

## **Project Review Comments**

PROJECT: 22-1149 P, Lower Miller Floodplain Restoration Design Sponsor: King County of Program: SALMON ST PROJ Status: Board Funded

**MEETING: Initial Review** 

Shared: 4/1/2022

Review Status: Needs more information

Considerations: Other

Topics	Comments
Review Status - Ir	nitial
	Likely to clear, may just need additional detail on scope of work and associated budget
Review Panel Cor	mments - Initial
Questions (resp	ponse required)
	The sponsor mentioned that there was a feasibility analysis completed for the site. Please attach to PRISM. Can the sponsor give a little bit of information in Q#8 as the what elements the feasiblity study considered and eliminated?
	Reply: This feasibility report has been uploaded to PRISM and the response to question 8 has been revised in response to this comment.
Improvements	to Make Project Technically Sound (response required)
	Currently the Scope of Work in question #5 is fairly general as to producing alternatives and a preliminary design. Additional detail on tasks expected to lead to the formulation of alternatives that meet the habitat objectives is needed. For instance, there may need to be sediment and hydrologic modeling that will determine the location and formation of channels once the contricting highway berms are removed. There may need to be some evaulation of soil compaction and associated with the berms and flood elevation and shear stress calculations that will affect the BNSF railroad trestle in relation to how much armoring is proposed to be removed.  It will be critical to identify the most important information that will help inform the greatest habitat uplift in this alluvial fan environment.  Once these tasks are fleshed out more, additional detail should be able to be provided for the budget.
	Reply: Thank you. We have revised the response to question #5 to provide more detail, and the cost estimate is also revised.
General Comm	ents (response not required)
	NOTE from Jen: generally thinking clear on this oneneed more detail in the scope and in the budget. Highly informative presentation and good proposal.
	Reply: The scope and budget show more detail in the revised versions.
	RCO Cultural resources staff comments-
	A preliminary review by RCO cultural resources staff found a medium risk that project activities will impact protected cultural resources. Cultural resources survey will likely be

ProjectReviewComments 6/14/2023 3:51:07 PM Page 1 of 2



## **Project Review Comments**

PROJECT: 22-1149 P, Lower Miller Floodplain Restoration Design Sponsor: King County of Program: SALMON ST PROJ Status: Board Funded

needed, but monitoring and archaeological permits are less likely to be required. The APE provided does not matches the project area shown in the attached project plans.

This is a limited, high-level review that looked at factors like location, landform features, known archeological sites, and ethnographic sites. RCO cultural resources staff will initiate tribal consultation and complete a more detailed review when projects are ranked in anticipation of funding. Any changes in the planned project activities may change the cultural resources analysis and degree of work required. Most applications should include a line-item for cultural resources costs.

The costs for a survey are dependent on the scope, scale, and location of your project. We encourage you to reach out to cultural resources consulting firms to assist in budgeting or conducting a pre-review. If any prior cultural resources studies have been completed for your project area, please reference the DAHP project identification or prior RCO project by number.

Reply: The project site map has been revised to show the APE. We will be sure to include prior cultural resources survey information and metadata from King County Roads Division and acknowledge that more extensive cultural resources review will be required for this project. Thank you.

ProjectReviewComments 6/14/2023 3:51:07 PM Page 2 of 2