

Project #17-1420, MF Newaukum Fish Passage_SiteID 021(45011)(07070)

Current Status: Application Submitted

Project Details

Primary Sponsor: Lewis County

Primary Contact: Ann Weckback
(360) 740-1440
ann.weckback@lewiscountywa.gov

Funding Program: FBRB Watershed Pathway

Project Type: Restoration

Project Description

1. This is a fish passage restoration project aimed at replacing a fish passage barrier with a stream simulation designed crossing.
2. This crossing is located on the Middle Fork Newaukum River on Middle Fork Rd in Lewis County.
3. The overall goal to be achieved is to remove a 33% passable fish passage barrier and replace with a stream simulation designed crossing that will allow for fish passage at all life stages and geomorphic connectivity.
4. Habitat upstream consists mainly of high quality rearing habitat with small reaches of suitable spawning gravels. Much of the habitat upstream consists of forested wetlands that are known to be highly productive for coho rearing.
5. This project will benefit steelhead, coho, lamprey, resident trout, and searun cutthroat trout.
6. The completion of this project will open approximately 2.5 miles of suitable spawning and rearing habitat. This will potentially increase fishing opportunities in the future.

Project Overall Metrics (Outcomes, Benefits)

Category / Work Type / Metric

Application Answer

Sponsor Match: Match Certification Credit

Select the type of Match Certification you are applying for (attach required form and materials to your application) Another fish passage barrier removal within the same watershed

Watershed Pathway Priority Watershed

Select the priority watershed the proposed project is located Washington Coastal – Newaukum River

Completion Date

Projected date of completion 10/31/2019

Sponsor Match: Monetary Funding

Amount of other monetary funding (A.12) \$0.00

Source of other monetary funding (A.12.a) N/A

Timing of other monetary funding N/A

Sponsor Match: Donated Un-paid Labor (volunteers)

Value of Donated Unpaid Labor (Volunteers) (A.13.a.2) \$0.00

Source of Donated Un-paid labor contributions (A.13.a.4) N/A

Sponsor Match: Donated Paid Labor

Value of Donated Paid Labor (A.13.b.1) \$0.00

Source of Donated Paid Contributions (A.13.b.2) N/A

Sponsor Match: Other In-kind Contributions

Value of Other In-Kind Contributions (A.13.c.1) \$0.00

Source of Other In-Kind Contributions (A.13.c.3) N/A

Description of other In-Kind contributions (A.13.c.2) N/A

Project Funding

Funding Request		Funding %	Min Match Required
FBRB Watershed Pathway (FY2018)	\$525,000	100.00 %	
Total Project Funding	\$525,000	100.00 %	
Project Cost Summary			
RESTORATION COSTS			
Restoration	\$404,875		
A&E	\$120,125	29.67 %	\$121,463 (30%)
Subtotal	\$525,000	100.00 %	
Total Cost Estimate	\$525,000	100.00 %	

Worksites and Properties

General Area: Newaukum River, Lewis County, WA

County: Lewis

Legislative Districts 2012: 20

Congressional Districts 2012: 03

Salmon Recovery Regions: Coastal

DNR Watershed Units (WAU): NEWAUKUM, MF

4th Field Catalog Units (HUC): Upper Chehalis

WRIA: Upper Chehalis

Sections: 20

Township: T13NR01E

Coordinates: 46.60166341
-122.70778306

Worksite #1: Middle Fork Rd x Middle Fork Newaukum River

Coordinates from Mapped Point:

Latitude: 46.60166341

Longitude: -122.70778306

Coordinates from Worksite

Latitude:

Longitude:

Directions:

Worksite Description: Lewis County proposed to replace an existing 7 ft x 5 ft corrugated metal squash pipe, located at MP 7.07 on Middle Fork Road, on the Middle Fork Newaukum River. This culvert was calculated to be only 33 percent passable due to high velocity flows. The culvert is ranked 119th for replacement within the Chehalis Basin according to the Middle Chehalis Basin Watershed Culvert Assessment, dated December 2003. Replacement of this culvert is anticipated to restore immediate year-round access to 2.78 miles of potential habitat; 10.64 miles of habitat one upstream seasonal barriers are replaced.

Site Access Directions: From I-5 take the WA-508 E exit, EXIT 71, toward Napavine/Onalaska. Turn east onto WA-508/Forest Napavine Rd W. Continue to follow WA-508 for 8.5 miles. Turn left onto Carlisle Avenue which will become Degler Road. Continue on Degler Rd 1 mile. Turn right onto Middle Fork Road. Continue on Middle Fork Road 0.5 miles. Your destination is at the culvert at MP 7.07.

