

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Skagit Watershed Council
Project Number:	15-1169
Project Name:	Illabot Creek Alluvial Fan Restoration 2b-SRFB
Project Sponsor:	
Grant Manager:	

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

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

The goal of this project is to restore natural processes and improve habitat conditions on the alluvial fan of Illabot Creek by addressing impacts from the dikes and roadway. The first phase of the project was completed in 2013 with SRF Board funds (project #11-1542), and included removing approximately 1,150 linear feet of dike, installing log jams, and constructing pilot channels downstream of Rockport-Cascade Road. Partial funding has been received for Phase 2 (project #14-2170) and the funding request described here is to complete funding for Phase 2. Phase 2 will involve completing final designs, constructing two new 100-foot span bridges on Rockport-Cascade Road, removing an additional 850 linear feet of dike, installing log jams, and actively reconnecting Illabot Creek with historic channels on the floodplain and alluvial fan. The existing bridge will be left in place, and when the project is completed any one of the three bridges could convey all or a portion of the flow from Illabot Creek. The project will initially direct flow through constructed pilot channels and the two new bridges, and then over time will allow the natural processes of erosion, deposition, and channel development to occur across the alluvial fan. This is expected to substantially increase spawning and rearing habitat for Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and other species.

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:

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



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:

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: April 29, 2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes No

Review Panel Member(s): Slocum and O'Neal

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

The Review Panel approved this project for funding in 2014 and still supports the implementation of this phase of the project. However, the new format in the 2015 application requires more specific information with respect to outcomes of the project that would assist in improving the previous cost benefit analysis. If the design doesn't include filling in the deep borrow trench outside of the upstream left bank levee, it should.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

As part of the revised 2015 application, more specific information is requested as part of the project objectives. The objectives listed in the current application identify implementation targets, but not expected outcomes in terms of habitat for fish (types of habitat, amounts of habitat, species and life stage targets for use of that habitat, timing of expected use). Comparison of these amounts to the current conditions would be ideal. Additional information on the specific outcomes expected from flood fencing and wood jams would also be helpful.

3. General Comments:

The estimate of the number of juveniles that would be associated with the project is helpful, but additional information on how that number was calculated is requested.

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.