

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



Lead Entity:	Island County LE
Project Number:	18-1366
Project Name:	Crescent Harbor Creek Restoration
Project Sponsor:	Skagit River Sys Cooperative
Grant Manager:	Duboiski, Marc

	Date	Status³
Post-Application		
Final	9/20/18	Clear

PROJECT SUMMARY *(for Review Panel reference only)*

Complete final design and permitting leading to construction for restoration of 1,400 feet of Crescent Harbor Creek between Crescent Harbor Road and the estuary. The restoration will reestablish meanders, pools and other stream complexity that was lost when the stream was ditched and straightened decades ago. The restoration will reconnect the channel downstream of Crescent Harbor Road to the adjacent floodplain, and will add more than 400 feet of length to the current ditched 1,000-foot channel by returning the channel to its historic alignment. A roughened channel approximately 40ft long will be utilized downstream to the culvert under Crescent Harbor Road to prevent scour erosion at high velocities and enable fish passage upstream. The area is very low gradient and low energy. Hydraulic analysis was not completed; a topographic survey was used to identify lower terrain for the channel alignment. Excavated material will be used to plug the upstream 20-30' of the existing ditch; additional excavated materials will be spoiled onsite in upland areas. A preliminary design and report were completed per SRFB project 13-1112. The salt marsh was completed per SRFB contract 04-1217 (after a scope change; project 04-1217 was originally focused on nearby Arrowhead Lagoon).

FINAL REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date: 9/20/18
Full Panel Review

Final Project Status: Clear

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:

POST-APPLICATION REVIEW PANEL COMMENTS

Date:
Full Panel Review

Project Status: Click to choose a status

1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:
2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:
3. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:
4. General comments:

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



³CLEAR=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



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

Note that comments provided in this section are preliminary and based on basic information provided in the project pre-application and site visit. Full Review Panel review will occur after the final application materials are submitted for the project and may identify technical issues not previously discussed or identified.

Date: May 1, 2018

Project Site Visit?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Review Panel Member(s): Smith and Tyler

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria (*Sponsor must respond to these comments*):

- In comments on the design grant for this project (13-1112), the review panel advised using reference conditions on the island to inform the design. Please describe how reference conditions were used in developing design features, such as degree of sinuosity, number of pools, etc.
- The proposal indicates that final designs are on PRISM, however the designs on PRISM are listed as preliminary. Please load final designs on PRISM. Please include the location of the existing dikes on all final design schematics and provide any information or data that substantiates the reasons for not removing and/or its lack of long term effects on channel migration.
- The 100% (construction ready) design task should be included in the scope, it is currently reflected only in the budget.
- The proposal indicates that the channel will be relocated to the historic alignment. What resource was used to identify the location of the historic alignment? Does the historic alignment predate the dikes that are proposed to stay on the site?
- We understand the desire to retain the mature trees and wetland/pond habitat associated with an old dike adjacent to the proposed alignment. A heron rookery is reportedly present at this location, however we did not see this part of the site. Has the sponsor explored ways to breach portions of the dike, working around large conifers and retaining some wetland portions? This would allow the potential for future stream movement in this part of the site, without impact to existing trees providing shade and habitat.
- Include match amounts in budget.
- The proposal states that a 40-foot portion of the diked channel will be filled or plugged as the new channel is constructed; utilizing fill from the construction. Please provide information on how the extent and length of fill was decided upon. The deep incision of the current channel may warrant additional fill to reduce the chance the new stream channel could be recaptured into the diked channel as it migrates on the floodplain. As the construction spoils are planned to be wasted on site, backfilling the existing channel further should have minimal effect on the budget, but could provide greater long-term benefits to the project success.
- The downstream salt marsh restoration, upon which this project builds, had a long and convoluted development, interrupted by funding challenges and the Iraq War among other things. As a result of the Navy Seabees being deployed overseas in the middle of the salt marsh project, some project elements identified in the Philip Williams and Associates 2003 feasibility assessment were not completed during initial salt marsh restoration. Per the SRFB Scope Amendment, SRSC and the Navy agreed to seek other funding sources to complete these actions. Has any additional restoration occurred since the completion

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

Individual Comment Form



of the initial salt marsh restoration? In developing the full tidal restoration alternative, did the feasibility assessment consider road abandonment of E. Pioneer Way between the current outlet and Solomon Drive, or relocating the city's Waste Water Treatment Plant out of the salt marsh? Please attach the PWA 2003 feasibility assessment report to PRISM if you have a digital copy.

2. Review Panel Comments (*A response is not necessary*):

This project does an excellent job of building on previous SRFB investment in project 04-1217, Crescent Harbor Salt Marsh restoration. Kudos to the sponsor for seeing the salt marsh restoration through despite the logistical challenges it faced. Sponsor did a nice job on the goals, objectives, scope and deliverables in the current application and has made excellent use of partnerships. In future proposals, please explicitly identify the responsible party for each task in the scope.

The idea was discussed in the field to consider plugging the outlet of the existing channel (ditch). We recommend that the outlet not be plugged, at least not at or downstream of current saltwater extent to allow for utilization during tidal influx.

It would strengthen the proposal and improve the understanding of the benefit to salmon if there was some discussion of conditions of habitat upstream of the project area and potential effects of water quality inputs from upstream agricultural land uses, as the stream is on the 303d list of impaired waters due to fecal coliform and dissolved oxygen levels. Could the creek's degraded water quality negatively affect the benefits to salmon gained from this project?

3. Staff Comments: By final application, please update the APE map to reflect the RCO-DAHP required elements.



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.