|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1438** | **Date** | **Status** |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit | 5/21/2012 | REVIEWED  AND FLAGGED |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/26/2012 | Reviewed |
| **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 | 10/22/12 | Condition |
| **Status Options** | | |
| **POC** | Project of Concern | |
| **CLEAR** | Project is clear | |

**Lead Entity:**  Chelan County

**Project Number:**  12-1843

**Project Name:**  Nason N1-KDIZ3 Floodplain Reconnection

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

**Grant Manager:** Marc Duboiski

**Project Summary**: This project entails the installation of two culverts to improve the connection between Nason Creek and side channel/floodplain habitat. The two culverts are a 30-foot diameter box culvert at the downstream end and a 10-foot diameter metal pipe at the upstream end. The action would reconnect between 0.9 acre and 13 acres of floodplain habitat depending upon design flows, including a 4.6-acre high flow channel. Costs include design, and permitting in 2013 and construction in 2014.

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:** 5/20/2012

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

**Early Project Status: REVIEWED AND FLAGGED. At time of site visit, the action was included in application 12-1438. All comments from the early review of 12-1438 are provided below. The project element identified as #2 in comments is the action proposed in this application.**

**Project Site Visit?** Yes, 5/21/2012

**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.

During the presentation, the sponsor and consultant provided some information regarding the culvert sizing design issue described below in comment 4a. The 30-foot culvert was one alternative analyzed, but was not in the final design advanced and constructed. If the removal of the beaver dam remains part of the proposed project, the review panel requests a copy of the design report further describing the alternatives considered and selected. The review panel believes this culvert sizing has more influence over the lack of flushing flows than the presence of the beaver dam. It is our understanding that the beaver dam removal portion will be taken out of the proposed project in the final application.

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

This project is flagged for full panel review and discussion on July 12. Three of the proposed restoration actions appear to have very limited benefits to fish for a variety of reasons noted below. The sponsor is commended for trying to provide some habitat improvements in a floodplain wetland complex with a state highway running through the middle of it – a challenging location to work in with many constraints that are costly to address. The current approach of piecing together small projects with a not-so-small price tag is really like putting a band-aid on a broken leg – not likely to be effective in addressing the root cause of the problem. The sponsor should continue to consider larger scale habitat projects in this highly constrained reach – even if they involve major highway reconstruction and associated costs – because ultimately this will advance the progress towards salmon recovery at a measureable scale in a much more meaningful way. Public works projects do cost more than standard restoration projects, but the gain in restoring habitat forming processes by removing major floodplain constraints can be large enough to prioritize these projects over smaller, less beneficial projects that constantly are limited in benefit by having to work around major watershed process constraints. Many publications in recent years provide justification for preference of process-based restoration implemented at a reach scale when trying to achieve measurable benefits in fish survival and productivity.

The review panel provides the following comments on the four individual project elements:

1. Remove floodplain fill of parking lot and old bridge abutment: This action is straight-forward and relatively cost effective.
   1. Clarify contradicting excavation elevation – in Section 2. Project Design text says it will be inundated at the 5 year event and a map says it will be inundated at the 2 year event. Greater inundation would increase rearing access opportunities – please clarify biological goals associated with this action.
2. Replace culverts under highway SR 207: FLAGGED. While floodplain reconnection is a valuable ecological function and can provide valuable complex off-channel rearing habitat, in this case due to constraints of the highway the costs don’t seem to justify the benefits especially if future highway realignment ever gets programmed.
   1. The application is confusing in terms of expected habitat benefits (0.9 acre in one place and 13 acres cited in another). Please provide flow inundation scenarios relative to presence of rearing juveniles.
3. Install three large wood structures: 2 of 3 sites FLAGGED. The site selection at RM 4.6 and 4.3 for large wood structures along the highway prism to pre-empt future bank armoring is not a good justification for habitat complexity placement.
   1. While the panel understands that wood structures better scour pools if they are in contact with higher flows, if these flows are on an eroding bank than the purpose is intended more for bank stabilization than for habitat improvements. Wood is a better habitat option than rock revetments but that is a weak argument to spend limited salmon recovery dollars on highway roadfill stabilization where chronic deficiencies have been identified.
   2. The structure placement at RM 3.7 has more obvious habitat benefits due to site selection at the inlet of an existing side channel. This particular location is better justified.
4. Remove beaver dam in oxbow side channel: FLAGGED. This action is not adequately justified in the proposal and runs counter intuitive to beavers as integral to habitat forming processes (see all the rationale for reintroducing beavers in that proposal).
   1. During the site visit RTT members mentioned that a culvert installed to reconnect the “2007 oxbow” (funded by BPA) was designed for a 30 foot culvert but instead a 12 foot culvert was actually installed, and that this is a major factor in limiting flows into the oxbow and creating instead attractant flows and conditions that beavers prefer. This undersized culvert issue needs to be addressed in detail – why was a smaller culvert installed and can the proposal be modified to correct this issue instead? Removing the beaver dam in only a temporary fix for if beavers like this location they will invariably return. The beaver activity in this case is a symptom of the inadequately executed project.
   2. If the habitat in the oxbow is simplified ponded habitat lacking cover the proposal could be modified to add cover in the form of whole trees. The review panel’s first choice is to correct the undersized culvert first and then address in-stream conditions.
   3. The review panel recommends leaving the beaver dam as is – the habitat provides benefits in the form of high flow refugia and for storing sediments in a low flow environment.

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

**3. Staff Comments/Questions:** This new proposal (entered into PRISM 06-28-12) needs clarification. The current budget is requesting $100,000 from SRFB, with $0 for match? Restoration proposals required 15% match. The project description does not say what element(s) of the original grant proposal 12-1438 has been shifted to this proposal. Make sure budgets and scopes of work are consistent between the two proposals on Nason Creek.

## 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: PRISM attachment #8.

*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:** 7/26/2012

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

**Early Project Status: Reviewed**

**Project Site Visit?** Yes during early reviews

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

The review panel appreciates the sponsor’s responses to comments. The application states that the high flow channel will be activated seasonally to provide high flow refuge and off-channel rearing. Please clarify the anticipated extent to which habitat may be provided at the downstream end during low flow periods. Given the apparent infeasibility of the road relocation due to high costs ($10-$20 million), the proposed action is a good alternative despite the high cost.

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

The application needs to be entered into PRISM to provide all information required in Manual 18.

**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:** October 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 proposed side channel reconnection to provide high flow refuge appears to provide only limited benefits for the costs. The proposed design would disturb a large amount of existing riparian vegetation which would limit the near-term function of the restored habitats.

The proposal has inconsistencies in the cost estimate. One table identifies permitting cost of $129,000, while another table lists the permitting costs as $52,000. The total project costs are identical in the two tables. Clarify the project costs. If permitting is more than the $52,000 estimate, please explain.

**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: PRISM attachments #10, 11, 12 13 and 14.

*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: Condition**

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

**Why? No.**

**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?**

* **Condition: Submit the completed preliminary design and design report to the RCO grants manager for SRFB review panel review and approval, prior to applying for permits and advancing to the construction portion of the grant scope of work. The review panel requires a 30-day review period once all documents have been provided. All design work shall include the content outlined in Manual 18, Appendix D-3 (2012).**

**4. Staff Comments/Questions:**