

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Hood Canal Coordinating Council
Project Number:	15-1190
Project Name:	Duckabush River Estuary Restoration Planning
Project Sponsor:	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
Grant Manager:	Mike Ramsey

	Date	Status¹
Post-Application	9/23/15	POC
Final	10/27/15	Clear

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

The Natal Estuary of the Duckabush River has been altered by the Highway 101 causeway which separates the lower floodplain from existing estuarine marshes and the channel outflow of the Duckabush River. The Highway 101 causeway was constructed in 1934 and resulted in the disconnection of numerous distributary channels in the upper estuary and aggradation of the north Duckabush River Channel. This project includes feasibility, modeling and preliminary design of the Highway 101 causeway removal and reconnection of the north channel of the Duckabush River to the mainstem along with a study of the feasibility of property acquisitions in the lower Duckabush River floodplain. Specific Action from the Issues and Actions Framework include Transportation Infrastructure modification, Channel Rehabilitation, Topographic Restoration, Riparian Restoration, Berm and Dike Removal and Protection.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 10/27/15

Final Project Status: Clear

Review Panel Member(s): Full Review Panel

- 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:**

POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 9/23/15

Project Status: POC

Review Panel Member(s): Full Panel Review

- 1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:**
16. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project
- 2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:**
The methodology has been identified as inadequate due to the lack of coordination with WSDOT. WSDOT needs to be a project sponsor or major partner that is committed to being engaged in the proposed feasibility work given the bridge work involved in the restoration. Otherwise the feasibility work cannot be expected to lead to acceptance by WSDOT. WSDOT has their own process for planning and programming transportation projects and this feasibility study would need to be integrated into that process. This will be a complex site for planning,

¹ CLEAR: Cleared to proceed; CONDITIONED: Cleared to proceed with a condition; NMI: Needs More Information; POC: Project of Concern; NOTEWORTHY: Exemplary Project

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



design and construction due to traffic levels, lack of a detour route, the status of the bridge as a Historic Highway Bridge registered with the National Register of Historic Places, multiple landowner and other sensitive environmental and cultural resources in the project area and will be competing with all other transportation priorities for funding.

The sponsor is encouraged to engage with WSDOT Olympic Region Engineering and Environmental managers and leadership levels that can provide any available information WSDOT has on this area, the bridge and causeway structures, and how the project concept fits into the regional transportation plan. WSDOT managers need to also be engaged to make decisions throughout the restoration planning process. This step is critical to initiate prior to funding request approval.

Additional information is also needed on the anticipated funding strategy for the project. The site is one of three Tier 1 priorities for the Corps and WDFW's Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project. While it is not required for the restoration to be conducted in partnership with the Corps, if Corps federal funding is needed to complete the project then they are another agency that needs to be involved from the start. If a decision about Corps involvement is planned for a later time, then there is the risk that the proposed feasibility work will be of limited use. This is because the Corps would need to be involved in the feasibility study.

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



SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

If your project is not cleared (i.e. has a status of NMI, Conditioned, or POC) you must update your proposal, PRISM questions, or attachments as necessary to address the review panel's comments. Use track changes when updating your proposal. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.

DRAFT APPLICATION / SITE VISIT REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: May 18, 2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes **No**

Review Panel Member(s): Paul Schlenger and Michelle Cramer

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

Given the high construction cost that would be associated with the proposed restoration elements, additional justification on the benefits to salmon is warranted. More information is needed on how the proposed project elements will achieve the stated goals. Please provide additional information on how adult and juvenile salmon utilize the habitats in the Duckabush estuary and how the proposed restoration elements address an impairment to salmon habitat.

Please provide the conceptual graphics used in site visit discussion to help understand what the vision is.

Task A includes a feasibility study to remove the US 101 causeway. How does the proposed feasibility study build-on the PSNERP feasibility and conceptual design or is different than the existing PSNERP document?

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Is there an opportunity to restore the apparent distributary channel near the intersection of Hwy 101 and Duckabush Rd? It appears that even a slight adjustment of that intersection could provide space to restore that channel and create some separation between the channel and the road.

Additional information is needed on the activities and deliverable outputs included in each task. Please explain how each component of feasibility and design will be conducted and reported on. Will each entail developing and evaluating multiple alternatives to then select a preferred alternative? Conceptual level cost estimates would be helpful to include in the feasibility studies. More detail is needed on what each task entails. It would be helpful to have a summary document covering all feasibility study tasks that describes the recommended alternatives and next steps, as well as a sequencing or phasing plan (i.e., which items need to happen before others or could occur concurrently).

Related to the above comments, more information is needed on the cost estimate. What is included in each line item listed in the budget? For example, what is the \$74,560 data collection and how does it fit in to the feasibility and design analyses? Additional justification is needed for the inclusion of project management and project administrative costs of \$83,015. It would be helpful to understand the costs associated with each task separately.

Please clarify the anticipated role and level of participation that WSDOT will commit to for the project. How does this affect the certainty of WSDOT being a willing landowner to support the proposed causeway correction? Clarify the plan for stakeholder involvement – who, how, and how often during project? WDFW is a major landowner and needs to be formally contacted to initiate the restoration pathway procedure and obtain the necessary approvals and clarification of the agency’s role in this project. Coordination with landowner objectives is key to a successful project. Please explain your coordination approach with WDFW and other stakeholders. In particular, coordination with state and tribal shellfish managers is very important as the tidelands support a recreational and tribal shellfish area of great importance.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. General Comments:

The proposed feasibility and design work is for a different alignment than previous concepts developed as part of the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP) General Investigation. The PSNERP designs are for an alignment that is unworkable due to excessive construction costs.

The funding decision from ESRP will be decided before the final application is submitted. If the match is not secured, the sponsor will either reduce the project scope or identify another source for match.

The objectives listed in section 3B of the application are not the project’s objectives; rather they are a list of tasks/scope of work. Objectives should support and refine the goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions and should be “SMART”: **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**elevant, and **T**ime-bound. Some examples of goals and objectives are in Manual 18, page 90.

4. Staff Comments:



SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



Revise your project proposals using “track changes” and update any relevant PRISM questions and attachments. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.