*This document must be opened in Adobe Acrobat in order to work.

2016 ESRP APPLICATION NARRATIVE SECTION

–RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROJECTS

Project Title/Name Seahorse Siesta Shoreline Barge and Armor Removal

Organization Name Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Foundation

Primary Contact Lisa Kaufman, Nearshore Program Manager

Budget Narrative

Complete the budget narrative to support the "whole project' worksheet. A definition of how ESRP defines the "whole project" can be found in the 2012 ESRP Guidance section on "Project Scoping Guidelines" We understand costs are estimates. Describe what funding has been secured already, other pending or planned grant proposals and remaining need. For pending match, describe current status if known. Describe how you will intend to secure the required 30% matching funds for ESRP and remaining funds needed to start implementation.

Personnel: NWSF personnel will expend approximately 953 hours to complete the project from final design through monitoring. Personnel costs include fringe. Lisa Kaufman, NWSF Nearshore Program Manager will be the lead staff. Total hours per staff: Executive Director 30 hours @ $50.65 ($1,519.50); Admin Coordinator 45 hours @ $24.98 ($1,124.10); Nearshore Program Manager 368 hours @ $32.95 ($12,125.60); Biologist 214 hours @ $25.92 ($5,546.88); Intern 224 hours @ $16.20 ($2,863.00); Account Mgr 70 hours @ $40.90. Total Personnel:$26,807.88.

Travel: Travel costs calculated at $0.54 per mile. 35 round trips (175 miles) plus 12 nights lodging @ $89/night during construction. Total Travel: $4,376.00

Equipment: No equipment purchases.

Supplies: Supplies include miscellaneous materials for monitoring (sieves, water quality probes, quadrats) @ $500.00; also included $500 in printing/postage for bid advertising. Total supplies: $1,000.00.

Contractual: $6,846 pre-agreement expenditures for permitting (match); $369,309 estimated construction with tax and 15% contingency; $10,000 archaeology oversight if needed; $5,000 forage fish surveys if needed; $36,679 construction oversight including as-built drawings (10% of construction cost); $4,500 for monitoring assistance - Island MRC assistance with volunteer recruitment, training, implementation; forage fish surveys lab analysis; post-construction elevation surveys. Total Contractual: $432,334

Indirect: Calculated at 10% of direct costs: $45,767.

Matching Funds: As noted above, $6,846 has been expended for permit development including biological evaluation, permit applications, and archaeological assessment. NWSF has submitted a proposal for funding through WRIA6 Salmon Recovery process for either PSAR or SRFB funds. The project was ranked second for 2017 PSAR funding. NWSF will continue to apply for grants as needed to secure required match. $146,239 unsecured to date.

Project Narrative (Please limit your narrative to 4,500 words or less)

A. ECOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE (40 pts.) - *An ideal project will restore dynamic natural ecosystem processes, structures and services, within a large complex process unit, resulting in site conditions where the composition and configuration of the landscape reflects historical complexity, and where the site is both resilient to current and future development impacts, and known to provide highly valued habitat services to target species.*

Q1. Does it have a large effect on the delta or shoreline process unit? – The project will maintain existing ecosystem services or provide a large increase in sustainable ecosystem services by protecting in-tact ecosystem processes or restoring the most significant sources of degradation to ecosystem processes.

Points Possible 0-10 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- Restores or protects historical ecosystem processes or services. (define some ecosystem benefits and what might be most important –broad context for ecosystem benefit –diversity web of life, etc).
- Protects intact areas.
- Addresses a high proportion of the restoration or protection needs (i.e. degradation or future risk) within a site.
- Project site is large and complex relative to other similar sites.
- Proposed action(s) **addresses** the PSNERP strategy for that process unit Cereghino et. al. 2012.
- Cumulatively restores critical stressors within a group of smaller and simpler process units.

Q1. Narrative Description

The project will remove a large barge/bulkhead from the base of a feeder bluff. The bulkhead (including the barge, which is part of the shore armor) extends 98 feet onto the beach from the toe of the bluff and 136 feet alongshore. Removal of the structure will restore feeder bluff and sediment transport processes, uncover potential Pacific sand lance spawning habitat, and recover 0.25 acres of intertidal habitat. The total beach area covered waterward of the bluff toe is 10,800 square feet (SF). A concrete bulkhead 9 FT high and 8 inches thick surrounds the barge and fill area. The bulkhead toe extends to 8 FT MLLW elevation which is 2.6 FT below local MHHW and 5 FT lower than the average bluff toe elevation.

