

Project Number	15-1288
Project Name	Mud Bay, Sucia Island Salt Marsh Restoration - Preliminary Design
Sponsor	Friends of the San Juans

Memo to the SJC TAG and SRFB Review Team:

Thank you for your time reviewing this project and for your thoughtful suggestions. We have taken a few steps to address your concerns and adjust for new information we have received.

Washington State Parks involvement: Washington State Parks staff have been very helpful with multiple education and restoration activities that Friends of the San Juans has been pursuing on Sucia Island's shores, including supporting a pilot volunteer rock removal project from the documented surf smelt spawning beach in Fossil Bay. To date, all of the many staff members who are part of the Mud Bay Salt Marsh Restoration project have been providing their time in kind. Parks staff has also provided in kind transportation to the site multiple times. To augment the parks landowner forms and description of parks roles provided with the draft application materials in May, additional Project Partner Forms have also been secured from State Parks staff. These partner forms outline specifically what their project tasks will be along with expected in kind support. These have been uploaded into PRISM.

Sea water intrusion/fresh water well analysis: To ensure that there is no risk of sea water intrusion into the freshwater wells from the preferred full restoration option, we have decided to complete the groundwater/well analysis with current funding from our existing SRFB Restoration Cultivation grant. The results of this study will be completed before October 2015 and allow us to be confident of the feasibility of full restoration prior to final grant approval and any project contracting. The budget has been adjusted to accommodate this change.

Cultural resources review: WA State Parks has requested that we include funds for the participation of their cultural resources staff. Drayton Archeology will work with the WA State Park's archeologist to ensure that existing cultural resources will be protected from proposed restoration activities. The budget has been adjusted to accommodate this change resulting in an overall slight increase in the total expected project budget.

Tidal channel configuration: We have added investigation of historic and reference tide channels and expanded planning and preliminary design attention to the restoration designer's scope of work. In addition, the project's planned physical survey work (pre, as built and year one) has been clarified to include standard channel as well as beach features (channel area, slope, width, density). The budget has been increased slightly to accommodate this change.

Fish use assessment: In addition to the planned pre, as built and post project physical surveys and forage fish spawning habitat assessment surveys, we have added assessment of fish utilization of the tidal channel to our preliminary design grant. We anticipate doing this using a combination of pole net, minnow trap sampling and underwater video (go pro camera in upper channel, person walks channel upstream moving fish past camera) within the channel multiple times during the preliminary design grant. We also plan to use underwater video and fyke netting to document fish use in the channel following restoration implementation; this post project monitoring is not included in the current design proposal but we wanted to be clear that we do intend to monitor fish use. The budget has been increased slightly to accommodate this change.

We considered included beach seining of nearshore fish utilization in the marine waters of Mud Bay but are not planning to embark on this effort for the following reasons: 1) would need budget disproportionate to the scale of the funding request to implement a sampling regime adequate enough to provide meaningful information; 2) seine results would not be expected to influence project design or proposed work (full restoration alternative via road, culvert and armor removal) and thus might be considered unnecessary research by the SRFB review panel; and finally 3) restoration not expected to significantly alter fish utilization in the marine nearshore environments of Mud Bay, but in the marsh/channel.