

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## Individual Comment Form



<b>Lead Entity:</b>	WRIA 1
<b>Project Number:</b>	15-1283
<b>Project Name:</b>	South Fork Phase 1 Nessett Restoration
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	Nooksack Indian Tribe
<b>Grant Manager:</b>	Marc Duboiski

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

The objective of the project are to place 21 log jams to: (1) increase key habitat quantity (number and depth of pools in low-flow channel, especially primary pools >1m residual depth); (2) increase habitat diversity (habitat unit diversity, quantity of complex woody cover in the low-flow channel; (4) increase availability of temperature refuges; and (5) reconnect disconnected floodplain and floodplain channels.

Anticipated project benefits in terms of increases in WRIA 1 habitat indicators for Phase 1:

- Length treated: 0.5 river miles
- Stable log jams: 21
- Number of pools formed in the near-term: 5 primary, 4 secondary
- Area of woody cover in wetted channel (current alignment): 153m<sup>2</sup>
- Number of temperature refuges: 6 in secondary channel
- Area of floodplain, length of floodplain channels reconnected: To be determined

### FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 9/23/15

**Final Project Status:** Clear

**Review Panel Member(s):** Full SRFB 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 project sponsor has addressed the previous Review Panel comments and is cleared to proceed.

<sup>1</sup> 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



### 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.

### DRAFT APPLICATION / SITE VISIT REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 6/4/2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes  No

Review Panel Member(s): Jennifer O'Neal and Steve Toth

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

Please include available information on spawning locations in the reach and current juvenile use of the habitat, especially information about current use of LWD.

Many of the structure designs rely on in river wood for racking on the key members. What is the current rate of wood transport in the system, and how long would it be before the structures were fully functional based on this rate?

Replanting native riparian forests is a key element of restoration plans. At the field visit the sponsor said that riparian reforestation is being done under a separate program. More information on the reforestation program would be helpful for assessing the benefit and certainty of this project.

There are some inconsistencies and lack of clarity between the project description and the text of the proposal regarding the number of proposed structures and the grading/excavation plans for reconnecting Rothenbuler Slough and/or other side channel areas. Please clarify the text on these issues. The budget includes \$50,000 for side channel excavation and gravel bar nourishment. Will these project elements be done?

#### 2. Missing Pre-application information.

RCO requires preliminary design documentation to be submitted prior to the final application deadline for construction projects with budgets over \$250,000. Please include the basis for design report from project 12-1511 with the final application for this project. Include a discussion of the dD hydraulic modeling that has been done and how it has informed the site of the various ELJs.

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



### 3. General Comments:

Past LWD structures have been installed at the site and should be included in the design drawings and planning discussions. How are those structures currently being used by both adult and juvenile Chinook, which are identified as the targets for this project (post emergence, over summer, and overwinter rearing)? If those jams are not providing the needed habita for fish, please justify the need for additional wood structures.

**Staff Comments:** As noted above, the preliminary design deliverables must be submitted with the final application on 8/14/15 to remain eligible for funding consideration (Manual #18, Restoration, page 12).



### 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.