Worksite Address:

Restoration Metrics (Outcomes, Benefits)

Category / Work Type / Metric	Application Answer	Work Type Costs
Targeted salmonid ESU/DPS (A.23)	Coho Salmon-Southwest Washington ESU, Steelhead-Southwest Washington/Washington Coast DPS	
Targeted species (non-ESU species)	Cutthroat, Rainbow, Searun Cutthroat	
Project Identified In a Plan or Watershed Assessment (C.0.c)	The culvert is ranked 119th for replacement within the Chehalis Basin according to the Middle Chehalis Basin Watershed Culvert Assessment, dated December 2003.	
Type Of Monitoring (C.0.d.1)	Implementation Monitoring	
Monitoring Location (C.0.d.2)	Onsite	
Fish Passage Improvement		
Number of blockages / impediments / barriers impeding passage (C.2.b.4)	1	
Type Of Barrier (C.2.b.3)	Culvert	
Miles Of Stream Made Accessible (C.2.b.1)	2.50	
Culvert installed or improved (C.2.f.1)		
Total cost for Culvert installed or improved		\$397,375.00
Miles of stream made accessible by culvert installation/repair (C.2.f.3)	2.78	
Number of culverts (C.2.f.2)	1	
Cultural Resources		
Cultural resources		
Total cost for Cultural resources		\$5,000.00
Acres surveyed for cultural resources	1.00	
Permits		
Obtain permits		
Total cost to Obtain permits		\$2,500.00
Number of permits required for implementation of project	4	
Architectural & Engineering		
Architectural & Engineering (A&E)		
Total cost for Architectural & Engineering (A&E)		\$120,125.00

Restoration Questions

1 of 6 Is the worksite(s) located within an existing park, wildlife refuge, natural area preserve, or other recreation or habitat site? If yes, name the area

and specify if the land is owned by local, state or federal government.
No

- 2 of 6 Cultural Resources: What is the current land use of the site? Has there been ground disturbances historically, if so, what are/were those disturbances? Is there any fill where ground disturbance is proposed? If known, how deep is the fill? The answer to this question will be used in cultural resource consultation so please provide detailed information.**
The crossing is currently within a County road right of way which has existed since 1931. It is estimated that previous ground disturbance in the area was limited to the roadway prism. The area surrounding the culvert within the roadway appears to have been previously disturbed, fill is anticipated to exist to a depth of 13 ft from the top of the roadway surface.
- 3 of 6 Cultural Resources: Has the worksite been investigated for historical, archeological, or cultural resources? If yes, when did this occur and what agencies and tribes were consulted? Attach related documents (letters, surveys, agreements, etc.) to your project in PRISM.**
No, This worksite has not been investigated for historical, archaeological or cultural resources, however, the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation GIS dataset provided to the County February 7, 2017, was used to determine the potential for sites occurring within the vicinity of the proposed project. There are no documented archaeological sites within a 1 mile radius of the of the culvert proposed for replacement. While there are numerous potential historical structures within 1 mile of the proposed culvert replacement none are within the APE and none are anticipated to be impacted by the proposed project.
- 4 of 6 Cultural Resources: Describe any proposed ground disturbing activities that will take place as part of your project. This includes work conducted by hand or mechanized tools. Provide specific information including length, width, and depth of the ground disturbance. Ground disturbing work includes all restoration activities, geotech, fencing, demolition, etc. Avoid subjective phrases such as "ground disturbing activities will be minor".**
It is anticipated that for the design portion of the project test pits will be hand dug for wetland delineation. Test pits will be no more than 2 feet in diameter and 30 inches deep. Geotechnical borings will also be excavated. Geotechnical borings are anticipated to be six inches and in diameters and 15 to 35 feet deep. Construction of the proposed culvert replacement will require a wider footprint as the culvert will be upsized from A 5 X 7 squash pipe to a box culvert with a minimum 24 ft span. It is anticipated that streamwork may require excavation approximately 2-feet below the existing bed.
- 5 of 6 Cultural Resources: Are there any structures existing on the property (including tidegates, dikes, residential structures, bridges, rail grades, etc.)? If so, please list all existing structures. Indicate if any of these structures will be altered or demolished as a result of the project, and provide the following for each structure that could be altered or demolished: identifying name, year constructed, year(s) remodeled/renovated. Attach at least one photo of each altered structure.**
Yes, The only structure on site is the existing 5'x7' corrugated metal squash pipe that is being replaced as part of this project. It is not known when the existing structure was placed.
- 6 of 6 Give street address or road name and mile post for this worksite if available.**
Middle Fork Road MP 7.07

Property for Middle Fork Rd x Middle Fork Newaukum River Worksite #1: Lewis Public Works

