

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	West Sound
Project Number:	15-1076
Project Name:	Port Orchard Pass Phase I: Feasibility and Design
Project Sponsor:	Bainbridge Island Land Trust
Grant Manager:	Elizabeth Butler

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

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

Bainbridge Island Land Trust proposes to complete feasibility work and a final design to restore 575 lineal feet of shoreline and 9 acres of associated riparian acres along Agate Passage to include removing bulkheads, intertidal fill, a house, and other structures. This design project is Phase I of a multiphased project. Phase II will be land acquisition and construction of the restoration design to permanently protect the property from future development. The overall property is comprised of over 39 acres on Bainbridge Island in which Trust for Public Land and Bainbridge Island Land Trust are pursuing a purchase for future habitat, open space and public access use, and to restore a segment of the shoreline, which, when combined with other nondeveloped shoreline in this reach of Port Orchard Pass, would result in more than one half mile of contiguous unarmored shoreline. The completion of the design will take into account shoreline processes, cultural resources, geotechnical analysis, hydrology (there are wetlands and seeps/streams), and topography. Additionally, the examination of the best course of action to remove/demolish structures on the property will take place. Costs estimates for the implementation of restoration actions will be created and permitting will begin, allowing for the project to be ready for future grant submittals for Phase II.

Fisheries benefit includes restoring beach habitat for pre spawner herring, smelt, sand lance and improving a rearing and migration corridor for juvenile chinook.

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

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



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

Date: April 22, 2015

Project Site Visit?

Yes No

Review Panel Member(s): Schlenger and Powers

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria.

As described in the proposal, the potential acquisition and restoration provides an opportunity to connect two intact stretches of shoreline to create one extended stretch of high functioning habitat. We recommend that the restoration feasibility focus on the shoreline, specifically on the armoring, fill, and invasive vegetation. This shoreline focus would appear to require a lower level of effort than proposed. Given the site and setting, our initial recommendation is to focus on the removal of shoreline armoring and fill that does not potentially affect the stability of the house.

The rock armoring and fill that extends furthest into the intertidal zone is in two locations that are separate from the house location. Despite extending into the intertidal zone, there is abundant gravel moving past the site and it appears that the most significant impacts from the structures are the loss of an area of intertidal habitat and the disconnection of feeder bluffs, rather than a groinlike impact impeding sediment transport along the beach.

The removal of the house and associated concrete bulkhead would provide some benefits, but the costs may not be commensurate with the benefits for fish. The concrete bulkhead in front of the house is located higher on the beach and therefore results in less loss of beach habitat. The sponsor is encouraged to consider restoration options in this portion such that the house remains and the concrete bulkhead is replaced using alternative shoreline stabilization techniques and materials. WDFW's Marine Shoreline Design Guidance (2014) is a good resource for informing the identification of such options.

The cost estimate includes a wetlands delineation, geotechnical analysis, and hazardous materials analysis. The notes describe the wetlands delineation as donated, but it is included in the funding request. Please clarify the funding request for the wetland delineation. Related to this, the level of effort for assessments appears high so please clarify the assessments proposed and associated budget for each element.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. General Comments:

At the time of the site visit, the sequencing was described such that the agreement to purchase the property is expected to occur prior to the deadline for the final SRFB application; therefore, if a purchase agreement cannot be reached then

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Individual Comment Form



no final application will be submitted. If the agreement is not in place and negotiations are ongoing, please include an update in the final application.

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.