



Contact Information

2024 Upper Columbia Regional Project Pre-Application

* Pre-applications due March 11, 2024 (COB)

*Complete applications due in PRISM April 19, 2024 (COB)

*Revised proposals due in PRISM May 24, 2024 (COB)

*Final revised applications due in PRISM June 24, 2024 (noon)

Project Title	Peshastin Creek RM 8.8 Preliminary Design
Sponsor	Chelan County Natural Resources Department
Primary Contact	Mike Kane
E-Mail Address	kanenaturalresources@gmail.com

Budget Request

Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

Anticipated Request - SRFB (standard round) 206928

Anticipated Request - Tributary Committee 206927

Anticipated Other Funding 768,587

Anticipated TOTAL Budget 1,182,442

Other Funding Source(s)

BOR WaterSMART Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Projects

Project Location

Briefly describe the location of the project

The project is located from the confluence of Ingalls Creek with Peshastin Creek downstream to the bridge to Valley High. About RM 8.8 on Peshastin Creek.

Latitude (decimal degrees) 47.280451

Longitude (decimal degrees) -120.392923

Project subbasin Wenatchee

Wenatchee Assessment Unit(s) Lower Peshastin Creek

Does the proposed project span multiple assessment units? No

Reach(es) Name Lower Peshastin 08

Identify the reach(es) priority/ reach ranking. Note: If the project involves work in multiple reaches, select "Multiple" and include details in the text box that will appear below. Please reference the Prioritization Web Map: <https://prioritization.ucsrb.org/>.

Rank 1

Project Information

1. What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into small steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). Note: This exact question is included in the PRISM application. Example format: The project seeks to address [specify limiting factor(s)] for [limiting life stage(s)] by [specific actions proposed] to create an estimated [include specific target metrics, as described below] upon implementation in [estimated year].

Objectives at implementation are to connect the straightened section of Peshastin Creek with the historic channel to create a 0.8 mile long side channel or split-flow channel. This project has multiple benefits including addressing a lack of spawning habitat for Steelhead and Chinook in lower Peshastin Creek, reducing stream warming by developing the historic channel into a well-vegetated channel during low summer flows and adding 0.8 miles of juvenile rearing and adult spawning habitat. Current project goals are to develop a new conceptual design for the site that is based on stakeholder feedback on previous design efforts. SRFB funding is to cover Conceptual Designs while BOR WaterSMART funding is to cover Preliminary Designs. This includes minimizing disturbance to the existing mature vegetation in the historic channel, current landowner use of the site, US 97 requirements and changes in limiting factors.

2. What species will the project benefit?

Spring Chinook

Steelhead

Bull Trout

3. Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics

Design, Monitoring or Assessment

4. Does this project already exist in Salmon Recovery Portal or PRISM?

Yes

5. Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or other process(es)?

Please explain which process(es) and how this proposal differs from the previous submission (e.g., different phase, modified scope, etc.)

An alternatives analysis and conceptual design was funded and completed in 2016 (12-1447). In that alternatives analysis, we selected a full-reconnection alternative to identify what issues and opportunities existed on the site. One of the main constraints at the time was the overall construction cost ~\$17 million. Additionally, due to existing channel constraints, significant excavation and disruption of the historic channel canopy would have to occur to accommodate that design. CCNRD continued working on the site with stakeholders and completed a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment in 2019. The results were that no issues were found as part of that process. The main difference between the current proposal and the previous, is that the new proposed alternative builds on past efforts and better fits within the stakeholder concerns, is less expensive and better addresses the limiting factors in this reach. Additionally, the project now has BOR WaterSMART funding secured.

6. What category is the project?

If applicable, what is the secondary project category?

Is the project eligible for Riparian Funding?

Design and Restoration Proposals

7. What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?

8. Is your project within a completed (or soon-to-be completed) Reach Assessment or other type of assessment (e.g., Rapid Site Assessment, other)?

9. Which limiting factors does the project propose to address?

10. Which life stages will the proposed project address?

Spawning and Incubation

Summer Rearing

Winter Rearing

11. Freshwater Benefits - Describe how your project will improve survival, capacity and/or distribution for target species at the reach scale?

The project will add 0.8 miles of stream corridor habitat by reconnecting the historic mainstem channel as essentially a split flow channel. With this will greatly increase juvenile habitat capacity in a stream where historic straightening has vastly reduced capacity. This split flow condition will also improve habitat conditions in the existing straightened channel and allow for development of a more diverse substrate, improved edge habitat conditions and allow for development of a mature riparian canopy in what is currently an exposed steep boulder dominated channel.

These changes will provide improved refuge habitat during high and low flows, increasing survival for juvenile and adult fish.

Distribution of spawning for steelhead and spring chinook will increase with the flow changes in the split channel as well. Currently there is no spring chinook or steelhead spawning in the .8 mile straightened reach, but post implementation spawning for steelhead will be improved in both channels and improved in one of the channels for spring Chinook (low flow).

Peshastin Creek is an important stream for wild Steelhead recovery and potentially an opportunity for increasing spring Chinook spawning.

