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| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Date | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit | 4/26/2012 | Reviewed & Flagged |
| July Review Panel Mtg. | 7/23/2012 | Reviewed |
| Status Options | | |
| REVIEWED | Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments. | |
| REVIEWED & FLAGGED | Review Panel has flagged this project as needing full panel discussion. | |
|  | Date | Status |
| Post Application | 10/5/2012 | POC |
| Final | 10/31/2012 | Clear |
| Status Options | | |
| POC | Project of Concern | |
| CLEAR | Project is clear | |

**Lead Entity:**  Island County

**Project Number:**  12-1260

**Project Name:**  Ala Spit Restoration Phase 3

**Project Sponsor:**  Island County Health Dept

**Grant Manager:** Mike Ramsey/Elizabeth Butler

**Project Summary**: Phase 3 of Ala Spit County Park Restoration to: 1.) restore the bulkheaded area (suitable for forage fish spawning) as well as habitats associated with back beach areas more resembling of predevelopment geomorphic conditions, and 2.) enhance nearshore/beach to improve public access to the beach. The bulkhead is contributing significantly to erosion in front of the parking area. The northern two thirds of the park bulkhead can be removed and replaced with a wood crib structure to protect the parking lot. Portions of the spit and the bulkhead are regularly overtopped during extreme tide conditions causing driftwood to accumulate on the landward side of the existing bulkhead. Wood catchers can be installed to prevent woody debris from blocking the parking area of the Ala Spit County Park. Sediment nourishment will be added to re-grade the beach to match existing, natural beach slope, which the bulkhead modified over time.

As part of the SRFB funded Ala Spit Phase 2 Restoration project (**SRFB 08- 1864R**), final engineering design plans, specifications, and cost estimate (PS&E); a performance monitoring plan; and bid documents were prepared and permits were obtained for the removal of the riprap and bulkhead. In October of 2011, the restoration work of removing riprap was successfully completed. However, the removal of the bulkhead was not feasible due to insufficient construction funds to complete this task.

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:** 4/30/2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Patty Michak, Steve Toth and Paul Schlenger

**Early Project Status: Reviewed & Flagged**

**Project Site Visit?** Yes 4/26/2012

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

The project sponsor needs to clearly present the objectives for the proposal; objectives should be statements of measurable outcomes that support the completion of the stated goal within a specified time frame. The objectives discussed within the project description are a start, but they need to be refined to better present the measurable outcomes and time frame of the project. (See SHRG Chapter 4 for guidance).

The sponsor states the goal of the proposed project to be “*The primary goal of the project is to maximize restoration and preservation of salmon habitat functions through restoration of natural sediment transport processes, while maintaining the current recreational use of Ala Spit County Park.”;* however, the Review Panel does not find that the proposed project is fully meeting this goal. While the current recreation use and access to the park is maintained the restoration of natural sediment transport processes are remaining impaired. Continued presence of the parking lot and rock groin over the short- and long-term appears to jeopardize restoration of natural processes along both the eastern and northern sides of the property.

The proposal mentions a Phase 2 contingency optional action that would involve placing additional beach nourishment and LWD at the neck of the spit where phase 2 work was completed. Given the natural accumulation of logs on these beaches, such placement of wood does not appear necessary. As described in the proposal, the sponsor will decide upon the need for this design element by conferring with Hugh Shipman at the Department of Ecology. The proposal will need to be updated to describe if this element is going to be included within the project proposal. If it is included, please provide supporting information and a description of the proposed elements.

The project proposal needs to better support the restoration elements included in the proposal versus those elements not included. For example, the proposal describes three separate actions along the park bulkhead: 1) remove and nourish, 2) remove and replace with wood cribwall, and 3) do not remove.

* Please explain the total length of bulkhead at the site and the length treated by each action type.
* Please explain the analysis that led to the size/length of each separate action.
* Explain other actions or alternatives not included; specifically more information on why the rock groin is not included (additional comment on this below) and was parking lot relocation considered rather than cribwall armoring to protect this encroaching infrastructure?
* Please explain benefits of the proposed log cribwall and wood catchers compared to the concrete bulkhead. Not enough design information is provided in pre-application materials to assess this.
  + How will the proposed change of material in bank armoring help in this area?
  + How will the proposed cribwall armoring facilitate the sponsor’s intent of constructing a demonstration project for shore armoring removal?
  + Rather than including a cribwall to protect the eastern margin of the parking lot, can the parking lot be reshaped/relocated within the counties property to separate it from the shoreline?

