

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Upper Columbia
Project Number:	15-1210
Project Name:	Nason Creek Upper White Pine Floodplain Restoration
Project Sponsor:	Chelan County NRD
Grant Manager:	Marc Duboiski

	Date	Status¹
Post-Application		
Final	9/23/15	Clear

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

This proposal seeks construction funding for a project that will reconnect about a half mile of Nason Creek with potentially productive floodplain wetland habitat by removing 2500 lineal feet of earthen levee and routing the creek through about 1500 feet of new channel. The proposed work represents a Tier 1 action in a Tier 1 assessment unit. The work is currently at the stage of a 60 percent design, which the review panel has reviewed.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 9/23/15

Final Project Status: Clear

Review Panel Member(s): Full SRFB Panel Review

1. If the project is a POC, please identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:
2. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:
3. Other comments:

POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Project Status: Click to choose a status

Review Panel Member(s):

1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:
2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:
3. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:
4. General comments:



SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

If your project is not cleared (i.e. has a status of NMI, Conditioned, or POC) you must update your proposal, PRISM questions, or attachments as necessary to address the review panel's comments. Use track changes when updating your proposal. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.

¹ CLEAR: Cleared to proceed; CONDITIONED: Cleared to proceed with a condition; NMI: Needs More Information; POC: Project of Concern; NOTEWORTHY: Exemplary Project

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



DRAFT APPLICATION / SITE VISIT REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: May 18, 2015

Project Site Visit?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

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

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

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. General Comments:

The 60% Design Report that is included in the PRISM attachments is useful for explaining the rationale for the various design elements. In particular, the report justifies the use of "fabric encapsulated soil lifts" to temporarily stabilize the new channel from lateral migration for the first several years after construction while riparian plantings establish themselves. The review panel believes that the use of biodegradable coir fabric for encasing the soil lifts is a critical design feature for ensuring that the project is consistent with the "design criterion" of "restor(ing) natural rates of channel migration ... consistent with reference/historical conditions." In this regard, the review panel would consider the use of more permanent bank stabilization methods such as rock armoring or gabions to be unacceptable.

While the design explanation in the 60% design report is generally clear, the proposal could be strengthened by explaining and/or justifying the costs of the following design elements. First, how much forest clearing along White Pine Road is anticipated for installing the new power lines? Has the visual impact of this clearing, for example on users of the USFS camp ground, been accounted for? Second, because of the high cost estimate of tree salvage and placing LWD (apparently about \$341,000), has the design considered using less LWD for purposes such as bank stabilization on channel meanders and floodplain roughening? Similarly, since the LWD placement appears to be driven primarily for promoting hydraulic roughness and less for fish habitat purposes, could some of the LWD be placed mid-channel, where it would provide more direct habitat complexity at low flows? The design report would be improved by documenting the technical reasons for the relatively high density of LWD placed along banks and floodplain. Third, please provide more explanation justifying the relatively high unit costs of importing, stockpiling and placing the new channel substrate (apparently \$65/cy). Besides basic mixing of the various size classes of substrate, why is washing required?

4. Staff Comments:



SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Revise your project proposals using “track changes” and update any relevant PRISM questions and attachments. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.