This site is within net shore-drift cell WHID-1, which originates about 1.4 miles northwest of the site and continues to Sandy Point, east of Langley, approximately 2.4 miles east of the site. Approximately 61% of the drift cell is downdrift of the site, ensuring that sediment transport restoration will benefit a significant amount of shoreline.

Within Shoreline Process Unit 6002, degradation for sediment input was ranked as low, with sediment transport and accretion both noted as having medium degradation. Physical disturbance is also indicated as a medium level of degradation, although nearly one quarter of the drift cell is armored or modified. The current degradation level for the beaches within the SPU are indicated as medium, however, they have high potential to provide ecosystem goods and services and the recommended management strategy is “Restore High”. Given that most of the armoring in the process unit is concentrated within the shoreline of the Town of Langley, this project represents a good opportunity to remove armor within the process unit and benefit downdrift habitats.

Q2. Will the site be resilient to future degradation? – The project results in a highly functioning site that **1)** reflects historical ecosystem dynamics and connectivity, and if not delivered fully by the project action, the proposal describes how incremental work will reach this target condition at the site scale (climate change will be addressed in a later category).

Points Possible
0-10 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- Expected future condition of target ecosystem state is clearly described including predicted changes over time. A full range of ecosystem components (Shipman 2008) or conditions (Cereghino et al 2012) will increasingly provide historical ecosystem services over time.
- Rare shoreform types (e.g. lost barrier estuaries, oligohaline and freshwater tidal marsh), and relatively rare ecosystem components (e.g. stream deltas) are recovered.
- Proposed actions will result in large contiguous patches of habitat that are hydrologically connected in a manner sustainable by natural processes, and open to unconstrained river and/or tidal processes.
- Adjacent areas support the function of the site (e.g. well-vegetated buffers deliver clean, cold water; up-drift bluffs provide sediment etc.).
- If incremental restoration is proposed, future restoration is feasible and designs do not preclude full restoration in the future.

Q2. Narrative Description

The barge/bulkhead was placed at the site in the late 1960's or early 1970's by a former resident of the community for the purpose of creating an elevated lawn area near the beach. The structure has since deteriorated creating a safety hazard for the residents as well as an impediment to shoreline processes and habitats. The barge/bulkhead is one of the larger protruding structures in the residential portions of Island County and is located along a bluff-backed beach which is mapped as a feeder bluff. Immediately following removal, it is anticipated that there will be an incident of deferred erosion where sediments currently landward of the bluff will be released to provide nourishment to the site and the drift cell. Over time, the exposed areas of the bluff will erode naturally, contributing to the long-term processes and functions of the drift cell.

Removal of the structure will restore the connection between the nearshore habitats and backshore and upland bluff crest. Removal will also expose a sand and gravel beach suitable for forage fish spawning and will improve nearshore habitats useful for migrating juvenile salmonids.

Healthy trees and vegetation exist shoreward of the riprap. This line of vegetation is important for helping to maintain healthy temperature and moisture conditions for summer spawning forage fish. Recruitment of large woody debris will also be improved as the backshore will not be obstructed by the barge. The overhanging vegetation and eventual LWD recruitment will provide a source of insects critical in the diet of migrating juvenile salmonids.

Q3. Do the surrounding conditions support the project? – The project approach is 1) responsive to potential risks of intense or complex site degradation, and 2) potential future impacts from population growth, and demonstrates a preference for work where historical processes will be restored or protected at the scale of the process unit or 'nearshore ecosystem site' *(Note: climate change should be addressed in section titled "Climate Change").*

Points Possible
0-10 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following*

- The project will protect or restore an ecosystem component or landform that is critical for increasing the integrity of the region, compared to historical composition.
- Project actions are consistent with the scientific record, respond to risks identified in Cereghino et al. 2012, and utilize local assessments.
- The whole of intact sites are protected, and/or target processes are comprehensively restored. The project addresses multiple stressors and their cumulative impacts.
- Upland and watershed modifications do not substantially limit the ability of the proposed actions to provide intended benefits and/or such modifications are or will be addressed through the project design.
- The potential for future development within and adjacent to the site is explicitly explored. The processes and services of the site will be resilient to anticipated change Cereghino et. al. 2012. Provides a range of risk metrics following Simenstad et al. (2011) and Bolte & Vache (2010).

Sample questions to consider in this section

-What are the known or anticipated (current and future) impacts to the project site from the surrounding landscape conditions?
-What are the known or anticipated (current and future) benefits to the project site from the surrounding landscape conditions?
-What are the historical conditions in and around the site? How does the restoration outcome improve upon the degraded conditions?

