

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Snohomish
Project Number:	15-1131
Project Name:	Woods Creek In-Stream Restoration Partnership
Project Sponsor:	Adopt a Stream Foundation
Grant Manager:	Elizabeth Butler

	Date	Status ¹
Post-Application	9/29/15	POC
Final	10/21/15	Clear

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

This project builds off a PIDA grant (14-1054) to do final design and construction of approximately 12 large wood material (LWM) instream structures and plant about 2.0 acres of native riparian forest vegetation on seven separate private properties along two reaches of Woods Creek. The purpose of the work is to improve instream and riparian habitat complexity for enhancing spawning and rearing conditions for Chinook and other salmonids. The project reaches and treatments were identified as priorities in a 2013 Snohomish County watershed assessment. Preliminary designs and permitting for the structures are currently being prepared as part of Project 14-1054.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 10/21/15

Final Project Status: Clear

Review Panel Member(s): 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:**

The response to comments resolved the concerns. Good luck with this project.

POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 9/29/15

Project Status: POC

Review Panel Member(s): Review Panel

- 1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:**
#11. The current level of design is not adequate to evaluate the risk of flooding and erosion that might result from the project and, therefore, whether the landowners and Snohomish County will be willing to allow the project to be constructed.
- 2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:**
A stronger commitment is needed for comprehensively assessing flooding and erosion risks that may result from the project than is currently demonstrated in the response to comments and the proposed design budget. Per

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



our pre-application comments, the proposal needs to include a detailed scope of work and a realistic budget for engineering modeling to determine flood rise, scour, and other relevant issues at each of the project sites and at the neighboring properties in the vicinity of the project sites. There is little certainty that the proposed log structures will actually be built until this information is presented to and accepted by the landowners, their neighbors, and county regulators.

We recommend that this project be phased into two phases. The first phase of design and permitting should result in providing informed assurances on flooding issues to the landowners, their neighbors and county regulators. When all parties are in agreement with the plan, then the log structures can be constructed in the second phase.

- 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: May 24, 2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes No

Review Panel Member(s): Kelley Jorgensen and Tom Slocum

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

Signed landowner agreements and preliminary designs are contract deliverables of Project 14-1054. Per Manual 18, page 12, landowner acknowledgement forms from the affected landowners must be completed and provided in the PRISM file of project 15-1131 by the final application date. While not required by the Manual 18 rules, it is strongly recommended that the preliminary design drawings and a basis of design report be provided by the final application date – the construction application is weakened without the design grant deliverables. The basis of design report should explain the rationale for the design for the LWM structures at each project site and the specific benefit to salmon habitat that each will create.

In the final application please clarify if the construction proposal includes a final design element or if the preliminary designs will be used to facilitate a design/build implementation – the application states design/build approach but the budget includes a final design line item. If final design is included, provide a detailed scope of work and line item budget for the final design tasks, or remove this task if the project would be implemented as a design/build project. It is strongly recommended that the scope include an engineering assessment of the stability of the structures in 100-year flood conditions and a basic hydraulic modeling (e.g. HEC RAS) evaluation of the potential flood and bank erosion impacts associated with the structures on surrounding land. Evaluation of potential impacts is particularly important for the right bank floodplain on intervening private parcels (i.e. those where no project work will be done) in Reach 2: having documentation that flooding and erosion issues were evaluated with a reasonable engineering standard of care is crucial for managing the sponsor's potential liability in the event of having to defend against damage claims for future flooding. If the proposed final design budget of \$10,000 is insufficient for these evaluations, it should be increased accordingly.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



The final designs should ideally include removal of all existing rock, miscellaneous debris observed in stream, and concrete bank armoring on the project parcels, as well as any bank treatments (grading, planting, etc.) that may be needed.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

Please provide more specific information on the context of the project within the WRIA 7 recovery plan, including how the proposed actions and stream reaches are prioritized relative to all other areas in WRIA 7. Also please make it clear how this project relates to project No. 14-1054.

Please also provide a project partner form from Snohomish Conservation District

3. General Comments:

The several separate attachments for each individual project site in the PRISM file are cumbersome for a reviewer to search through. It would be helpful to reviewers if the designs for all the project sites were presented in one file, and similarly if the photos were packaged together in one file.

The proposal states that some of the construction work will be done by interns. We encourage the sponsor to review Washington Dept. of Labor and Industry's rules on the use of interns to verify that its plan will be in compliance. See: <http://lni.wa.gov/WorkplaceRights/files/UnpaidInternshipsFactSheet.pdf> as a starting point.

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.