|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit  | *6/16/11* | No | NMI |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/6/2011 |  | NMI |
| Post Application | 9/30/11 | No | POC |
| Final | 10/28/11 | No | POC |
| Final PSAR Review | 1/30/12 | Yes | Clear |
| 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: 11-1577A

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.

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: July 29, 2011

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

**Early Project Status: NMI**

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

The evaluation proposal asserts briefly that the kind of rocky shoreline / bull kelp habitat that characterizes the project site is important for salmon, but provides no documentation on how the site fits within WRIA 2’s overall salmon recovery strategy, or how ESA-listed salmonids actually utilize the shoreline at the site. SRFB funding has supported an in depth study of Chinook salmon utilization of WRIA 2 coastal waters, but the proposal does not mention how the Jolley site fits within the specific findings of this study, or why the acquisition of this particular site is necessary to protect specific high priority habitat conditions that are identified in this and other assessments of salmon ecology that have been completed in WRIA 2. The proposal’s general observation that coastal development tends to have a negative impact on the quality of natural habitat is not sufficiently strategic to demonstrate the benefit and certainty of the proposed project.

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: September 30, 2011

Panel Member(s) Name: Full Review Panel

**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) Yes

Why? Criteria #2 and #4, as explained in the July 29, 2011 comments listed above. The applicant did not address these comments.

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

The applicant must demonstrate the benefit of the project to supporting WRIA 2 salmon recovery goals.

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: 10/28/11

Panel Member(s) Name: Full Review Panel

**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) YES.

Why? Criteria #2, as explained in the comments listed above.

The project sponsor has not sufficiently addressed previous comments/concerns of the Review Panel. Specifically, the project sponsor has not provided adequate information to show a direct benefit to salmon, how the proposed acquisition provides such a benefit, and the potential threat to salmon if this property is not acquired. Since the arrangements for the full funding package haven’t yet been figured out, and the WRIA 2 strategy is still in flux pending completion of the "Pulling it all Together" project, we believe that the project is premature and at this time we cannot confidently assess the project's direct benefit to protecting high priority salmon habitat.

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:

The application materials are still incomplete: the application lacks responses to the “Supplemental Questions” for acquisition projects, which are listed in Section 7 of Manual 18.

# JANUARY 2012 REVIEW PANEL Comments IN CONSIDERATION OF 2012 PSAR FUNDING REQUEST

Date: 1/30/12

Panel Member(s) Name: Full Review Panel

**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) No.

Why?

Based on the updated project proposal submitted in January 2012, the proposed funding request is $250,000 to support the sponsor’s acquisition of the Jolley property along President’s Channel. This is a reduced funding request that approximately matches the value of a conservation easement for the property – which the current landowner is unwilling to allow.

The project sponsor and lead entity indicated that the area’s salmon prioritization project has drafted broad-scale priority areas which include the Jolley property. This prioritization is based on the shoreline’s likelihood of use by juvenile Chinook, juvenile forage fish, and adult forage fish.

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?

The sponsor describes future long-term stewardship of the property (question 3C in application) to include: “likely open the property to pedestrian and kayak access.” The Review Panel interprets this to mean no infrastructure (e.g., no roads, parking) and minimal disturbance (e.g., unpaved walking trail) to the property. If this interpretation is inconsistent with the sponsor’s intent, then further clarification by the sponsor is necessary.

4. Other comments:

This application is being reviewed in January because the LE and sponsor want to put the project forward for open-round PSAR funding at the April Board meeting.