The Review Panel has concerns that the rock groin that is remaining on site, which the project sponsor has stated that they are unable to remove at this time due to risk of slope failure and endangerment of private property, is impeding restoration of sediment and wood transport and as long as the rock groin is present impacts to Ala Spit would continue. From review of the Feasibility Study it appears that the removal of the rock groin was dropped from consideration early in the study and that the impacts of the rock groin were not fully analyzed. The rock groin appears to cause a back-eddy effect as it grows a sand bar and creates a pocket between the sand bar and the historic spit. This back-eddy appears to be eroding the beach (and re-depositing materials into a berm) in the area that the bulkhead is to be removed. Has modeling/design investigation been conducted to determine the effect of the groin which appears to be building a sand bar and creating a back-eddy? Removal of the groin appears key to restoring the sediment and wood transport processes necessary to maximize the benefits of the restoration investments at the spit. If full removal is deemed infeasible, then removal of a significant portion of the rock groin should be considered. If the groin is determined to be necessary to protect the hillslope, then it appears that only the interior portion (i.e., approximately 15-foot-long section at base of slope) would be necessary to achieve that protection and the removal of the remainder would substantially improve sediment and wood transport among higher portions of the beach. Prior to moving forward with additional site treatments the project sponsor is encouraged to further investigate the removal (full or partial) of the rock groin.

The project proposal needs to better describe the beach nourishment element of the proposal. From the field discussions it seemed that the intent is a one-time placement of beach material to speed-up the natural recruitment of sediments, versus a passive approach allowing storm action to reshape and deposit native materials. If the placement of these materials is primarily to ease public access, can a more passive approach be taken that would facilitate beach access and allow natural processes to provide and place beach substrate? To support the beach nourishment the proposal should expand on existing documentation of forage fish use, especially for surf smelt and sand lance that could be utilizing the upper beach area. Incomplete design information was available on PRISM. On design sheet C-8 (attachment #24), the slope of the beach nourishment is not indicated in cross-section F.

The project does not discuss (or show in the cost estimate) revegetation of the disturbed high-beach area behind the bulkhead. The project sponsor is encouraged to incorporate native vegetation in the disturbed area. If public use of the area is high then fencing may be needed until the vegetation is established.

Additionally, the project sponsor discussed during the field review their hope is the site can be used as a demonstration site for landowners to see bulkhead removal and natural beach protection. If this is an objective of the proposed project the sponsor should be very conscious of costs and actions taken that a typical landowner would be able to complete if this site is anticipated to be utilized as a bulkhead removal demonstration site.

Phase 3 proposed in this application goes beyond the preferred alternative from the feasibility study, but is discussed within the study as other restoration actions to consider; however within the list of other actions removal of the rock groin, and removal of the parking lot and access road are also suggested. Please provide supporting rationale for why only the bulkhead removal is proposed while other higher priority (in the Review Panel’s opinion) actions are not proposed.

Are further phases planned? Are all elements of the preferred alternative completed?

Please describe the phase 2 performance to date and explain why and how the measured and anticipated benefits are achieving or different from those identified in feasibility study.

The potential vulnerability of the site to sea level rise is not discussed, nor does it appear to be reflected in the design. Please explain the potential effects of sea level rise on the site and if/how this was incorporated into the design.

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

Provide detail on requested A&E; and describe how this links up to the previous phase of the project. For example, are permits in-place for the bulkhead removal as it was proposed to be completed in Phase 2?

Please provide the full 2008 Feasibility Report – only the cover is currently attached in PRISM. (RCO Grant Manager Note: The feasibility report was completed under #05-1491 and is attached there, but the cover page has been replace with the full report in project #08-1864, as attachment #24)

Provide a landownership map showing the county park parcel(s) and surrounding, adjoining parcel lines and ownership.

**2 attachments on PRISM not accessible: PowerPoint (attachment #13) and Neck Photo document (attachment #26)**

(RCO Grant Manager Note: Both attachments opened for me on 5/11/12. Contact RCO if you continue to have problems)

**3. Staff Comments/Questions:**

A&E greater than 30%, as presented in the application; budget PRISM summary and detailed budget don’t match.