The project is just downstream of two important tributaries for Bull Trout, so has potential to provide important habitat for BT life stages as well.

Additional wildlife benefits could be realized with this project as bridges across the stream could be designed to also function as wildlife under-crossings.

12. Temporal Effect - Briefly describe how and to what extent the project would promote natural stream/watershed process consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?

The project will help spread out flows over portions of the historic floodplain and create peripheral or side channel habitat, but will not allow complete restoration of natural stream processes.

The presence of US 97 running down the middle of the valley and a portion of the historic channel and floodplain will keep the site from becoming a full restoration. The split flow condition will allow a much greater geomorphic stability and work with the watershed scale efforts to restore habitat in this system. Riparian shading for low flows will be improved in the split flow condition, regardless of which channel is selected for the low flow thread. By splitting flows, restoration of shoreline vegetation will be improved in the existing channel, and existing vegetation in ground water inputs in the historic channel will contribute to maintaining cooler water temperatures.

13. Temporal Effect - How long will it take for the project to achieve its intended response?

1-10 years

14. Temporal Effect - How long will the restoration action and its benefits persist?

50+ years

15. Temporal Effect - What level and/or interval of maintenance is anticipated? What is the plan for any anticipated maintenance?

Since this is a design phase of the project, there is not yet a plan for anticipated maintenance.

Full project implementation would include re-routing sections of the stream corridor and extensive riparian planting, so a detailed monitoring and maintenance plan would be developed at a later design stage and annual maintenance would be expected for 3-5 years post construction to address plantings and possible channel adjustments.

16. Methods - Briefly describe the potential (for design) or proposed restoration methods and how they will achieve project objectives.

CCNRD has continued to meet with stakeholders (most recently with WSDOT) and will continue to do

so throughout the design process. In addition, a consulting engineer with relevant experience will be hired to develop the design as part of a design team. The design team will also review limiting factors in the reach along with WDFW and the UCRTT, including looking more closely at temperatures and spawning for chinook and steelhead. The design team will include input from stakeholders/partners, including private landowners and WSDOT.

Assessment Proposals

Protection Proposals

Monitoring Proposals

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. What is the landownership?

WSDOT ownership and ROW, private holdings including a gravel mine.

2. Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project?

Yes

Please explain

CCNRD has worked with landowners in this reach since 2015 and ownership has not changed much. Permission has been granted to complete the initial work on this site and to continue with the current effort. Most significantly, the current effort reflects important feedback from landowner coordination.

3. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if/how they could affect the project

Landowner requirements will be determined as part of the design process. One issue that was previously identified was the need for a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment and that has been completed. The main requirements are focused on continued operation of US 97 without compromising integrity and continued access to the private owned parcels. A private gravel mine operates adjacent to the project, so assumptions are for that continued use at this time.

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?

There is no anticipated issues for other landowners or recreational users. There is limited kayaking of this stretch during spring flows, so we will reach out to the whitewater community as part of our project outreach.

5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

Chelan County Natural Resources will be managing the development of the design and will continue to collaborate with partners. Since this is the design phase, there will be no required management and maintenance by current landowners. Post-implementation, WSDOT would be managing the bridges and CCNRD would have short-term responsibility to maintain restoration sites. All landowners would be required to not remove any structures, plantings or other project components as part of final landowner agreements.

6. Are other projects being proposed immediately upstream or downstream of worksite?

No

7. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

The overall project will be expensive and has risks inherent in large bridge construction to

accommodate highway traffic.

There are only a few landowners directly affected, including WSDOT and almost no residential development in the immediate vicinity, so risks are limited in that sense.

8. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

Yes, CCNRD will host their watershed community outreach meetings during the design process and after implementation. The project does build on community support for salmon recovery efforts and responds to community members previous questions as to when we were planning to do work in Peshastin Creek.

9. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

This proposal is a good investment of public funds because it supports salmon recovery and would add climate resiliency to the highway system by increasing the available floodplain/channel for flood flow conveyance. There are very few projects in the Wenatchee basin that add a 0.8 miles of stream length, so this is an excellent investment for increasing overall capacity.

10. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.

CCNRD has a long history of partnering with WSDOT on habitat projects in the Wenatchee basin and recently met with them to discuss this project and others. They have also provided feedback during previous design efforts.

CCNRD also has a long-standing partnership with US Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and they have provided project support for previous phases of this project and are providing topobathy LiDAR for this phase. BOR WaterSMART has committed to funding 65% of this design phase.

The HCP Tributary Committee and Salmon Recovery Funding Board have provided initial funding for earlier phases in scoping and design for this project.

Optional Section - Preparation for PRISM

The following questions are identical to the questions RCO requires in the PRISM application. If desired, sponsors can complete associated questions early and copy responses into PRISM during the "Complete Application" phase due on April 19, 2024.

Do you want to review and/or pre-populate PRISM questions?

No

Supporting Documents

[Upper Columbia Process Guide 2024](#)

[SRFB Manual 18 \(2024\)](#)

[RCO Application Resources \(2024\)](#)