Q3. Narrative Description

The project addresses multiple stressors and their cumulative impacts. Armor has significant negative impacts on salmon prey. Surf smelt and Pacific Sand lance, Chinook forage fish prey species, use beaches for spawning and spawn between +5 and +9 MLLW. Puget Sound beaches are composed primarily of sediment derived from bluff erosion. Shoreline armor structures at bluff sites impound sediment that would otherwise be supplied to the beaches down-drift of the armor. There is a significant difference in beach elevation on the updrift side from the downdrift side at this site resulting from the location of the barge within the intertidal area. There should be a lowering of the beach on the updrift side with the removal of the barge. Shoreline hardening is identified as a stressor (STR-03) within WRIA 6: Change of shoreline habitat or features to conditions that reduce habitat extent and/or disrupt shoreline processes. The community had previously hoped to repair the structure, but realizing they would have difficulty obtaining permits to do so, opted for removal and restoration.

The upland parcel is owned by the community as a common parcel and will not be developed. The community has worked to concentrate runoff and direct it through a tight-line away from the bluff to minimize erosion caused by poor water management. The homes have sufficient setback from the bluff crest to allow for removal. Tidelands waterward of MHHW are managed by DNR.

The project will target a variety of species and their habitats including Pacific salmonids, forage fish, marine and shore birds. The removal of the barge will expose a sand and gravel beach suitable for forage fish spawning and will improve nearshore habitats useful for migrating juvenile salmonids. Offshore habitats include extensive eelgrass beds and sand lance spawning has been documented updrift and downdrift of the site.

Q4. Does it provide ecosystem benefits that society places value on? – The site provides a high level of ecological services compared to other similar landforms, based on an identified and accurately cited assessment.

Points Possible
0-10 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- Proposed actions restore or protect ecosystems that have experienced significant loss in size or quantity in Puget Sound or sub-basin, or that contain rare, vulnerable or ecologically important species or resources (e.g. PSP indicators: estuarine wetland, eelgrass meadow, seabirds, unarmored sediment sources, forage fish, and Chinook salmon; state or federal listed species, WDFW's priority habitats and species).
- Proposed action is logically linked to a change in habitat and other conditions that provide direct benefits for species of concern. The mechanism by which habitat change leads to species benefits is described (e.g. increases in tidal wetland area and re-establishment of channel networks is anticipated to increase juvenile salmon carrying capacity; predicted change in sediment texture and increase in overhanging shoreline vegetation increases forage fish spawning area).
- Proposed actions are clearly identified in regional or species recovery plans.

Q4. Narrative Description

The project will target a variety of species and their habitats including Pacific salmonids, forage fish, marine and shore birds. The removal of the barge will expose a sand and gravel beach suitable for forage fish spawning (specifically sand lance) and will improve nearshore habitats useful for migrating juvenile salmonids. Offshore habitats include extensive eelgrass beds and sand lance spawning has been documented updrift and downdrift of the site.

WDFW's Priority Habitats and Species also identifies Dungeness crab and Gray whale as species using the shoreline and the area is mapped as estuarine and marine wetland as the aquatic habitat type. Residents also noted that there are populations of sand shrimp on site and gray whales are a common site during their migration.

Removal of the structure will allow for increased wrack as well as trees to eventually fall onto the shoreline contributing large woody debris and insect fallout.

B) TECHNICAL MERIT AND READINESS (35 pts.) - *A strong technical and social review of the project is well documented or proposed for the current phase. Work will be done quickly, and the project is being designed to meet a range of contingencies, advance ecological science, and maximize resilience under climate change.*

Q5. Are the techniques reliable? – 1) The project team includes the range of professional skills and experience suited to the scope of the project, ensuring high confidence the project will result in the predicted benefits, and 2) the project has been improved by critique from an independent and documented interdisciplinary technical review process.

Points Possible
0-15 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- The project team contains the range of expertise needed to complete proposed actions.
- Proposal references or proposes an independent and well documented external review of project strategies and alternatives. Proposal has identified, by name, an interdisciplinary design team that supports the proposed project.
- The project addresses links between ecosystem elements and the processes that maintain them so that the project is likely to have the outcomes described in Ecological Importance (considers ecological context, confidence in predictions, and predictability of the management measures).
- Acquisition
    - Risks to ecological processes at the site can largely be controlled through acquisition. A strong stewardship plan is provided or is proposed as an early project deliverable, to be approved by ESRP, which clarifies how the site will be managed.
- Restoration
    - Sponsor has engaged key stakeholders and technical experts to identify key uncertainties and constraints regarding project performance. Proposed approach is designed to address the uncertainties and constraints to the extent possible and consider alternative scenarios in the design process. For construction projects, the sponsor has a clearly defined contingency plan to address uncertainties.

