

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity: Pend Oreille

Project Number: 11-1511

Project Name: Indian Creek Fish Passage Design

Project Sponsor: Pend Oreille County

Grant Manager: Dave Caudill

Lead Entity	Date	Application Complete	Status
Early App. Review-Site Visit	6/22/2011	NO	NMI
July Review Panel Mtg.	7/6/2011		
Post Application	8/2011		
Final			
Status Options			
NMI	Need More Information		
POC	Project of Concern (Post)		
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process.		

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW/SITE VISIT - REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 7/7/2011

Panel Member(s) Name: Kelley Jorgensen and Steve Toth

Early Project Status: NMI

Project Site Visit? No

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

The Level B Assessment Report appears to contain an erroneous value for the Bed 1 Elevation for the cross-section at the downstream control. If necessary, please update the results of the calculation. Also, please clarify the discrepancy in the bankfull width measurements between the Level A and B assessments. What was the protocol for determining bankfull width measurements?

In the final application, please describe at what flows on the Pend Oreille River does the culvert on Indian Creek backwater? What time of year is the culvert a barrier compared to local fish run/use timing?

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

We would like to reiterate comments provided by the 2010 SRFB Review Panel:

...Construction of a bridge at the site will be an expensive project involving acquisition of additional county road right of way, raising and re-aligning the road grade, and mitigation of wetland impacts caused by the re-alignment.

Because the likely high cost of the eventual project construction will demand a careful assessment of the relative benefit to the WRIA 62 program of recovering local bull trout and cutthroat trout habitat, the review panel recommends that the sponsor re-check the Level B fish passage barrier assessment to ensure that it accurately reflects the real situation at the site. During the site visit, the review panel did not see any evidence of channel scour and, to

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



the contrary saw plenty of stable, medium size gravel in the culvert and creek bed. The sponsor reported that Indian Creek is a spring-fed system whose flow is fairly consistent throughout the year. Furthermore, high flows are usually accompanied by a rise in the stage of the Pend Oreille River, which typically backwaters the creek immediately below the culvert.

These observations suggest that the very high velocity calculation in the Level B analysis may not accurately reflect actual conditions at the site, and thus the relative barrier to fish passage may be exaggerated. The proposal would be strengthened by presenting a more robust hydrologic and hydraulic engineering evaluation of the likely flow velocities in the culvert during typical bull trout migration periods, taking into consideration observations of actual typical stream flow conditions. The evaluation should include a discussion of the extent that the existing culvert actually does inhibit upstream fish passage for the target species, including data on actual bull trout and cutthroat trout utilization of the upstream habitat, if available.

EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW/SITE VISIT - LEAD ENTITY & PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manager an e-mail.

All Flagged and NMI projects will be reviewed at the July 6th full Review Panel meeting. Sponsor responses received no later than one week prior to the meeting will be considered by the Review Panel.

Response:

*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.
Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

JULY 6TH REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

Early Project Status:

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.
2. Missing Pre-application information.
3. Comments/Questions:

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



JULY 6TH REVIEW PANEL MEETING - LEAD ENTITY & PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:

*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.
Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

POST APPLICATION - REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

Application Project Status:

Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “Why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

1. Is this a draft project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No)

Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments:

POST APPLICATION - LEAD ENTITY & PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:

*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.
Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



Final Project Status:

Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “Why” box, explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

1. Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No)

Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments: