

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council
Project Number:	15-1205
Project Name:	Lower Mainstem Skokomish LWD Design-HWY 101
Project Sponsor:	Mason Conservation District
Grant Manager:	Mike Ramsey

	Date	Status¹
Post-Application	9/23/15	Clear
Final	10/28/15	Clear

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

This project will take place throughout a 1.6 mile reach of the main stem Skokomish River between river mile 4.1 and 5.7. The project will analyze the entire reach to determine the most appropriate size, frequency, and location for LWD installations to achieve the goal of improving structural and habitat diversity by facilitating sediment storage, sediment processing, normative channel patterns, and stable vegetated islands (where appropriate). Design alternatives will be discussed amongst project stakeholders, and the most appropriate alternative will be selected based on landowner support and benefit to fish. Final designs will be developed for the selected alternative and the project team will work with permitting agencies to obtain all appropriate permits.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 10/28/15

Final Project Status: **Clear**

Review Panel Member(s): Full Review Panel

- 1. If the project is a POC, please identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:**
- 2. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:**
- 3. Other comments:**

POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 9/23/15

Project Status: Clear

Review Panel Member(s): Full Panel Review

- 1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:**
- 2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:**
- 3. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:**
- 4. General comments:**

The project is cleared for funding, but the review panel would appreciate clarification of the response to the comment about the parcel map. We understand the channel on the "Vicinity Restoration Project Map" is conceptual, but please clarify the concept for the "other potential overflow channel". It is described in the text as a back channel of the Old North Channel, but drawn as a connected channel. There is no problem with it either way (i.e., back channel or side channel) at this time, but we wanted to make sure we understand the concept.

¹ CLEAR: Cleared to proceed; CONDITIONED: Cleared to proceed with a condition; NMI: Needs More Information; POC: Project of Concern; NOTEWORTHY: Exemplary Project

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

If your project is not cleared (i.e. has a status of NMI, Conditioned, or POC) you must update your proposal, PRISM questions, or attachments as necessary to address the review panel's comments. Use track changes when updating your proposal. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.

DRAFT APPLICATION / SITE VISIT REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: May 20, 2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes No

Review Panel Member(s): Schlenger and Cramer

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

2. Missing Pre-application information:

Provide all landowners in the project area as required in section 11B of the application.

3. General Comments:

The objectives listed in section 4B of the application are not the project's objectives; rather they are a list of tasks/scope of work. Objectives should support and refine the goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions and should be "SMART": **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**elevant, and **T**ime-bound. Some examples of goals and objectives are in Manual 18, page 90.

Please provide a parcel map showing ownership within and adjacent to the project area. Also provide a map showing other proposed, active and completed restoration projects (highlighting planting areas) and discuss how this project fits into the overall strategy for recovery.

Provide additional information when the US 101 bridge is planned for replacement. The design of ELJ structures should consider the possible replacement of the bridge and the possible changes to channel span, clearance, and alignment. WSDOT's participation as a stakeholder as noted in the application should help inform the design team about the future plans for the bridge.

The review panel commented on SRFB proposal #14-1329 asking if "...any planning that has been done with USACE regarding coordinating the project design with USACE's plans for reconnecting side channel(s) in the reach. For example, could LWD installations be sited to divert high flows into the proposed USACE side channel project". The response from the sponsor was "Regarding coordination with the USACE to reconnect side channels in this reach, this design effort is just now continuing beyond the 10% design phase. We will coordinate with the USACE to design this proposal's log jams to complement their future effort to reconnect side channels (currently scheduled for construction in 2019)". Please address the 2014 review panel question now that a year has passed and provide supporting information regarding the USACE's side channel restoration design(s) in or near the proposed project area.

Provide detailed cost estimates. For example, break down "Contracted Engineering Services" into subtasks and costs.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



4. Staff Comments:



SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

Revise your project proposals using “track changes” and update any relevant PRISM questions and attachments. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.