Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee LE
Project Number:	15-1226
Project Name:	Deschutes RM 33 LWD Design
Project Sponsor:	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group
Grant Manager:	Kat Moore

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

PROJECT SUMMARY (*for Review Panel reference only*)

This project seeks to create preliminary designs to restore the aquatic habitats on approximately 1,500 linear feet of river channel in the reach by increasing the amount of large woody debris, re-establishing native riparian forest and creating in-stream complexity. A conceptual design, funded with a grant from the Squaxin Tribe, addresses the lack of LWD, particularly stable log jams. This project will advance those conceptual plans to preliminary stage, while continuing to see landowner input in the design process. While bank erosion is certainly a natural process within the Deschutes River, erosion rates within the project site have clearly been exaggerated by clearing of riparian forests. The addition of stable log jams in this reach would diminish fine sediment loading to the river as well as Capitol Lake, and can be accomplished in a way that improves both aquatic and riparian habitat by introducing complex roughness elements along the bank that simulate natural LWM and logjams. Once banks are stabilized, riparian planting can commence with a far greater chance of success.

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:

[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

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: June 11, 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:**
   The site's location in the river, the current conditions, and the opportunity to work with an important new landowner make this a very promising project. Additional information is needed to clarify how the 2014 Concept Design Report contributes to the proposed preliminary design work. During the site visit, it was described that the 2014 report provided some initial ideas for a portion of the project site, but the design techniques to advance had not been decided upon. The review panel recommends that, if acceptable to the landowner, the project site extend upstream from the decommissioned road and include the left bank side channel and additional upstream mainstem habitat. It is recommended that geomorphological considerations inform the establishment of the river reach to include in the project. This geomorphic analysis and additional project length would presumably require additional budget than preliminarily requested. The review panel finds that these additional considerations are important for the project to achieve its objectives and take advantage of the apparent opportunity with the landowner.

   The lack of connection with the floodplain and potential high shear stress along the right bank near the (Figure 2-8) road should be considered in the context of risk to the success of habitat structures. In developing the design technique along the decommissioned road, carefully consider the potential channel incision. Since the river bank is high in that area, there is typically very high shear stress along that bank which means is will be difficult to secure LWD.

   Clarify the initial project steps (i.e., pre-design) to go from the 2014 report to an actual design approach that will be advanced to the preliminary design stage.

   Provide more detail in the budget. Make clear what analysis is included and how much it costs.

   Provide more information in the proposal on the self-ballasted LWD. Specifically, the core providing ballast is described as stream bed cobbles or other dense material. Clarify that it will be stream cobbles or provide more information on what the other dense materials may be. Provide available information on the anticipated longevity of the self-ballasted LWD vs natural LWD. Are there site examples where the material has been used and information on performance is available? Photos would be helpful.

2. **Missing Pre-application information:**

3. **General Comments:**
   This is an excellent location for a large wood structure project. The sponsor is commended for engaging a new major landowner in the basin.

4. **Staff Comments:**

Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Individual Comment Form

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.