|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit  | *6/16/11* | No | NMI |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/6/2011 |  |  |
| Post Application | 8/2011 |  |  |
| Final |  |  |  |
| Status Options |
| NMI | Need More Information |
| POC | Project of Concern (Post Application and Final only) |
| FLAGGED | Needs full panel discussion |
| CLEAR | Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process.  |

Lead Entity: San Juan

Project Number: 11-1572A

Project Name: President Channel Shoreline

Project Sponsor: San Juan County Land Bank

Grant Manager: Mike Ramsey

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: 6/21/11

Panel Member(s) Name: Tom Slocum and Jim Brennan

**Early Project Status:**

Project Site Visit? Yes (6/16/11)

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

The sponsor proposes to acquire fee simple title to a 20-acre property on the northwest coast of Orcas Island. The land is primarily forested upland with about 1200 feet of steep, rocky shoreline and two or three small “pocket beaches.” The site is bordered by WDNR land to the south and a protected private parcel to the north.

The application needs to demonstrate the specific benefits to salmon recovery that acquisition of the site will produce and the specific threats to salmon habitat and/or habitat-forming processes that the acquisition will prevent. While the site’s location on the northwest coast of Orcas Island is in general a high priority protection area identified in the WRIA 2 strategy, it does not appear that residential development at the site under current zoning levels would result in a particularly heavy negative impact to salmon habitat and habitat-forming processes. There are no feeder bluffs in the area and the removal of a relatively few view trees, as is common practice for residential development, would not appear to significantly impact nearshore habitat. While it is obvious that acquisition of the site would support the sponsor’s aesthetic and public recreation land preservation goals, the sponsor needs to clearly link the proposed acquisition’s value for supporting specific salmon protection objectives.

The property is zoned R-20 allowing for 1 residential unit. While this is low density, the property is narrow and steep and we have no idea how the site might be developed. While some homeowners do develop their properties in a sensitive manner, there are just as many who do not. Certainly, there would have to be a driveway running north to south close to the shoreline. In addition, a house with a large footprint (10,000 – 20,000 ft2 would be entirely possible), coupled with a guest house and large lawn could have significant impacts on the shoreline. In fact the developed properties to the north are perfect examples of how this type of property could be altered. Aerials of these properties are attached.

Given the clear linkage between juvenile salmon and terrestrial food sources, clearing of this site would certainly decrease terrestrial invertebrate populations. Additionally, run-off from a lawn maintained with fertilizer and pesticide inputs and from a driveway could be significant sources of marine contamination. Non-point source pollution is described as the number one threat to the health of Puget Sound.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

In the final application, please provide the standard evaluation proposal and supplemental information for acquisitions, as outlined in Manual 18.

3. Comments/Questions:

## EARLY APPLICATION Review/Site VISIT - lead entity & project sponsor responses

**Directions:** Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manager an e-mail.

All Flagged and NMI projects will be reviewed at the July 6th full Review Panel meeting. Sponsor responses received no later than one week prior to the meeting will be considered by the Review Panel.

Response:
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# JULY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Early Project Status:**

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

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

## JuLY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - lead entity & project sponsor responses

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

#  Post Application - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Application Project Status:**

Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “Why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

1. Is this a draft project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No)

Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments:

## Post application - lead entity & project sponsor responses

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Final Project Status:**

Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “Why” box, explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

1. Is this a project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No)

Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments: