

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Snohomish
Project Number:	15-1199
Project Name:	Middle Pilchuck LWD Design
Project Sponsor:	Wild Fish Conservancy
Grant Manager:	Elizabeth Butler

	Date	Status ¹
Post-Application	10/1/2015	Conditioned
Final	10/21/15	Conditioned

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

This proposal is to develop permit level designs for 5-8 Engineered Log Jams in the Middle Pilchuck River. The goal of the project is to restore the historic floodplain processes and function in the treatment reach. Although habitat in this reach of the river is degraded, there is still a high concentration of chinook spawning, and ELJs, which encourage complex flow patterns and pool formation, will improve rearing habitat in the reach. ELJs will be designed to persist through high water events and to encourage scour patterns that will direct flow away from actively eroding un-vegetated banks, which will be planted through a co-occurring CREP installation. This project area has received several other SRFB grants including design and restoration (07-1714, 09-1282, and 11-1263).

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 10/21/15

Final Project Status: Conditioned

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 sponsor accepted the condition but will increase the budget slightly to allow for additional review. Please confirm the requested budget increase with the lead entity.

POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 10/1/2015

Project Status: Conditioned

Review Panel Member(s): Full Review Panel

- 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:**

The review panel remains concerned about a proposal in this dynamic and evolving reach of the Pilchuck River where several SRFB projects have already been funded and have failed. The review panel recognizes the importance

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



of the reach for providing habitat for adult and juvenile Chinook salmon. As such the project is Conditioned as follows:

The scope of work shall be amended to include the completion of a draft Restoration Feasibility Assessment report as part of initial conceptual design and hydraulic modeling tasks. This report shall be submitted to the review panel for approval prior to spending any project funding on the preliminary design tasks. The deliverables of both the Feasibility Assessment and Preliminary Design tasks shall meet the requirements in Manual 18 Appendix D-1 and D-2, respectively.

The scope of the Feasibility Assessment report shall include, but is not limited to:

- Description of reach scale geomorphic processes including rate of lateral channel migration and expected channel trajectory. The study reach shall extend sufficiently upstream and downstream of the proposed project site to provide an accurate understanding of the geomorphic context affecting the project.
- Description of site-specific known habitat use by adults for spawning, and holding, and juveniles for rearing and refuge.
- Candid evaluation of land use and infrastructure constraints to process-based restoration.
- A list of clearly articulated goals and quantifiable S.M.A.R.T objectives.
- A range of potential restoration alternatives that would meet the stated objectives. These alternatives should expand upon the proposal's state objective of installing 5 to 8 ELJs to include other methods of restoring habitat forming natural processes (including allowing for natural channel migration) in the project reach. The report must document the input that the consulted agencies (WDNR, WDFW and others as appropriate in) provide in the evaluation of these alternatives.
- The selection of a preferred alternative, based on the objective evaluation of relevant criteria for ensuring benefit to salmon and certainty of successful implementation. The criteria must include, among others, minimization of adverse impacts to the existing salmonid utilization of the project reach.

The Review Panel requires 30 days to review and provide comments on deliverables, and this timeframe should be taken into account during project schedule development.

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:

This project area has received several other SRFB grants including design and restoration (07-1714, 09-1282, and 11-1263); the site is experiencing active lateral channel migration and right bank bar building and hillslope failure that has unraveled the previous restoration attempts. While the site is an important area to provide improved juvenile rearing habitat quantity, diversity and complexity that is proximal to known spawning

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



locations, the location and bank stabilization approach is also problematic because of the prior history of failed restoration projects, and a lack of acknowledgement by prior sponsors of the dynamic nature of floodplain processes. Would the overall certainty and benefit of the conceptual approach be improved by working to reconnect nearby off-channel opportunities that might be less susceptible to being eliminated by active channel migration? The proposal would be strengthened by proposing a holistic project that addressed potential off-channel juvenile rearing opportunities that limited large wood to habitat structures as opposed to bank stabilization structures that would arrest lateral channel migration.

The final application would be strengthened by including a detailed deconstruction of and lessons learned from the past restoration attempts. Ideally, this would include an analysis of such key issues as the rate of channel migration, the potential for continued migration based on typical radius of curvature and reach, site scale upstream and downstream geologic controls (including the impact of the 1930s era cross valley dike), the required scale at which ELJs would be needed to affect the project goal, and the realistic likelihood for success for continued intervention at this location. We acknowledge that lack of a funding for this kind of analysis may make it unfeasible, but given the the unsuccessful outcome of the three previous SRFB grants at this location, without this kind of information the review panel lacks confidence in the certainty of successful implementation for the present proposal. We would be more supportive of a feasibility approach that investigated options that DNR and permitting agencies would support, and focused not on design of a specific project, but on identification of constraints and opportunities after a thorough examination of past restoration attempts, and a gap-analysis to focus future design-related baseline data and avoid duplication.

The sponsor needs to clarify the level of design intended by the phrase “permit level” that will be provided as deliverables – please see Manual 18 Appendix D which provides a list of deliverables for each of the typical design options: Conceptual, Preliminary (commonly used for permit submittal), and Final Design Deliverables, and Construction and Design-Build Deliverables.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. General Comments:

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.