Q5. Narrative Description

This site was identified through an assessment funded by ESRP and Puget Sound Marine and Nearshore grant programs. NWSF commissioned Coast Geologic Services (CGS) to analyze feeder bluff sites in Island and Jefferson Counties to identify sites where sediment transport processes could be restored through armor removal without jeopardizing upland structures.
The project addresses PSNERP's beach restoration strategy targeting sediment supply restoration. Armor removal from feeder bluffs is the primary restoration management measure to effectively restore sediment supply. The project is consistent with the broad PSNERP objective to restore the size and quality of beaches and bluffs in Puget Sound; and the process for selecting the site is consistent with PSNERP beach restoration strategies that aim to restore the ecosystem processes that most strongly control structure and services by proactively focusing resources on the development of projects at high priority sites, rather than using limited resources to implement un-prioritized, opportunistic projects. Several design options were assessed, with the preferred alternative to completely remove the structure with no other actions other than regrading. The community association was concerned that they would lose access to the beach with the removal of the barge. They were not willing to have the structure removed if some form of protection was not included in the project. The small rockery serves this purpose and is allowing the project to move forward with the approval and willingness of the community. NWSF has led numerous shoreline restoration projects and has the technical expertise to oversee the contracting and construction process with engineering assistance from CGS. The MRC will provide volunteers to develop and assist with pre- and post-construction monitoring. A monitoring plan will be developed and will follow protocols outlined in the Shoreline Monitoring Toolbox, WDFW's forage fish sampling protocols, and other methods commonly used throughout Puget Sound.

Q5. Narrative Description (continued)

Q6. Have you identified and resolved uncertainty around technical methods and ecological response to actions? – **1)** The post-construction uncertainties and associated risks have been well defined, **2)** a strategy for monitoring and managing uncertainty is defined, and **3)** opportunities for learning are fully developed and integrated into the project design.

Points Possible 0-5 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- Feasibility and design – proposal explicitly lists factors anticipated that may create uncertainty in project outcomes, including impacts from partial restoration, landscape setting, future threats, ongoing human use, and fundamental assumptions about climate change.
- Acquisition
    - Long-term stewardship and management plan has been (acquisition phase) or will be developed (site identification phase) based on known uncertainties and risks.

- Restoration
    - Projects requesting monitoring funds should have completed a monitoring and adaptive management plan, which will be the basis for evaluating requests for monitoring funding.
    - A management strategy, including an appropriate level of qualitative or quantitative monitoring, has been (or will be) developed to monitor the evolution of natural processes and to observe characteristics of the site during and following implementation that are explicitly linked to outcomes.
- Proposal has identified specific learning objectives, and a systematic approach for achieving new knowledge, through the implementation of robust experimental design. Specific postulates and hypotheses are listed.
- Proposal will identify staff responsible for site management including the skills, knowledge, and experience needed for proposed outcomes.

Q6. Narrative Description

A hypothesis-based monitoring plan will be developed to: test assumptions about the project goals and outcomes; provide a basis for adaptive management; and deepen volunteer and community understanding of the science behind restoration and restoration monitoring.

Project goals include: enhancement of nearshore physical habitat conditions by removal of the barge/bulkhead structure; and the restoration of sediment transport processes along shore. Several hypotheses to be tested by monitoring include:
1. Removal of armoring will re-establish sediment transport and substrate composition within the drift cell will change.
2. As sea level rises, the amount of intertidal habitat will be maintained over the long term. The slope of the upper shore will be reduced allowing fine sediments to settle and become a dominant part of the upper beach substrate.
3. The removed armoring will allow for the accumulation of large woody debris.

The plan will follow protocols outlined in the Shoreline Monitoring Toolbox, WDFW's forage fish sampling protocols, and other methods commonly used throughout Puget Sound. Monitoring parameters include biological and physical elements and is being implemented by citizen-science volunteers as well as support through WDFW's nearshore monitoring program that is assessing armored sites pre and post construction. Parameters include: forage fish spawning surveys, nearshore fish use (beach seining), large woody debris accumulation, beach wrack composition, beach elevations, insect fallout, and intertidal surface epifauna and algae. WDFW is also collecting data on sediment composition and percent shade. A sample monitoring plan from another armor removal project is attached.

