

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](#)

METRICS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
Planning Metrics	Please don't overcommit on your metrics. See manual 18 for the deliverables for feasibility reports (Appendix D-1). Thank you for planning for cultural resources costs should they be required.

APPLICATION QUESTIONS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
------	-----------------------

PROJECT PERMITS

Page	Grant Manager Comment
Project Permits	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 Oct 15th. 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. 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>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.</p>

