

Amendment to Project Agreement

Project Sponsor: Hood Canal SEG
Project Title: Lower Big Quilcene River Master Plan Design

Project Number: 13-1209P
Amendment Number: 3

Amendment Type:

Scope Change

Amendment Description:

Reduce the scope of the project (and Special Condition) from meeting the "Preliminary Design Deliverables" to Conceptual Design Deliverables.

Agreement Terms

In all other respects the Agreement, to which this is an Amendment, and attachments thereto, shall remain in full force and effect. In witness whereof the parties hereto have executed this Amendment.

State Of Washington
Recreation and Conservation Office

Project Sponsor

BY: 
Kaleen Cottingham

TITLE: Director

DATE: 2-18-2015

Pre-approved as to form:
BY: ISI
Assistant Attorney General

AGENCY: Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement group
BY: Mendy Harlow
TITLE: Executive Director
DATE: 2/20/15

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2015

WA STATE
RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE

Sponsor Request

Ramsey, Michael (RCO)

From: Michelle Myers <michelle@pnwsalmoncenter.org>
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2015 10:22 AM
To: Ramsey, Michael (RCO)
Cc: Mendy Harlow; Kat Morgan; Jenny; Salmon Today; Michelle Myers; Kim Gower
Subject: Request Change of Project Scope for the lower Big Quilcene River Master Plan #13-1209

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Mike,

The Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group (HCSEG) would like to request a change of the project scope for the lower Big Quilcene River Master Plan (BQMP) #13-1209. Currently, the BQMP project is listed as a preliminary design and HCSEG is now requesting a change to a conceptual design.

The reasons for this change came as HCSEG began the initial steps of this project working with the partners in gathering information for design parameters from key community stakeholders. Since this project aims to address many goals in the lower Big Quilcene River including salmon habitat restoration, HCSEG identified the need to work closely with the Quilcene community in designing a project that will ultimately be not only benefit salmon and the Quilcene community. The lower Big Quilcene River community for which a salmon habitat restoration design project would affect, consists of private landowners, several large scale businesses in the shellfish industry and well as recreational interests. After outreach efforts to several community stakeholders, HCSEG is now aware this project is not ready for a preliminary design but rather a conceptual design with alternatives.

Additional project funding is currently being requested from other funding sources to complete the preliminary design phase. For example, the HCSEG submitted a 2015 ESRP proposal that would allow additional funding to continue this project towards a preliminary design. Currently, the project proposal was ranked by ESRP but is listed below the funding line and will most likely not be funded.

\$10 million

HCSEG is committed to seeing this project move forward in a positive way that addresses the needs for salmon, stakeholders and the Quilcene community. Thank you for your consideration and please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Michelle

--

Michelle Myers

Project Manager

Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group

600 Roessel Road | P.O. Box 2169

Belfair, WA 98528

360-275-3575 ext. 22

Natural Resources Building
1111 Washington St. S.E.
Olympia, WA 98501

P.O. Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917



(360) 902-3000
TTY (360) 902-1996
Fax: (360) 902-3026

E-mail: info@rco.wa.gov
Web site: www.rco.wa.gov

STATE OF WASHINGTON

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE

February 13, 2015

Mendy Harlow
Hood Canal SEG
PO Box 2169
Belfair, WA 98528

RE: Lower Big Quilcene River Master Plan Design, RCO #13-1209P
Amendment # 3

Dear Ms. Harlow:

In response to your request to amend the above-referenced Project Agreement, we have reviewed the circumstances and pertinent RCWs, WACs, and program policies relating to your request. As a result, I am approving an amendment to the Lower Big Quilcene River Master Plan Design project.

Enclosed are two original amendments to the Project Agreement. Please sign both amendments, retain one for your records, and return one original. If you have any questions, please call Mike Ramsey at (360) 902-2969, or send an e-mail to mike.ramsey@rco.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kaleen Cottingham", written over a horizontal line.

Kaleen Cottingham
Director

Enclosures



AMENDMENT APPROVAL FORM

Minor scope change

Project #: 13-1209 Planning

Amendment #: 3 - Scope Change

Project Title: Lower Big Quilcene River Master Plan Design

Project Sponsor: Hood Canal SEG

	Date	Initials
Grant Mgr:	2-18-15	MK
Section Mgr:		
Fiscal:		
Deputy:		
Director:		

AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION:

Reduce the scope of the project (and Special Condition) from meeting the "Preliminary Design Deliverables" to Conceptual Design Deliverables.

PROJECT SUMMARY:

Board Funded Date: 12/04/2013	Prior Time Extensions: 1	RCO Amount: \$200,000.00
Project Start Date: 08/22/2013	Other External Amendments: 0	Sponsor Match Amount: \$54,408.00
Original End Date: 02/28/2015	Sponsor Active Projects: 8	Total: \$254,408.00
Current End Date: 02/29/2016	Sponsor Completed Projects: 39	RCO Paid To Date (26%): \$51,669.88
	Sponsor Not Completed Projects: 1	RCO Remaining (74%): \$148,330.12
Last Progress Report:	Sponsor Dead Projects: 3	Last Billing Date: 02/10/2015

PROJECT AGREEMENT DESCRIPTION:

Working with the Nature Conservancy's 2013 evaluation of the PSNRP designs alternatives completed in 2012, HCSEG will design a feasible restoration project that allows for the maximum benefit to salmon. The goal of this planning project is to design a project in the lower mile of the Big Quilcene River that reconnects the river with the southern floodplain and distributary channels in the estuary. This project will support Hood Canal Summer Chum, Puget Sound Steelhead and coho salmon.

PROJECT FUNDING (CURRENT):

Bien	Fund	Appn	Reapp	Ind	Orig	Bien	Orig	Appn	Grant	Activity	SubActiv	SO	Amount
13-15	057	S08			New					PSARP	PROJ	NZ	\$200,000.00

QUESTIONS:

	Yes	No	N/A	Other (see notes)
Is the amendment request consistent with the original project intent?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Did the sponsor provide adequate justification for the proposed change?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Did the sponsor exhaust all practical alternatives before requesting the amendment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the current project meeting its milestone obligations to RCO?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the current project meeting its billing obligations to RCO?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Did the sponsor have little control over the condition causing the amendment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the sponsor have a good track record of implementing projects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will the proposed change help implement the project faster?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the project change a result of a design and /or permitting requirement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes	No	N/A	Other (see notes)
Will this action cause funding to be re-appropriated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is staff recommending approval of this amendment request?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the Lead Entity support the proposed change and is the documentation provided (letter or e-mail)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the proposed change technically sound? Has the Review Panel reviewed the change? If so, have their comments been incorporated into the request (i.e. conditioning)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

NOTES AND ANALYSIS:

I spoke with the LE Coordinator on this request. She (Alveda) was fine with going to conceptual plans in anticipation of moving forward with the community and agreement to complete preliminary ~~the~~ plans in the next phase.

Mila