PROJECT: 20-1056 PLAN, EDMONDS MARSH ESTUARY RESTORATION DESIGN

Sponsor: Edmonds City of Program: Salmon State Projects Status: Wastebasket

Parties to the Agreement

PRIMARY SPONSOR

City of Edmonds
Address 121 5th Ave N
City Edmonds **State** WA **Zip** 98020
Org Type City/Town
Vendor # SWV0013866-00
UBI
Date Org created
Org Notes

link to Organization profile
link to PRISM Organization page
☐ Org data updated

SECONDARY SPONSORS

No records to display

LEAD ENTITY

WRIA 8 LE (King County)

QUESTIONS

#1: List project partners and their role and contribution to the project.

Unocal/Chevron: The current owner in process of completing site clean-up before transferring title to WSDOT.
Ecology: Overseeing Clean-up
WSDOT Ferries: To receive property from Unocal, once ECY certifies. Future need for property uncertain, not in long-term ferries plan.
Community: Engaged and interested to advance a robust restoration project.
WDFW: Potential Future Owner
WDNR: Potential Future Owner

External Systems

SPONSOR ASSIGNED INFO

Sponsor-Assigned Project Number

Sponsor-Assigned Regions

EXTERNAL SYSTEM REFERENCE

Source	Project Number	Submitter
HWS	20-1056	JWilkinson

Project Contacts

Contact Name Primary Org	Project Role	Work Phone	Work Email
Zachary Richardson Edmonds City of	Project Contact	(425) 771-0220	zachary.richardson@edmondswa.gov
Jason Wilkinson WRIA 8 LE (King County)	Lead Entity Contact	(206) 477-4786	jason.wilkinson@kingcounty.gov
Alexandra Doty Puget Sound Partnership	Regional Contact	(360) 280-6664	alexandra.doty@psp.wa.gov
Keeley O'Connell	Consultant	(360) 220-5544	keeley@natureinsightconsulting.com
Elizabeth Butler Rec. and Conserv. Office	Project Manager	(360) 867-8650	elizabeth.butler@rco.wa.gov

Worksites & Properties

#	Worksite Name
#1	Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore

Planning	Property Name
✓	BNSF Right-of-way
✓	Edmonds Marsh
✓	Marina Beach Park
✓	Unocal property

Project Application Report - 20-1056

Worksite Map & Description

Worksite #1: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore

WORKSITE ADDRESS

Street Address 180 W Dayton St
City, State, Zip Edmonds WA 98020

Worksite Details

Worksite #1: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore

SITE ACCESS DIRECTIONS

TARGETED ESU SPECIES

Species by ESU	Egg Present	Juvenile Present	Adult Present	Population Trend
Chinook-Puget Sound, Threatened				Declining
Chum-Puget Sound/Strait of Georgia, Not Warranted				
Coho-Puget Sound/Strait of Georgia, Species of Concern				
Pink-Odd Year, Not Warranted				

Reference or source used

TARGETED NON-ESU SPECIES

Species by Non-ESU	Notes
Cutthroat	Cutthroat trout (eggs, juveniles and adults) are currently present in the system

Questions

#1: Give street address or road name and mile post for this worksite if available.

180 W Dayton St, Edmonds WA 98020

Project Location

RELATED PROJECTS

Project Application Report - 20-1056

Projects in PRISM

PRISM Number	Project Name	Current Status	Relationship Type	Notes
14-1299 P	Willow Creek Daylighting Conceptual Design	Closed Completed	Earlier Phase	Final Feasibility and Expanded Marsh Alignments Study- completed in January 2019. Deliverables: Preferred daylight tidal channel alignment that increases habitat through channel sinuosity, habitat benches, and enhanced buffers; site specific sea-level ris
13-1107 P	Willow Creek Daylighting Final Feasibility Study	Closed Completed	Earlier Phase	Feasibility Study Completed in December 2015. Deliverables: final evaluation of marsh outlet configuration across Marina Beach; evaluation of structural measures; determination of need for a self-regulating tidegate in the daylighted channel;
11-1553 P	Willow Creek daylighting	Closed Completed	Earlier Phase	Early Feasibility Study phase-completed May 2013. Deliverables: alternative alignment screening assessment, conceptual project design, and a determination of biological response to daylighting Willow Creek. The results of the feasibility study indica