Lisa Kaufman, Nearshore Program Manager will provide project management. Lisa has managed several armor removal and other nearshore restoration projects including Bowman Bay, Cornet Bay, NW Marches Point, as well as numerous projects while managing DNR's creosote piling removal program. Jason Morgan, Biologist, will oversee monitoring. Jason currently manages monitoring at five restoration sites.

Q7. Does the project help address climate change issues? – The action increases the resilience of both natural and human systems or fosters adaptation to anticipated sea level rise and local climate change.

Points Possible 0-5 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- Proponent demonstrates understanding of how climate change is likely to affect site processes and functions and demonstrates how the information has been considered in the site selection and design process, and monitoring.
- Opportunities to facilitate landward movement of coastal ecosystems subject to dislocation by sea-level rise and other climate change impacts are considered. For example:
    - Beach projects allow for landward migration area of shorelines within the project and sustained sediment supply necessary to adjust beach elevations.
    - Adequate opportunities for landward migration of tidal wetlands are available with the project area
    - The project design and system conditions allows for adequate and timely delivery of sediments to support marsh accretion within the project area and drift cell.
- Proposal identifies and addresses potential impacts of the project to adjacent land uses under climate change scenarios.

Q7. Narrative Description

Impacts of climate change on the nearshore marine habitat will include acidification, sea level rise, and changes in light penetration and tidal heights on the beach as sea level rises (University of Oregon. 2006). Possible species adaptations will include a lateral shift shoreward of some species, such as kelp, and expansion of sea grasses, such as eelgrass. Forage fish spawning may move shoreward as optimal tidal elevation shifts laterally. These shifts will be stymied by shoreline armoring, that constrict beach width (Galbraith, et al. 2002). Removing shoreline armoring from the project site will strengthen many of the ecological functions of those habitats, and allow for lateral shifts in species assemblages and beach use shoreward at the project site when sea level rises and light penetration depths change.

Q8. Is the project ready to go? – The proposed schedule is reasonable for project phase and not likely to be significantly delayed by social controversy or uncertainty over landowner willingness.

Points Possible 0-10 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- Proposals will be evaluated for readiness as defined within each of the ESRP status categories.
- Landowner has provided written support for the project.
- Proposed actions are consistent with local land use goals, policies, and regulations.
- There have been documented public communication efforts concerning the project and evidence that the sponsor has taken appropriate steps to prevent or limit controversy that would prevent or substantially delay implementation.
- Budget needs for the proposed phase of project, including matching funds, are secured or pending and likely. A clear strategy is provided for financing necessary additional phases that comprise the whole project.

Q8. Narrative Description

The Seahorse Siesta Community Association has provided permission and support for the project. Preliminary design has been completed and permit applications have been submitted. We anticipate receipt of permits by late fall 2016. Pending funding, the project will be ready for construction in summer 2017.

The project was included in the recent Near Term Action updates for the 2016 Puget Sound Action Agenda and received a ranking of 20th amongst all projects. Shoreline hardening is also identified as a stressor (STR-03) within WRIA 6: Change of shoreline habitat or features to conditions that reduce habitat extent and/or disrupt shoreline processes. The primary source of this stressor is the construction of shoreline infrastructure that produces a hard linear surface along the beach or stream bank to reduce erosion (e.g., sea walls, revetments, rip-rap, and rock piles). The Seahorse Siesta project is also included on the four-year salmon recovery workplan for WRIA6.A letter from the WRIA6 Lead Entity Coordinator is attached. NWSF and CGS met extensively with the Seahorse Siesta Community to assess and address their concerns and needs. Several design options were presented to them and they agreed to the design that includes full removal of the structure with the inclusion of the small rockery. Permitting agencies have been to the site and understood the need for the wall to ensure the project would proceed.

NWSF has applied for project funding through the WRIA 6 salmon recovery process. The project has been forwarded to SRFB for funding consideration. As noted above, the project was also included in the Puget Sound Action Agenda update as a Near Term Action. We hope to acquire funds through one or both of these sources to meet matching fund requirements. NWSF will continue to pursue other funding opportunities as they arise.

C) COST JUSTIFICATION (15 pts.) *- Ideal projects will have clear budgets that are appropriate for the type of actions proposed in the given location and demonstrate that cost-saving mechanism (design considerations, low-cost partners, diverse funding sources etc.) have been incorporated into the project.*

Q9. Are actions cost effective for the site? – The relationship between expected outcomes and total project cost is appropriate for the project location and landform.

