

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## Individual Comment Form



<b>Lead Entity:</b>	Island County
<b>Project Number:</b>	15-1048
<b>Project Name:</b>	Camano Island State Park Lagoon Reconnection
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	Skagit River System Cooperative
<b>Grant Manager:</b>	Mike Ramsey

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status<sup>1</sup></b>
Post-Application	9/23/15	<b>NMI</b>
Final	10/27/15	<b>Clear</b>

### PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

This project is intended to evaluate potential actions and develop preliminary designs for restoring access for juvenile Chinook and other salmonids to pocket estuary habitat at Camano Island State Park in a manner consistent with natural habitat processes and the recreational and educational uses of the park envisioned by Washington State Parks staff and citizen user groups.

### FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 10/27/15

**Final Project Status:** Clear

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

- 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 Panel appreciates the response of the project sponsor with respect to identification of opportunities to stop work if the assessment information identified issues that creates a low likelihood of providing a sustainable design. Please post a rough analysis to PRISM identifying the approximate financial percent complete at each of those points in the process.

### POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 9/23/15

**Project Status:** NMI

**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:**
- 2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:**
- 3. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:**
- 4. General comments:**

More information is needed to understand whether the proposed sequence of work allows for the opportunity to stop work if assessment information identifies an issue that creates a low likelihood of providing a sustainable design that provides beneficial restored fish access in a configuration that does not conflict with other park uses (notably boat ramp and parking). The sponsor identifies that if a reasonable approach to implement a sustainable project (specifically regarding the sediment transport and the boat ramp with respect to the inlet to the nearshore area) cannot be identified, that the effort to develop a design(s) for the project will not move forward. As a further detail, the review

<sup>1</sup> 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



panel would like clarification on the decision point and follow-up actions should a sustainable implementation solution not be identified. Specifically, at what point (\*level of design) would the efforts be stopped, and what portion of funds would be returned if the design portion of the proposal were not completed?



### 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:** April 8, 2015

**Project Site Visit?**

Yes  No

**Review Panel Member(s):** Schlenger and O'Neal

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

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

The proposal needs to be updated to the 2015 outline.

**3. General Comments:**

The project was proposed in 2014 and the sponsor addressed the issues identified during that review. The proposed restoration includes social and technical challenges that will be examined. From an ecological perspective, it appears to be a particularly challenging site to provide a sustainable tidal inlet, especially if located updrift (south) of the boat ramp which requires active maintenance by State Parks (2 times per week in summer, three buckets per day in the winter) to remove sediment. The 3D hydrodynamic model evaluates the ability of the channel to remain clear, based on estimated width of outlet channel. Connection to estuary is on the border of being able to move all the sediment away from the opening, except for the largest group of the sediment sizes. Design could affect the ability to remain connected. Outreach component of the project is targeted at working with coastal engineer and any conflicts to existing uses and ways to improve access.

Additional clarity should be added to the proposal in terms of the relationship of this effort with other efforts (such as wetland mitigation) in the Park that are planned in the near future. Access to structures such as the boathouse should be defined and described as one of the design criteria for the preliminary designs to ensure long term access to this park feature. Also, including further details of the crossing through which freshwater would connect with the marsh area once it is opened.

Is there a way to reconstruct the boat ramp to allow for sediment transport underneath it to reduce both the cost of maintenance and the risk of channel blocking?

**Staff Comments:**

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



As the RP members noted above, please submit your Salmon Project Proposal (narrative) on the 2015 template, which is located in Manual 18, Appendix C: [http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual\\_18.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual_18.pdf)



## SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

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.