Related Project Notes

Additional design work was conditioned by the SRFB Technical Review Panel "Control and Tenure established, and MOU provided to SRFB: Project sponsor will provide a signed Landowner Acknowledgement Form from WSDOT-Ferries and a written report of negotiations between the City and WSDOT-Ferries that includes an MOU between these two parties clearly stating the agreed upon preferred alternative channel alignment across the Unocal property (future WDSOT property) including any communicated intention and/or commitment from WSDOT-Ferries to adopt or incorporate the concept into their future development of the project permanent."

Questions

#1: Project location. Describe the geographic location, water bodies, and the location of the project in the watershed, i.e. nearshore, tributary, main-stem, off-channel, etc.

Future estuary restoration project located in the Puget Sound nearshore of the City of Edmonds in the WRIA 8 watershed. Edmonds Marsh is a 28 acre remnant barrier estuary located in the City of Edmonds in the northern extent of the nearshore of the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish watershed (WRIA8). The immediate extent of the project is west of SR 104, south of the Port of Edmonds' Harbor Square business park, east of the Port of Edmonds' Marina and the BNSF Railway's right of way, and west of the former Unocal/Chevron property (see site area vicinity map attached).

#2: How does this project fit within your regional recovery plan and/or local lead entity's strategy to restore or protect salmonid habitat? Cite section and page number.

This project is located within the WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Plan as a Tier 1—or highest priority— area for restoration implementation. The WRIA 8 Plan identifies the nearshore as Tier 1 due to the rearing habitat benefits offered to juvenile Chinook salmon, and the plan also recognizes that restoration along the nearshore provides a regional benefit by improving habitat for multiple species of fish originating from numerous watersheds. In the WRIA 8 recovery plan, this project aligns with the following priorities: reconnect backshore areas and pocket estuaries, remove fish passage barriers, restore natural marine shoreline, protect and restore functional riparian vegetation and increase awareness and support for salmon recovery (Lake WA/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan 2017 Appendix E).

#3: Is this project part of a larger overall project?

Yes

#3a: How does this project fit into the sequencing of the larger project?

This project has received three SRFB grants to advance design for a future estuary restoration project. Previous phases included feasibility, alternatives assessment, and conceptual designs of the preferred restoration alternative (attached). Future phases will include long term landowner/ stewardship options, development of preliminary designs and permitting, final design, and ultimately constructing the restoration project.

#4: Is the project on State Owned Aquatic Lands? Please contact the Washington State Department of Natural Resources to make a determination. **Aquatic Districts and Managers**

No

DNR has confirmed that this project does not occur on State owned Aquatic Lands (pers comm with Brenda Werden, WDNR on 4/12/2013). Email communication with DNR was added to attachments in PRISM in prior phase 14-1299.

Property Details

Property: BNSF Right-of-way (Worksite #1: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore)

Property: Edmonds Marsh (Worksite #1: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore)

Property: Marina Beach Park (Worksite #1: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore)

Property: Unocal property (Worksite #1: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore)

Project Proposal

Project Description

City of Edmonds will develop a preliminary design to reconnect the 28-acre Edmonds Marsh to Puget Sound, restoring uninterrupted juvenile fish passage to this barrier estuary, located adjacent to the city's downtown core. Restoration designs will include a new tidal channel, and in-stream and riparian habitat enhancements. The design effort will include continued communications with landowners within the restoration area, primarily Washington Department of Transportation-Ferries Division, slated to be the future owner of the Unocal Property.
This future estuary restoration project addresses a key salmon recovery issue of limited juvenile access to important, yet rare, nearshore rearing habitat. Once constructed (in a future phase) the project will enable juvenile fish passage to rearing habitat for out-migrating Chinook, coho, chum and pink salmon to an area that is currently inaccessible to fish, increasing nearshore habitat diversity available along the highly degraded WRIA 8 nearshore. This RCO funding request will complete preliminary design, but the City is leveraging other funding sources to ensure a full design can be completed without additional funding requests of RCO. The project restores a essential lost estuary connection and valuable fish habitat, but also has the unique condition in that it can actually add new aquatic habitat (in upland Shellabarger Marsh) when combined with the advent of sea-level rise. Designs will meet standards of Manual 18 Appendix D-2.

