

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	West Sound
Project Number:	15-1079
Project Name:	Crescent Creek Culvert Feasibility
Project Sponsor:	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group
Grant Manager:	Elizabeth Butler

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

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

The proposed project is to complete a feasibility study to replace the culvert at the mouth Crescent Creek. Crescent Creek enters Puget Sound in the northeast corner of Gig Harbor through an undersized culvert under 96th Street NW/Vernhardson Street. The culvert restricts tidal flow, inhibits fish passage at some tidal elevations (i.e., partial barrier), and fragments the estuary. The feasibility study would evaluate fish passage, tidal hydrology, and estuarine function to prescribe a design for a new structure to restore fish passage and tidal hydrology. This project was identified as a priority by the WRIA 15 Prioritization and Development project (062271) and would build upon restoration work recently complete on the other side of the Harbor on Donkey Creek.

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:

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.

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



DRAFT APPLICATION / SITE VISIT REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: April 8, 2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes No

Review Panel Member(s): Schlenger and Slocum

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

The proposed project is the right step to take to develop and evaluate alternatives for addressing the partial fish barrier created by the culvert. The feasibility study will efficiently provide useful information to evaluate how to best address the partial barrier created by the culvert. The approach would be strengthened by including an analysis/interpretation of sediment transport and deposition associated with each alternative evaluated. While a quantitative model is beyond what is planned in the study, an interpretation of the anticipated changes to the configuration of the upper and lower estuary resulting from each alternative would be informative in the selection of a preferred alternative.

The proposal states that increased turbidity levels have occurred due to channel instability and associated suspended sediment resulting from the estuary being perched above its historic elevation. What information is available to support this assertion?

Depending on the alternatives evaluated, there is the potential to impact shoreline landowners downstream of the crossing. This is a sensitive topic that could impact the ability to implement a project. Have adjacent landowners been contacted and will they be included in the stakeholder process? With this in mind, there may be a need for a higher level of effort than proposed to gain the necessary stakeholder and community input before selecting a preferred alternative.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

The proposal identifies a "preliminary design report" as a deliverable. Since the project does not include preliminary design, please rename this deliverable.

3. General Comments:

As a partial barrier in the estuary that only restricts fish passage when tides are below 7 feet MLLW, cost effectiveness of the alternatives developed and evaluated should be an important consideration. It is a potentially expensive project depending on the alternative selected relative to the fish and habitat benefits.

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.