

APPLICATION: 15-1074 PLN, COWLING CREEK CULVERTS REPLACEMENT FEASIBILITY

Sponsor: Mid-Puget Sound Fish Enh Grp Program: Salmon State Projects Status: Application Submitted

APPLICATION REVIEW

LINKS TO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- [Restoration Projects - Manual 5](#)
- [Long Term Obligations - Manual 7](#)
- [Salmon Grants \(Manual 18\)](#)
- [Appendix F: Landowner Acknowledgement Form](#)
- [Appendix E: Barrier Information Forms](#)
- [Grant Applicant's To-Do-Lists](#)
- [Salmon Grant Applicant's To-Do-List](#)

PROJECT DETAILS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
Worksites & Properties	Please list all property owners that would be necessary to approve of the restoration work. What about the upstream side of the culvert -- the salmon center would not have a role? Paul should not be included as an adjacent landowner?
Worksite Map & Description	Please fill in the blanks.
Property Details	Please complete the blanks and add properties if others would be a part of the restoration project.

METRICS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
Planning Metrics	<p>Please don't overcommit on your metrics. How do you get 12miles? Project description indicated 5 miles? Add a note of clarification about you how arrived at this number so as not to confuse. See manual 18 for the deliverables for feasibility reports (Appendix D-1). You'd selected preliminary design, but I don't think that is what you are proposing (based on your description) so I selected the planning metric instead. Take a look at Appendix D-2 for details about preliminary design deliverables and correct if you can afford to advance that far with this budget.</p> <p>No cultural resources assessment? Should plan on needing this covered as Executive Order 05-05 requires RCO consult with DAHP and Tribes on projects with ground disturbing activities. Better to plan for costs than come up short.</p>

COSTS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
Planning Cost Estimates	<p>Please consider adding funding for cultural resources assessment as the ground disturbing activities will require consultation. Just because it is work in the right of way doesn't mean that there are not resources -- and the Area of Potential Effect for the future restoration project includes staging, so likely will extend beyond the right of way?</p> <p>Will this \$80K afford all the work described in the proposal?</p>

APPLICATION QUESTIONS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
Planning Questions	Please complete the blanks.
Overall Project Questions	<p>Please complete the blanks.</p> <p>Check with DNR if the future restoration would potentially impact the tidelands. May need to coordinate and secure a right of entry. Add notes to indicate whether or not DNR has jurisdiction over the tidelands -- and if they do you'll need a landowner acknowledgement form signed by them by the application deadline.</p>

PROJECT PERMITS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
Project Permits	Please include all permits that the future fish passage project would need to complete. We understand that applications will not be submitted with this grant -- but important to indicate the breath of permits that would be required for this type of restoration project.

ATTACHMENTS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
Attachments	<p>Please add a note to explain the baseline inventory -- what is this document?</p> <p>What about other restoration work that could accompany the culvert -- for example removing the tidelands weir? Is that outside the scope of this proposal? It isn't mentioned... yet seems like it would be important to consider when selecting the preferred alternative?</p> <p>It could be helpful to develop an MOU between MidSound and the County regarding their role in reviewing the alternatives and participating in the selection of the preferred alternative.</p> <p>Looking at the APE -- it does extend beyond the ROW -- Please include all property owners in your properties list and you'll need landowner acknowledgements from each before the application due date. You'll need to secure landowner permissions for work necessary to complete the feasibility report -- how do you propose to secure the permissions?</p> <p>Salmon Proposal: Please explain the discrepancy between 100% blockage and the fish passage that is enabled by volunteers. Read through it again and make sure the proposal is clear that this is a feasibility study -- not a restoration project. Goals and objectives read as if you are restoring access -- the goal is to develop conceptual designs for a future restoration project that will... You might search "restoration" to check -- maybe adding "future" before and "phase" after?</p> <p>Seems like the assumptions and constraints wouldn't require \$80K to assess -- cost limits and road closure could be identified early. Is there a point earlier in the feasibility project at which you'd know whether or not this future restoration work would be viable? If the road can't be closed -- that seems like a big red flag.</p> <p>Your deliverables will need to meet the standards of Manual 18 appendix D-1 -- please incorporate that deliverable into your proposal.</p> <p>Engaging the community is the selection of the preferred alternative could be important to the potential success of the project. Better to engage stakeholders early than just before you plan to construct.</p> <p>Please use track changes as you update your salmon proposal, and respond to review panel comments in the final section of the document.</p> <p>Cost Estimate: Additional line item detail could be helpful. Can you break the line items down in more detail? Include cultural resources as an assessment may be required. What about community engagement?</p>