

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	North Olympic Peninsula
Project Number:	15-1045
Project Name:	Beach Lake Acquisition and Restoration
Project Sponsor:	Coastal Watershed Institute
Grant Manager:	Kat Moore

	Date	Status¹
Post-Application	9/30/15	POC
Final	10/27/15	Clear

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

This proposed acquisition and restoration project will acquire a 27-acre property with 870 feet of Strait of Juan de Fuca shoreline near the mouth of the Elwha River. The project site has experienced significant erosion as a result of sediment starvation over the past 100 years associated with the former dams. Approximately 870 feet of failed armor now litter the intertidal shoreline in front of the parcel. Despite sediment made available by dam removal, no deposition of sediment has been observed on the armored beaches. The strategic timing of the acquisition of this parcel enables a significant restoration potential to remove armor and better enable this shoreline to retain sediments made available by dam removal and support habitat-sustaining nearshore sediment transport processes. Further, the site contains Beach Lake, a relict channel of the Elwha river (an ~8- acre wetland complex that is primarily open water and forested wetland and occasionally a pocket estuary). Twenty acres of the parcel and all structures are in the mapped 100 year floodway, offering an excellent opportunity to restore additional wetland acreage. There are approximately 9 structures, one tennis court and several septic which will be removed from sensitive wetland buffers to restore dynamic natural processes to nearshore and wetland habitats that support ESA-listed salmon and forage fish.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 10/27/15

Final Project Status: Clear

Review Panel Member(s): 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:**

The project sponsor has addressed the previous Review Panel concerns regarding project costs and the scope of the assessment work and is cleared to proceed with the proposed project.

POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 10/1/15

Project Status: POC

Review Panel Member(s): Review Panel

- 1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:**

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



4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor failed to justify the costs to the satisfaction of the review panel.

2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:

The grant request for acquisition costs would need to be reduced to be more proportional to the 15% of the property with direct benefits for ESA-listed salmon and steelhead. The proposed assessment and design elements would also need to be removed. The project sponsor has not sufficiently justified the need for these assessments to support the removal of failed rock armoring along the shoreline. Addressing the eroded rock along the shoreline should not require extensive hydraulic analysis since it does not affect flood risk and is no longer serving as bank armoring. The project should be relatively straightforward and require minimal assessment work to support development of permit applications and to implement rock removal.

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: April 6, 2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes **No**

Review Panel Member(s): Steve Toth and Michelle 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:**

This proposed project would acquire 27 acres of land with 870 feet of shoreline and develop preliminary designs for restoration activities. Most of the proposed acquisition is upland with little direct benefit to fish habitat. In the past, the SRFB Review Panel has proposed that grant requests for acquisitions be proportional to the amount of benefit to fish. The current grant request is for approximately 33% of the total acquisition cost. In this case, the shoreline area and a marine riparian buffer of 200 feet (about 4 acres or 15% of the total acquisition) might be a more appropriate area to consider for fish benefit.

The primary concern for the Review Panel will be the costs of the project relative to the benefits provided for threatened salmon, steelhead, and bull trout. Any benefits to fish will only be realized with the removal of large angular rock from the failed armoring along the shoreline- yet the \$500,000 grant request from the SRFB only pays for land acquisition and design. Moreover, the benefits of removing the shoreline rock are significantly reduced by the presence of large and extensive shoreline armoring on the property to the south. Please justify the costs of \$165,000 to complete the preliminary design for restoration work. Again, the benefits to fish are primarily from the proposed shoreline rock removal, which should require only minimal design and engineering work.

Finally, the connection between the remaining rock along the shoreline and lack of sediment deposition on the beach is tenuous. Since the site is along the outskirts of recent sediment deposition from Elwha dam removal, more time may simply be needed to observe sediment accumulation along this portion of the shoreline. The recent

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



erosion noted along the shoreline may just reflect the loss of armoring, rather than a situation that prevents cross-beach deposition of sediment.

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.