

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Island County
Project Number:	16-1306
Project Name:	Seahorse Siesta Barge Removal
Project Sponsor:	NW Straits Maring Cons Found
Grant Manager:	Marc Duboiski

	Date	Status ¹
Post-Application	9/22/16	POC
Final	10/26/16	Clear

PROJECT SUMMARY (for Review Panel reference only)

The project will remove a large barge and 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. The project will also construct a small rockery above elevation +13 MLLW to allow for continued access to the beach by the community. The project includes final design prior to bidding and construction.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: October 26, 2016

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:

The Review Panel requests that the rock wall and stair access be mimized to the extent possible in terms of the length of shoreline. Further, we would emphasize that the rock wall is not intended to stabilize the slope above and will not likely prevent movement of the path surface.

POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: September 22, 2016

Project Status: POC

Review Panel Member(s): Full Panel Review

1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:

This project is a POC basd on the following critera:

#5 The project does not consider the processes in the watershed

#8 It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated goals and objectives

2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:

The Review Panel concerns with the project center on the use of the rock wall to stabilize the access to the beach. The removal of the barge is supported by the review panel and will benefit the sediment transport processes at the site; however, the placement of a rock retaining wall for access reduces some of that benefit.

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



The instability in the slope above the barge causes additional concern over the longevity of the hillside access to the site. There is concern that the slope along the entire hillside path will continue to slide and that the rock toe stabilization may be in place long after the access is no longer provided by the hillside path. It is recommended that a less impactful design to provide beach access at the base of the path (such as stairs or softer approaches) be investigated further to reduce impacts to the project's overall restoration benefits.

If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:

3. 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 6, 2016

Project Site Visit?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Review Panel Member(s): Jen O'Neal and Paul Schlenger

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

The project sponsor has spent considerable effort on coordination with land owners to gain support for this project, and the local support for the project is high. The stability of the beach access, even above the barge is uncertain, and some additional information on the geotechnical stability of the slope above and below the access road should be included in the approach.

Please provide additional information on the alternatives examined. The report describes one full and one partial restoration alternative. There appear to be several partial options that could have been considered and the discussion during the site visit suggested others were initially considered. Please provide more information on those and further justification for the rockery. The rockery wall is shown down to approximately +10 ft MLLW, although the anticipated beach profile indicates it will be buried up to approximately +14 ft MLLW. Has an analysis been conducted to examine whether more of the rockery will be exposed after wave action acts on the site? Is there an opportunity to install the stabilization structure at a higher elevation and/or vertically to prevent its interaction with the aquatic environment? Is there an opportunity to provide wood steps or another approach to maintaining residents' access without the rockery?

Additional information is needed on how the construction cost was developed, particularly in regards to assumptions about the fill material in the barge and the anticipated integrity of the barge that may require additional effort to demolish and remove. Please clarify the extent of the fill area that is a barge. It appears that only the waterward half of the fill area is the barge. It is recommended that some test pits are taken within the fill removal area to add certainty to assumptions about the composition of the material (i.e., all substrates or is there other debris buried in there?).

Please separate out the cost of the rockery from the barge removal.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. General Comments:

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



There is some concern on the part of the panel about the cost benefit ratio for this project. Additional information about the total nearshore area that would be affected by the project would help provide the broader context of the project beyond the foot print of the barge itself.

4. 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.