock and gravel operation has a modest footprint in this location, historic use patterns (in the form of legacy contaminants) and future use or expansion does not usually bode well for restored conditions. What discussions with the BRG have taken place regarding future habitat protections?

During the presentation the Nason oxbow project was used as an example of a similar side channel reconnection project in terms of scale and cost. The review panel and others believe the Nason box culverts are directly affecting habitat conditions in the side channel/oxbow – while we understand they were undersized to limit flows, this alternative selection has created backwater ponded conditions with a lack of flushing flows. Given the beaver dam issue on Nason, we hope the sponsor will take a lessons learned approach while developing alternatives for this project and more clearly define the habitat objectives linked to each alternative. If low-flow habitat environments providing high-flow refugia are the habitat functions desired, then the structure size may vary greatly from the alternative with a goal of providing off-channel habitat that provides spawning opportunities and requires sufficient flushing flows to transport fine sediments rather than store them. The sponsor should be very clear in their goals and objectives during alternative development and selection with regards to structure size and habitat outcomes – if smaller structures are installed to save money than that will impact the habitat directly.

*Draft comments based on pre-application materials and site visit:*

The future implementation phase has the potential to reconnect much needed side-channel habitat providing rearing and refuge functions for juvenile salmonids in the Peshastin Creek. The proposal would be strengthened by addressing the following questions in the final application:

* Clarify the level of design that has been completed to date that generated the four conceptual alternatives.
* What benefits would a back water channel have over a flow through channel but one that is shorter in length than the entire reach between the existing undersized culverts? This was mentioned as an option on site but concerns were expressed about lack of flushing flows to maintain the channel.
* What criteria will be used to prioritize project alternatives?

**2. Missing Pre-application information.**

**3. Staff Comments/Questions:** This project must follow the preliminary and final design criteria outlined in SRFB Policy Manual #18. <http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual18Appendices/Appendix_D2_Prelim_Design_Deliverables.pdf>

<http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual18Appendices/Appendix_D3_Final_Design_Deliverables.pdf>

## 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 projects will be reviewed at the July 12th full Review Panel meeting. Sponsor responses received no later than one week prior to the meeting will be considered by the Review Panel.

**Special Note:** To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please re-attach your proposal in PRISM in WORD “track changes.” This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

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

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

# JULY 12th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:**

**Panel Member(s) Name:**

**Early Project Status:**

**Project Site Visit?**

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

**2. Missing Pre-application information.**

**3. Staff Comments/Questions:**

## JuLY 12th 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:** 10/5/2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Application Project Status:** POC

**1. Is this a draft project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No)**

Yes.

**Why?**

Evaluation Criterion #4 applies to this project: The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor and lead entity have failed to justify the costs.

**2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?**

The design costs exceed the 30% A&E that is typical for restoration projects; the $199,000 design and permitting estimate are out of proportion with the estimated $420,000 - $600,000 construction estimate.

Has the County had WSDOT engineers review the conceptual alternatives and cost estimates? They seem low for two culverts under a busy state highway where the in-water work window will overlap with peak construction and tourist season and very little room for a detour exists within the project area. If in fact the construction costs are higher it may justify the relatively high design costs. A few items stand out in the budget as high that need additional justification: alternatives analysis when there are only two alternatives that will seemingly be most influenced by the hydraulic analysis, JARPA, impact analysis (what does this entail?), and ESA consultation (Limit 8 use would result in only consultation with USFWS and you could use the SPIF form if you have a Corps permit), design review is listed as both a stand-alone item and in the project management budget. Also in terms of milestone sequencing, typically a sponsor would seek input from stakeholders prior to submitting permit applications in case there is significant feedback that alters the project.

**3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?**

**4. Staff Comments/Questions:**

## 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:** October 26, 2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Final Project Status: Clear**

**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. Staff Comments/Questions:**