Activity: Restoration

Landowner

Lewis County Public Works
2025 NE Kresky Ave
Chehalis, WA 98532

Control and Tenure

Instrument Type: Landowner Agreement
Purchase Type:
Term Length: Fixed # of years (10 years)
Expiration Date: 03/31/2030
Note:

Landowner Type: Local Government

Overall Project Questions

- 1 of 5 Is the project on State Owned Aquatic Lands? Please contact the Washington State Department of Natural Resources to make a determination. (www.dnr.wa.gov/Publications/aqr_land_manager_map.pdf)**
No
- 2 of 5 Does your project address or accommodate the anticipated effects of climate change? If yes or maybe, please describe how.**
Yes, The proposed project will be designed to accommodate the anticipated bankfull width in 2099 by incorporating the projected 8 percent increase in bankfull width provided by the WDFW.
- 3 of 5 Is any part of the scope of work included in this application required as mitigation for another project or action or court injunction? E.g. FERC relicensing, Habitat Conservation Plan, legal settlement, culvert injunction, etc. If yes, explain:**
No
- 4 of 5 Provide the WDFW Site ID for the proposed culvert barrier correction worksite(s) or enter Unknown.**
021(45011)(07070)
- 5 of 5 When was the last barrier evaluation and downstream check conducted for the proposed barrier correction worksite(s)? Please provide an overview of the barrier evaluation and downstream check results (for example: The existing culvert was evaluated in 2014 and determined to be a 33% passable slope barrier. There are no barriers downstream.)**
The crossing was last evaluated in April of 2016 by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. The culvert was assessed to be a 33% passable velocity barrier, and a downstream check was also completed the same day with 0 downstream barriers identified. An upstream habitat survey and inventory was also completed.

Project Permits

Applied Received Expiration

Permit Type	Date	Date	Date	Permit Number
Cultural Assessment [Section 106]				
Hydraulics Project Approval [HPA]				
Nationwide Permit				
Water Quality Certification [Section 401]				

Permit Questions

- 1 of 3 **Will this project require a federal permit? If this project requires a federal permit, will the scope of that permit cover ALL proposed ground disturbing activities included in this project? You may need to request a pre-application meeting with the permitting agency to answer this question.**
 Yes, This project will require a US Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit 3 - Maintenance. All proposed ground disturbing activities will be included in the Section 106 consultation including any test pits dug for wetland delineations or boring for geotechnical analysis, if needed.
- 2 of 3 **Are you planning on using the federal permit streamlining process (Limit 8, www.rco.wa.gov/documents/fact_sheets/Permit_Streamlining_fact_sheet.pdf)?**
 No
- 3 of 3 **Are you planning on using the Fish Habitat Enhancement Project (FHEP) streamlining process (<http://apps.oria.wa.gov/permithandbook/permitdetail/112>)? If no, please let us know why.**
 Yes

Project Attachments

Required Attachments 7 out of 7 done

Applicant Resolution/Authorizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Barrier evaluation form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Cost Estimate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Landowner acknowledgement form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Map: Area of Potential Effect (APE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Map: Restoration Worksite	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Photo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Photos

Attachment Type	Title	Attach Date
Amendment request	Cost Increase Amendment Request 17-1420 MF Newaukum Site.pdf	03/19/2018
Applicant Resolution/Authorizations	Signed Application Authorization 3-12-18.pdf.pdf	03/14/2018
Barrier evaluation form	Appendix_E_BarrierEvaluationForm.doc.doc	12/19/2017
Certification of Applicant Match	Match Cert Credit Form_PRISM 17-1420 MF Newaukum Site ID 021.pdf	03/19/2018
Cost Estimate	SRFB_Cost_Estimate 1-23-18.xlsx.xlsx	01/24/2018
Map: Restoration Worksite	Worksite Restoration Map 1-24-18.pdf.pdf	01/29/2018
Match Certification Credit form and materials	Match Certification w attachments 3-8-18 (reduced).pdf.pdf	03/08/2018
Photo	021(45011)(07070)_2.JPG.jpg	12/19/2017
Photo	021(45011)(07070)_1.JPG.jpg	12/19/2017

Application Status

Application Due Date: 10/05/2017

Status	Status Date	Name	Notes
Application Submitted	03/28/2018	Josh Lambert	On behalf of sponsor
Preapplication	11/30/2017		

I certify that to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is true and correct. Further, all application requirements due on the application due date have been fully completed to the best of my ability. I understand that if this application is found to be incomplete, it will be rejected by RCO. I understand that I may be required to submit additional documents before evaluation or approval of this project and I agree to provide them. (Josh Lambert, 03/28/2018)