Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Individual Comment Form

Lead Entity:	Island County
Project Number:	15-1072
Project Name:	Greenbank Marsh Restoration Issues Assessment
Project Sponsor:	Whidbey Island Conservation District
Grant Manager:	Mike Ramsey

	Date	Status[1]
Post-Application		
Final	9/23/15	**Clear**

PROJECT SUMMARY (*for Review Panel reference only*)

This project is focused on evaluation of land use issues and site conditions related to implementation of restoration of the Greenbank Marsh system. The project sponsor was contacted by the local home owners association to help them identify and refine concepts for restoration to aid in stakeholder outreach. Additional studies are also proposed to inform the concepts.

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:

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

[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

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 proposal is well thought out and organized and the detail on the budget was helpful to reviewers. Areas where more information would be helpful include:

1) Any site specific or comparable information on the level of spawning and rearing habitat along the shoreline. Information from comparable sites nearby was mentioned at the site visit. It would be helpful to include this information in the application. Is there information available on the fish community in the creek system and wetland? There is an impoundment on the adjacent upland parcel. Are there fish planted in that pond?
2) More detail on the scope of the studies (e.g. cultural surveys, sediment transport dynamics) to be performed and the associated analysis. There was mention at the site visit that the effects of the project would include upstream changes to the marsh habitat under North Bluff Road, but it was not specified in the application whether the studies would include those areas. Reviewers would recommend identifying the current conditions in those areas as well if they are expected to be affected by the project.
3) Specifically for sediment transport dynamics, please identify the approach to be used to assess conditions at the site and the budget associated with that approach.
4) Provide additional information on the drainage problems referenced in the proposal. Are the problems on both sides of North Bluff Road and on both sides of the driveway to the boat ramp?

The proposal and conceptual alternatives from 2013 study focus on restoring estuarine habitat waterward of North Bluff Road; however, much of the historic marsh is inland of the road. The review panel recommends that the scope of the assessment include expanding the restoration to improve the hydraulic connection under the road and restore estuarine habitat in a larger portion of the historic footprint. In this way, the solution to improve drainage waterward of the road should evaluate future conditions assuming the existing 30" culvert under the road remains as well as with a wider opening allowing more hydraulic connectivity and suitable conditions for fish passage.

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

3. **General Comments:**

We appreciate and recognize the willingness of the home owners association to support this project, and the early ground work that has been done to move the project forward.

4. **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.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Individual Comment Form