# Salmon Recovery Funding Board
# Individual Comment Form

| | |
|---|---|
| **Lead Entity:** | WRIA 6 |
| **Project Number:** | 11-1076 |
| **Project Name:** | Iverson Marsh Restoration Feasibilty |
| **Project Sponsor:** | Island Co. Health Dept. |
| **Grant Manager:** | Mike Ramsey |

| | Date | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Draft Application Review/Site Visit | 4/8/14 | **Reviewed** |
| Post Application | 9/22/14 | **NMI** |
| Final | 10/22/14 | **Clear** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Early Application Status Option** | |
| **REVIEWED** | SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments. |
| **Post-Application & Final Status Options** | |
| **NMI** | Need More Information |
| **POC** | Project of Concern |
| **CONDITIONED** | SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions |
| **CLEAR** | Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process |

## PROJECT SUMMARY

This project will follow up on a 2001 feasibility study by evaluating three key issues related to the overall goal of restoring tidal connection and juvenile Chinook rearing access into the approximately 100-acre Iverson Marsh area, a historic salt marsh that was diked and drained for farming by early settlers. The three issues that will be addressed are 1) determining the elevation and extent of surface water inundation under various tidal reconnection scenarios, 2) evaluating impacts of "salt water intrusion" resulting from tidal reconnection, and 3) contacting adjacent private landowners to try to generate support for a tidal reconnection project.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Individual Comment Form

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## DRAFT APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 4/10/14

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Slocum and Powers

**Early Project Status:** ☒ Reviewed

**Project Site Visit?** ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

The project site has long been recognized as having the potential to greatly expand Chinook rearing habitat for fish migrating from the Skagit, Stillagaumish and Snohomish rivers. The three issues that are the focus of the current proposal are relevant ones to consider at this stage of project development.

The proposal would be strengthened by elaborating in more detail on the scope of the three studies and who will be responsible for doing them. In the experience of the review panel, the budget allocation for the surface water inundation and salt water intrusion studies is inadequate to hire a qualified engineering consulting firm to complete them. If the work will instead be completed in-house by Island County staff, please provide more detail on staff's experience and how they propose to do them. We recommend that the sponsor contact other project sponsors who have attempted restoration designs of similar scale and with similar development constraints in the local area, including WDFW (Lecque Marsh and Fir Island Farms restoration projects) the Stillaguamish Tribe (Matterand property restoration), Skagit River System Cooperative (Wiley Slough) and Whidbey Island Conservation District (Crescent Harbor and Dugualla Lagoon) for insights and experiences.

The focus of the "salt water intrusion study" should not be limited solely to salt water intrusion, but to the more general issue of impacts to drainage and water table. This is particularly important with respect to impacts on drain fields and basements that may be present at the houses along the beach. The $12,000 that is allocated to study this complex technical issue does not appear to be adequate, except at a very preliminary, screening level. Please also provide more detail on the proposed scope of work for the surface water/flooding modeling study.

At this stage, the landowner outreach task seems to be the most critical one in terms of deciding whether to move forward with more in-depth engineering design. It is critical to actively contact all "stakeholders" whose interests could conceivably be affected by the project (and not just the ones who responded favorably to the initial survey). Stakeholders include not only the owners of the beach front lots, but also the users of the county park. We recommend that the sponsor contact WDFW staff (for example, Mr. Brian Williams at the LaConner office) for advice on how to plan an effective public consultation program for a potentially controversial project like this one.

We also recommend a phased approach to the design, working first with existing information to inform the landowners and try to reach concensus on which alternatives to model. Likely for the modeling to be effective decisions will need to be made about channel excavation and dike setback. These should be included in the model.

2. **Missing Pre-application information.**

3. **Comments/Questions:**

4. **Staff Comments:**
   The application has been submitted and all SRFB requirements for funding eligibility have been met. Regardless, the applicant can make refinements to the project prior to the August 15, application deadline.

## EARLY APPLICATION REVIEW AND SITE VISIT – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

**Directions:** **By the final application due date**, applicants must revise their project proposals using "track changes" and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the section at the end of the project proposal which asks how you responded to the review panel's comments.

**Special Note:** To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD "track changes" and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

## POST APPLICATION – REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 9/22/14

**Review Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Application Project Status:** **NMI**

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, what changes would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?**

3. **If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:**

4. **How could this project be further improved?**

5. **Other comments:**
   The revisions to the project scope are consistent with recommendations that were provided during the initial review, but the sponsor should document its specific responses to the comments on the application form, per the requirements in Manual 18.

## POST APPLICATION – LEAD ENTITY AND PROJECT SPONSOR RESPONSES

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board
# Individual Comment Form

**Directions**: All projects will be reviewed at the September 22-25 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2014. **By October 15**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals. Please "accept" all current track changes in the project proposal so you are starting with a clean proposal. Then please turn track changes back on when you make new changes. This step will save time and focus the reviewers on the changes.

In addition, please fill out the section at the end of the project proposal which asks how you responded to the review panel's comments.

## FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 10/22/14

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Final Project Status:** **Clear**

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 review comments have been adequately addressed.