Salmon Recovery Funding Board

POST APPPLICATION INDIVIDIAL PROJECT COMMENTS

Project Information			
Panel Member Name:	SRFB Review Panel		
Lead Entity:	Chelan	Project Location:	Chelan
Project Sponsor:	CCNR	Project Number:	09-1466
Project Name:	Nason Creek Upper White Pine Restoration	Project Number:	
Date:	October 30, 2009		
		_	
OCTOBER COMMENTS (October 30, 2009):			
Is this a project of concern according to the SRFB's criteria? Yes \(\subseteq \text{No} \subseteq \text{No} \subseteq \text{.}			
CCRD is proposing to change the project to a non-cap request and reduce the funding request. An alternatives analysis will be completed.			
SEPTEMBER COMMENTS (September 30, 2009):			
Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "Why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.			
 Is this a draft project of concern according to the SRFB's criteria? Yes ∑ No □ 			
Why?			
2. Information provided or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for,			

- or the benefit of, the project.
- 6. The project may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments, or restoration actions in the watershed.
- 8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives.

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

The Review Panel early comments requested more detail about the restoration alternatives for the site and to consider a more aggressive breaching approach that would allow channel migration processes into the floodplain area. The current design shows a selected breaching approach, which does not restore natural processes but provides connectivity for fish rearing. Please provide hydraulic model information that shows the frequency of the rearing connection and how this may be affected by the long term channel profile changes in Nason Creek.

Please provide more information on why moving the power poles is not feasible (e.g., costs, land ownership, existing infrastructure, and environmental impact). Was the alternative of protecting the power poles given consideration? Please provide more details about the location and grade of quarry spalls to allow access across the swales and how the PUD access road will be altered from its current condition. Also it would be helpful to know the dimensions and elevation of the rocked work pad around the power poles.

Please provide conceptual design information for the proposed log jams at the channel entrance.

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

4. Other comments.

EARLY APPLICATION COMMENTS (Summer 2009):

Panel Member

Project Sponsor:

Name: Steve Toth and Pat Powers

Lead Entity: Chelan Project Location:

Chelan County Natural Resources Dept.

Project
Number:

Project Name: Nason Creek Upper White Pine Reconnection

Date: 6/26/09

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

This restoration project would involve the selective breaching of a levee along middle Nason Creek to allow for improved connectivity with the floodplain area. Selective breaching was chosen as the preferred alternative due to Chelan PUD power poles within the floodplain area. Please provide more detail about the restoration alternatives considered at the site. We would prefer to see more aggressive breaching or removal of the levee to allow for restoration of channel migration processes into the floodplain area. The power pole near RM 13.3 appears to be within the bankfull width of the river already, and it seems that the two power poles upstream could be protected from scour with wood jams or other techniques.

2. Missing Preapplication information.

The application will need to include details about fish use and habitat conditions in the reach, a list of project tasks, and a detailed cost estimate. A larger scale Lidar image of the project area would also be useful to better understand the geomorphic setting. Please provide a copy of the CCNRD alternatives analysis, if available.