

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## Individual Comment Form



<b>Lead Entity:</b>	Pierce County Lead Entity
<b>Project Number:</b>	15-1224
<b>Project Name:</b>	South Prairie Creek (RM 4.0-4.6) Phase I
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group
<b>Grant Manager:</b>	Kay Caromile

	Date	Status <sup>1</sup>
Post-Application		
Final	9/23/15	Clear

### PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

The proposal is for phase 1 of a two-phase project to restore floodplain connectivity, side channel habitat, and main channel habitat. This phase 1 project seeks to restore/enhance 0.5 miles of habitat on South Prairie Creek and plant 18 acres to kick start channel aggradation and habitat complexity in the mainstem channel in advance of Phase 2 work on floodplain restoration and connection to 80 acres of floodplain and half a mile of side channel habitat. The phase 1 project scope would complete main channel treatments, demolish existing dairy buildings and a bridge crossing, install a new bridge crossing over Silver Springs, and plant areas that will not be affected by phase 2 construction activities. The phase 2 project scope would focus on floodplain treatments and planting on the north floodplain and installation of two upstream main channel structures to tie the two phases of the project together.

### FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 9/23/15

**Final Project Status:** Clear

**Review Panel Member(s):** Full Panel Review

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:**

**Project Status:** Click to choose a status

**Review Panel Member(s):**

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:



### SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

<sup>1</sup> 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



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: 5/15/2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes  No

Review Panel Member(s): Marnie Tyler and Paul Schlenger

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

To the extent possible, the final design should incorporate materials that would naturally be found in the project reach. For example, does the kind of large rock specified in the designs occur naturally in this valley bottom? Are flood flows fast and deep enough to create the kind of scour that makes light loose riprap necessary rather than using cobble/boulder characteristic of this valley? The final design should strike a balance between using materials naturally occurring in the valley bottom, combined with bank widening to expand the channel area to provide flood flow capacity, with the strength of materials needed to hold up to the expected shear at a 100-year flow. This can be figured out readily with 1D HEC RAS modeling.

#### 2. Missing Pre-application information.

Please include the latest design drawings available with the final application. The drawings discussed at the site were helpful, but still needed to go through TAG review. Please include cross-sections and profile views of the mid-channel wood treatments in main channel, specifically at the locations where the two channels split at upstream end of project site and rejoin at downstream end.

#### 3. General Comments:

The review panel appreciates the applicant's responsiveness to comments provided during the 2014 review round, particularly in incorporating mid-channel wood structures in the main channel rather than rock, and ultimately designing a less aggressive approach to restoration of the side channel and floodplain reconnection.

#### Staff Comments:

1. Please be sure to address all comments I provided when I reviewed the application in April (if you haven't already done so), along with completing all other final application requirements listed in Section 3 of RCO Manual 18 [http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual\\_18.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual_18.pdf). All changes to your proposal should be made using "Track Changes" in Word.



### 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.