30% construction contingency – shown in detailed budget in proposal document.

Correct 100 LF of “silk” curtains to silt curtains; see Misc (g) in cost estimate (pg 12 of 19 in proposal pdf).

## 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 projects will be reviewed at the July 12th full Review Panel meeting. Sponsor responses received no later than one week prior to the meeting will be considered by the Review Panel.

**Special Note:** To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please re-attach your proposal in PRISM in WORD “track changes.” This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.



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

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

# JULY 12th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:** 7/23/2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Early Project Status: Reviewed**

**Project Site Visit?**

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

The Review Panel appreciates the sponsor’s response to early review comments and to the changes made in the project proposal. The Review Panel is supportive of the decision to remove LWD placement from the proposal and to further assess removing the rock groin and bulkhead. We do have concerns, however, about sequencing of the assessment and the potential implementation of full-site restoration actions.

The assessment to determine the feasibility of removing the rock groin and the bulkhead should be the priority of the sponsor. The assessment could potentially qualify for a design-only grant on its own. Other actions to partially remove a portion of the bulkhead and place a cribwall should be delayed until the full site restoration has been assessed. Since restoration of the entire site would achieve the objectives proposed in this phase and additionally fully restore the littoral transport within the drift cell, it seems appropriate to wait on project construction until the assessment has been completed. The entire project could then be implemented at once, rather than in two separate construction phases, and would likely provide substantial cost savings. A more detailed scope of work for the assessment would be helpful within the revised proposal. The assessment should include a geotechnical report by a qualified geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist that assesses the slope stability hazards and the risks to private or public infrastructure. Preliminary designs of potential restoration actions should also be produced as part of the assessment.

While the Review Panel understands that the County must maintain site access due to the funding for the park, we encourage the sponsor to continue pursuing options to remove the road and parking area. Future acquisitions in the surrounding area may provide alternative parking sites and allow for the removal of the fill material from the southern portion of the pocket estuary.

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

**3. Staff Comments/Questions:**

## JuLY 12th 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:** 10/5/2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Application Project Status: POC**

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

**Why?**

Criterion #22 (unclear how project will meet its stated objectives).Incomplete application – budget detail. Additional information is needed on the scope and budget.

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

More detail and justification of the budget is necessary. Within Section 5 of the proposal additional detail on the scope of work for the feasibility study should be provided; e.g. groundwater/hillslope hydrology; geotechnical investigate concerning home(s) on bluff (as mentioned within the Project Description); nearshore effects from groin and bulkhead removal; and an alternatives analysis.

The analysis of the effects of removing the groin and bulkhead should include an alternative assuming the full extent of the current parking area does not need to be protected. The review panel recognizes the need to provide public access to the park, but encourages the sponsor to consider a shorter access road, such that parking is concentrated closer to Jones Road. Such a parking adjustment could benefit the pocket beach to the north, the shoreline to the east, and the marsh to the south of the road. This would allow for a more naturally dynamic shoreline to the east, which can be expected if some or all of the groin and bulkhead is removed. Partial removal of the parking area would fully support the objectives of the project. The project sponsor is encouraged to evaluate the potential for alternate park areas for overflow parking within the vicinity.

The application states that the groin’s proximity to Kayak Park makes the possible removal of the groin more complex. Please clarify if Kayak Park and Ala Spit Park are one in the same; and discuss why the proximity to the park creates additional complexity.

Earlier comment regarding a sea level rise analysis was not satisfactorily addressed. Please explain how sea level rise will be incorporated in proposed investigation.

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

**4. Staff Comments/Questions:**

The project has been changed to a design-only assessment of the feasibility for removing the rock groin at Ala spit. The Review Panel is supportive of the phased approach to ultimately remove at a minimum a portion of the rock groin and the remaining bulkhead to restore natural shoreline processes.

Reference to construction management within the proposal should be removed.

## 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:** 10/31/2012

**Panel Member(s) Name:** Review Panel

**Final Project Status: Clear**

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

**Why?**

The sponsor has revised to a design-only assessment of the feasibility for removing the rock groin and set-back of the parking area at Ala Spit park.

**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. Staff Comments/Questions:**