Points Possible
0-10 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- Conceptual design and costs are focused on the most relevant management measure(s). Only a limited proportion of funds are focused on supporting management measures.
- Operations and maintenance costs are minimized and cost-savings mechanisms are used (e.g. low cost partners; volunteers, partnerships etc.).
- Non-state funding sources are leveraged to maximize the ecological protection and restoration benefits.

Q9. Narrative Description

Construction cost estimates were developed by Coastal Geologic Services based on comparisons to like projects. Barge mobilization costs were also determined based on a recently bid project managed by NWSF. Professional services including forage fish surveys, archaeological and construction oversight were developed by NWSF based on recent projects completed in 2014 and 2015. Travel costs were calculated based on allowable Washington State travel reimbursement rates.

NWSF will develop bid documents rather than out-sourcing this to an engineering firm. Construction oversight costs will be also minimized by using NWSF staff for the demolition phase of the project. Lisa Kaufman, Nearshore Program manager has experience managing these types of projects. Professional engineering oversight will be required for the installation of the rockery and final elevation/as-built surveys.

NWSF requested a portion of salmon recovery funds come from non-state sources if possible to be used as match for this fund. NWSF will seek other opportunities from non-state grants and private foundations as available.

Volunteers and in-kind services from WDFW will contribute most of the time for monitoring with coordination from NWSF staff.

Q10. Is there a clear and understandable budget? – The budget is complete and provides a fair estimate of all elements required for successful implementation of proposed actions.

Points Possible
0-5 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- The whole project budget is complete, sources of funding are explicit, and their status can be clearly discerned.
- Line item costs are clearly described in a budget narrative so that the nature of the costs and the estimation method can be easily discerned.
- Budget narrative describes uncertainties considered when developing the budget. Modest but reasonable contingency (based on specific and identified risks) is built into the budget at the task level.
- Funding partners and contributions reflect the diversity of benefits that will be delivered by the project (e.g. projects addressing drainage or flood control have contributions from agricultural groups or dike districts; if public access is improved, matching funds or in-kind from a user-group included; if salmon recovery project, SRFB dollars included).

Q10. Narrative Description

The 'whole project' budget identifies costs from the site assessment, preliminary design, and permitting completed since 2015 through final design, monitoring, and project implementation. The budget is broken down by tasks specific to each phase of the project and includes contingency.

D) PUBLIC SUPPORTAND INVOLVEMENT (10 pts.) *- The project will build community support for protection and restoration, engage the local community and/or encourages valuable partnerships.*

Q11. Are there social benefits? – The project provides benefits in addition to ecological restoration or protection.

Points Possible
0-5 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- The project references or provides documentation that the project will deliver multiple benefits to local communities including but not limited to public education or engagement, recreational/commercial fisheries, appropriate low-impact public use, flood hazard mitigation, drainage improvements, or infrastructure upgrades.

Q11. Narrative Description

The project is located along the shoreline of a privately owned community. Tidelands waterward of MHHW are managed by DNR and therefore are accessible from the water by the public.

The Seahorse Siesta Community is willing to have the site used for demonstration purposes. Northwest Straits Foundation regularly hosts community workshops to inform shoreline property owners of coastal processes and the impacts of hard armor to these processes and associated habitats. Workshops include field trips to show successful project sites in order to demonstrate the benefits of armor removal from private and public tidelands.

Q12. Are there many stakeholders and partners involved? – The project engages many local and regional partners that will collaboratively support education, technology transfer, and stakeholder participation.

Points Possible
0-5 Points

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices: *Ideal projects have some or all of the following:*

- Letters of support indicate a broad and diverse base of support.
- Partners have been identified and specific mechanisms developed to support communications and collaboration relevant to successful completion of ESRP tasks and on-going project stewardship.
- Project is in a demonstrably visible location and proponent has a project communications strategy describing how specific groups of stakeholders will be made aware of project activities and related issues.
- Partners or key stakeholders actively involved in feasibility, design and/or implementation.

Q12. Narrative Description

Letters of support from the community association as well as WDFW's Nearshore Monitoring Program and Island County Marine Resources Committee are attached.

WDFW and Island County MRC will assist with monitoring activities pre- and post-construction. Data will be used to compare to other armor removal sites throughout Puget Sound.

The Northwest Straits Foundation was established in 2002 and has successfully completed a number of nearshore restoration projects funded through state, federal, and private sources.