

ASRP Project Review Notes

Project Name	NF Newaukum Lawson Reach Design and Implementation
Project Sponsor	Lewis CD
Project Type	Reach Scale/Multiple small scale

RIT Recommendation: Advance to TRT

TRT Recommendation: Advance to SC

SC Recommendation: Advance to CBS Board

Step 1: RIT Review

RIT Review Date: 2/15/2024

**Are there any modifications to the project required before advancing?
Please specify below.**

Click here to enter text. State if this project needs to return to the RIT to verify these modifications prior to advancement, or if the project sponsor will make these changes independently.

**Should the project sponsor consult or present to any other groups
before advancing?**

Click here to enter text. For example, the RIT might require input from the Technical Review Team or the Technical Advisory Group. The RIT might recommend that a local strategy proposal involves an additional presentation to the Steering Committee to better establish context.

RIT discussion to be shared with TRT:

- Question- how will Freshwater Mussels be addressed?
 - Mussel presence will be determined from snorkel surveys.
- Question- how will you cross stream?
 - A temporary bridge will be brought in during summer low flow.

- Could be nearby CREP parcel- please note this on context map

RIT discussion to be shared with SC:

- Fish life salvage will be handled by HPA

Other summarized notes from RIT review, if any:

Step 2: TRT Review

TRT Review Date: 3/18/2024

Are there any modifications to the project required before advancing?
Please specify below.

No- project is at concept stage

Should the project sponsor consult or present to any other groups
before advancing?

Not before advancing, but project team should start conversations with public landowners such as WA DOT.

Expectations for next project milestone (design, implementation, etc.)

- Next milestone would be Preliminary BoD report review.
- Basis of design report should incorporate latest research conducted by DFW and the ASRP TAG
- Discussion of near- and long-term probability of achieving project goals
 - EG, channel length, riparian buffer width, number and quality of summer holding pools, erosion reduction.
 - Justification for why side channel creation won't result in overall reduction in channel length.
 - Consider replacing channel spanning log jam in site 2 with apex/deflector jam.
- Baseline habitat data needs to be collected (if not already), tabulated, and associated with each site's design on a map.
- On designs, map what kind of habitat will be created where (spawning, rearing, adult holding), and connect to limiting factors.

- Whenever possible, quantify limiting factor goals (example, increase amount of cover above X threshold by y year)
- Quantify expected progress towards limiting factor goals created by project actions.
 - For example, while water temperature is identified as a limiting factor, it is not clear that enough new riparian habitat is being created to result in a significant reduction in water temperature.
- Speak to how project actions could benefit mussels

TRT discussion to be shared with Sponsor:

- Is there an opportunity on the downstream side to work with WA DOT and increase the scale of the project? WA DOT has a large property with intact riparian, but could use more large wood
- What opportunity is there to expand some of the riparian buffer into the pastureland? Especially, would be very beneficial to connect to wide buffer just downstream of site 2.

TRT discussion to be shared with SC:

- Likely the best that can be done at this stage given landowner constraints. This could serve as a demonstration project and result in more of a reach-scale project.
- Project could create more holding pools, a limiting factor with a recreational nexus

Other summarized notes from TRT discussion, if any:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Step 3: SC Review

SC review date(s): 3/20/2024

SC discussion notes specific to the project:

General support for the TRT's request to evaluate near-term and long-term benefits and risks, as well as justification for why those risks might be acceptable.

SC questions, clarifications, or requests for the project sponsor:

Interest in quantitative data that can speak to return on investment in terms of invasive treatment and planting helping with landowner connections. What is the likelihood of getting more landowners involved on this reach, from this project?

- Response from sponsor: Very likely to get more interested landowners in this reach- some others already are interested but need concept designs. Most landowners are motivated by erosion issues.

SC questions or clarifications sought from TRT:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Special conditions, milestones, or modifications requested by SC:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Other discussion notes or flags raised for more program-level discussion needed:

Future projects of this scale could include monitoring in the budget.