

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Mason Conservation District
Project Number:	15-1107
Project Name:	West Oakland Bay Restoration and Conservation
Project Sponsor:	Squaxin Island Tribe
Grant Manager:	Kay Caromile

	Date	Status¹
Post-Application		
Final	9/23/15	Clear

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

This project consists of 4 components of restoration, planning and conservation in the Goldsborough Creek estuary in Oakland Bay, South Puget Sound. The restoration component of the project consists of two related projects designed to rebuild lost salt marsh habitat.

Component 1 : Construction of up to 14 engineered logjams at the mouth of Goldsborough Creek designed to capture sediment to rebuild the creek mouth;

Component 2 : As phase one of a multiphase project we will enhance the estuary and tidelands by removing a 1/4 mile dike and importing bed material to create intertidal benches/shelves at appropriate elevations to allow for natural vegetation that will mesh with the creek mouth project;

Component 3 : A planning project will produce a final design for the removal of a bulkhead on Port of Shelton property on the north shore of the harbor. In a future phase we will reconfigure the shoreline to a more natural slope designed to fit with the Component 2 Shelton Harbor project;

Component 4: This consists of a fee simple conservation acquisition of 14 acres of High Priority habitat on Eagle Point in Shelton Harbor. The property of interest includes 2 acres of freshwater wetland, 4 acres of tideland, 8 acres of riparian upland and 1600 feet of marine shoreline.

All restoration will occur in areas rated as High Priority by the WRIA 14 technical committee and Enhance High Priority by PSNERP. This project is expected to benefit Chinook, coho and chum salmon as well as cutthroat and steelhead trout.

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 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



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

Date: May 21, 2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes No

Review Panel Member(s): Schlenger and Cramer

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria:
2. Missing Pre-application information:
3. General Comments:

The project is largely unchanged from a project reviewed in 2014. The exception is that the 2015 application includes the partial removal of a dike from the south shoreline of Goldsborough Creek.

The Component 2 restoration entails importing a substantial quantity of material. Describe the sources of material and how sequencing/stockpiling may proceed to complete the work. Describe the anticipated funding approach for completing subsequent phase(s). If no future phases of work are constructed or if construction is delayed, how does that affect the performance of the portion proposed in this phase? Have hydrodynamics and coastal processes been analyzed to assess the sustainability of this phase as a standalone project? If so, please provide that information.

Explain the Component 2 phasing approach. Did you consider starting with the West Lobe marsh construction along the eastern shoreline of the mill site? Does the proposed redevelopment of the mill site provide an opportunity to access the West Lobe from upland which could make construction easier? Would constructing the West Lobe portion first provide additional delta stability and elevation that would allow for a lesser number of ELJs in Component 1 while still achieving the objectives?

Describe the construction techniques anticipated for delivering and grading the Component 2 materials.

The removal of the dike has been added to the design and a revised design set will be needed. The dike removal is not included in the cost estimate. Will that removal be funded separately? How does the dike presence or absence affect the design, analysis, and anticipated performance of Component 2? How have working waterfront operations been incorporated into the concept?

Explain how removal of the dike affects the ELJ placement in Component 1. Will the design be adjusted to account for this change? If not, please provide a justification. Could the Component 2 work focus instead on the

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



proposed marsh area along the mill's shoreline? Would this reduce the need for 14 ELJs at the mouth of the creek?

Provide an updated parcel map showing land ownership of the parcels included in each component of the project.

4. Staff Comments:

When we met, you described how the individual phases would be prioritized if you didn't receive funding to complete all the phases. Please be sure to include that information in your proposal.

Please revise 4A of the project description to clarify that dike removal is part of this project. In the restoration metrics, please check off "dike or berm modification/removal" and fill in the metrics.

Please be sure to address all comments I provided when I reviewed the application in May (if you haven't already done so), along with completing all other final application requirements listed in Section 3 of RCO Manual 18 http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual_18.pdf. All changes to your proposal should be made using "Track Changes" in Word.



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.