

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## Individual Comment Form



<b>Lead Entity:</b>	Island County
<b>Project Number:</b>	15-1049
<b>Project Name:</b>	Iverson Preserve Stakeholder Integration
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	Island County Dept. of Natural Resources
<b>Grant Manager:</b>	Mike Ramsey

	Date	Status <sup>1</sup>
Post-Application		
Final	9/23/15	Clear

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

This project will build upon the two previous feasibility studies (circa 2001) for the Iverson Marsh to further address the feasibility of restoring intertidal marsh at Iverson Marsh. The project area is approximately 120 acres and consists of 3,200 linear feet of shoreline with one hundred acres currently diked, drained and farmed for hay. It is located on the western edge of Livingston Bay on Camano Island, and in WRIA 6 High Priority Geographic Area 1 (ICSRP 2005, p. 27). The 2001 feasibility studies included restoration alternatives and recommended that additional studies ensue to evaluate potential flood hazard risks to neighboring properties from proposed restoration actions. The main goal of this project is to integrate the stakeholder’s concerns into an acceptable restoration alternative. Island County is interested in balancing the community’s concerns with improving habitat for listed species and water quality. Staff will facilitate neighborhood/stakeholder meetings to work with existing plans and information from feasibility studies to inform the landowners to reach a consensus on alternatives to model and evaluate risks, and to and explain the site restoration benefits to advancing habitat restoration at Iverson Preserve.

### FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:** 9/23/15

**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:

### POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date:**

**Project Status:** Click to choose a status

**Review Panel Member(s):**

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:



### SPONSOR RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS:

<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



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.**

The project advances restoration planning at a strategic location to increase the availability of juvenile Chinook salmon rearing habitat.

Please clarify the project deliverables and how each aspect of the outreach, research, and analysis will be documented. Since this is a project that may take time to develop, it will be particularly helpful to document the input received during the landowner discussions.

The proposal schedule describes a sequence of 1) conducting saltwater intrusion and flood risk analysis, 2) landowner outreach, and 3) conceptual design. Please provide more information on the activities included in the conceptual design task and what the outcome will be. Often conceptual designs are prepared to inform an alternatives analysis being conducted at the same time. Since the proposal does not include an alternatives analysis, it is not clear why such a substantial budget is included for the conceptual design task. Will multiple conceptual designs be advanced or just one?

Consider the option of moving the parking access to the roadway entrance to the community as part of the analysis. This option may help reduce the disturbance to the neighborhood and also expand the options for restoration in the marsh area.

Please clarify what the flood risk analysis task entails and the expected deliverable and outputs that it will contribute to discussions with landowners and future restoration. During the site visit, it was mentioned that FEMA recently completed a flood mapping analysis. What portions, if any, of the FEMA work are at an applicable level of detail and resolution to support the proposed analysis? The 2001 feasibility study by PWA described a lack of topographic data for the residential area. Will that be included in this task?

Provide more information on documented fish use in the accessible portion of the marsh. Also, the relative benefits of the self-regulating tide gates are documented in research by Beamer et. al and others. Please provide information on the benefits of the self regulating tide gate as compared to the current tide gate.

The 2001 feasibility study by PWA reports 20 acres of Spartina in the outer marsh area. Please describe the current extent of Spartina on the site.

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

**3. General Comments:**

# Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



## Staff Comments:



### 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.