# Salmon Recovery Funding Board
# Individual Comment Form

| | |
|---|---|
| **Lead Entity:** | San Juan |
| **Project Number:** | 15-1288 |
| **Project Name:** | Mud Bay Sucia Island Salt Marsh Restoration |
| **Project Sponsor:** | Friends of the San Juans |
| **Grant Manager:** | Mike Ramsey |

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

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

This project will complete a preliminary engineering design for removing road fill, rock revetment and a culvert from a 2.2 acre salt marsh on State Parks property in order to restore connectivity with natural tidal processes. The design work will also include preliminary plans for capital and operational improvements to accommodate the changes that will result from removing the access road.

## 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:** None
**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.

[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

WASHINGTON STATE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
Salmon Recovery Funding Board

## DRAFT APPLICATION / SITE VISIT REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

**Date: June 3, 2015** **Project Site Visit?** ☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**
**Review Panel Member(s): Paul Schlenger and Tom Slocum**

1. **Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria:**
   The conceptual approach to this project is technically sound and seems likely to result in substantial benefit for restoring nearshore habitat. Providing more detail in the scope of work for some items such as the proposed ground water study would make the proposal clearer. The present plan for leaving the central ditch as-is deserves further evaluation: comparison of natural "reference sites" and similar marsh hydrology restoration projects indicates that linear ditches take a very long time to naturalize themselves. Filling the ditch, at least partially, and planting the surface with native vegetation would probably result in more natural hydrology patterns. In this vein, it would be beneficial if the geomorphic assessment attempted to determine the likely original configuration of the marsh outlet (i.e. through the beach berm), since it most likely was not dead center down the axis of the marsh, as it is now.

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

Provide partner contribution and landowner acknowledgement forms from Parks if they aren't already in PRISM.

Clarify in the proposal budget that the work is to 70% design, not final design.

3. **General Comments:**

The ability to remove the road is a key element of the potential benefits of the project because it is crucial to the restoration of natural overwash of the beach berm and the restored connection of the marsh. We urge the sponsor to make sure that the focus and priorities of the design work is on the ecological restoration component of the project and not on the capital and operational improvements. Parks has its own engineering and permitting staff whose job it is to plan, design and permit improvements, and these resources should be fully integrated into the project scope, rather than overly relying on outside consultants for basic tasks. Likewise, it will be very important to negotiate a written plan with parks management to commit its maintenance staff to supporting the restoration work, even to the point of performing small adjustments, repairs, maintenance of plantings, etc. in the first few years after construction. To date there have been several SRFB-funded nearshore restoration projects at State Parks, and we encourage the sponsor to contact the sponsors of these other projects for detailed discussions of "lessons learned."

**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.