|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Date | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit  | 5/30/12 | 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 | 9-27-12 | Clear |
| Final | 10/31/12 | CLEAR |
| Status Options |
| POC | Project of Concern  |
| CLEAR | Project is clear |

**Lead Entity:**  Cedar/Sammamish WRIA 8

**Project Number:**  12-1282

**Project Name:**  Bear Creek Reach 6 Restoration

**Project Sponsor:**  Adopt A Stream Foundation

**Grant Manager:** Elizabeth Butler

**Project Summary**:

The proposed project will enhance salmon habitat conditions along about 350 lineal feet of Bear Creek located in the Friendly Village mobile home development by regrading an eroding bank, installing large wood structures, and planting a buffer of native riparian vegetation. The project site is located in the fifth highest priority reach of a Tier 1 – Core Chinook use sub-basin.

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:** 6/5/12

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

**Early Project Status: Reviewed**

**Project Site Visit?** Yes (5/30/12)

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

The proposal aptly justifies why work on this degraded reach of urban creek supports high priority ecological and social objectives of the WRIA 8 salmon recovery plan. While the proposed habitat enhancement work consists of common and technically straight-forward treatment techniques, the review panel cautions that because of the sub-basin’s disrupted hydrology and sediment transport patterns and severe limitations on the ability of the channel to respond to them, the sustainability of any in-channel treatments at the site will be subject to risks that are beyond the scope and budget of this small project to control. In particular, the long term effectiveness of excavating the outside bank of the meander to a sloping bench as a means of stabilizing erosion and providing flood storage is doubtful, given that a few winter high water events could easily erode the bench back to a vertical cut bank. This scenario occurred at the Ohop Creek SRFB restoration project near Eatonville within two years of construction, and the review panel suggests that the sponsor discuss the effectiveness of this technique with the Ohop project sponsor (Nisqually Indian Tribe).

We also caution the sponsor to avoid giving the property owner the impression that regrading the left bank will make a significant reduction in flooding at the site, unless appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic modeling has been completed to demonstrate that it will. The review panel’s informal field observations suggest that channel constriction by structures immediately downstream of the site will backwater the site during flood conditions, regardless of the proposed bank regrading.

Because of the significant uncertainties associated with the effectiveness and sustainability of the bank regrading component of the design, the review panel suggests that the sponsor focus instead on installing abundant LWD pieces along the existing left bank to enhance salmon habitat complexity and reduce bank erosion. Please also consider the merits of installing a mid channel LWD structure that is positioned to deflect high flows over the point bar on the inside of the meander, and which will further improve habitat complexity. We strongly support the proposed revegetation component of the project, especially if it can retain the existing large cottonwood tree on the left bank.

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

In the final proposal, please include sufficient budget to prepare the design and as-built documentation that is required in Manual 18 Appendix D.

**3. Staff Comments/Questions:**

## 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:** 9-27-12

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

**Application Project Status: Clear**

**1. Is this a draft project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No) 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 sponsor submitted detailed responses to the pre-application comments, which adequately address the pre-application concerns. These responses are to be incorporated into the scope of the project.

The sponsor must submit a landowner acknowledgement form into PRISM prior to signing a grant agreement with RCO.

**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 31, 2012

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