Project Questions

#1: Problem statement. What are the problems your project seeks to address? Include the source and scale of each problem. Describe the site, reach, and watershed conditions. Describe how those conditions impact salmon populations. Include current and historic factors important to understand the problems.

Site Description: Edmonds Marsh is a 28-acre remnant of a historical 80+ acre barrier estuary-marsh complex located adjacent to the downtown area in the suburban City of Edmonds. Two spring-fed, freshwater tributaries feed into Edmonds Marsh, Willow Creek (393-acre basin) and Shellabarger Creek (378-acre basin). Edmonds Marsh is one of the few remaining such ecological features in the Central Puget Sound basin. Research indicates that barrier estuary habitats, such as this, are an important habitat type for Pacific juvenile Chinook salmon (Fresh, 2006; Beamer, 2006) and significant losses of this particular habitat type have occurred along the WRIA 8 shoreline (Williams et al, 2001; Leschine, T. and AW Petersen, 2007). Several studies specifically call out the need for restoration of barrier estuary complexes as a critical component to Chinook recovery (Redman, S, 2005; Beamer, 2006), including the 2012 Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda.

History: Edmonds Marsh and the contributing creek watersheds likely supported several salmon species and life stages, including juvenile Chinook and coho salmon in the marsh system.

Passage Problem: The current conditions of a piped, vault and tidegate system significantly limits fish access. There is no recent evidence of non-natal juvenile salmon rearing in the marsh.
The current outlet of the marsh is a combination of a narrow, steep ditch and a 1,600' long system of buried pipes and vaults that empties into Puget Sound at approximately -8.0' MLLW. A flap tide gate is present within the pipe outfall system. The tidegate is often closed during winter months limiting tidal inflow and fish access. The gate is held open mid-March through mid-October. This existing system is a nearly complete fish access barrier. In addition, the existing system interrupts the natural delivery of freshwater, organic matter (detritus), and prey organisms to the shoreline of the Puget Sound. Thus, juvenile Chinook salmon and other species migrating and rearing in the shallow waters along the shoreline do not benefit from the current inputs of the marsh system.

Limited Quality and Quantity of Habitat Problem: Currently, approximately 10 acres of the accessible 28-acre marsh is a combination of mudflat and saltmarsh habitat (see Existing Conditions map in the attachments) that would support juvenile Chinook rearing. The remaining 18 acres of marsh are dominated by cattails, indicating primarily a freshwater habitat. Previously existing channel networks from the creeks to the estuarine portion of the marsh have now been overgrown by cattails and no channels exist currently.

#2: Describe the limiting factors, and/or ecological concerns, and limiting life stages (by fish species) that your project expects to address.

This project addresses a key salmon recovery issue of limited availability for juvenile Chinook salmon to important, yet rare, nearshore marsh/estuarine rearing habitat. The project is located approximately 9 miles from the Cedar River outlet from Lake Washington at Shilshole Bay and 17 miles from the Snohomish River. This is within the range of documented juvenile fish migration and use. The stream slope (<6.5 percent), watershed size (>100 acres), and anticipated tidal channel outlet configuration (tidally backwatered) for the preferred daylight alignment would promote use of the restored marsh and creek habitats by juvenile Chinook salmon along the WRIA 8 nearshore, enhancing the juvenile life stage of Puget Sound Chinook salmon, and the egg, juvenile and adult life stages of both chum and coho salmon. The project will also improve habitat conditions for the existing population of cutthroat trout found in the estuary-marsh complex and associated freshwater tributary system.

#3: What are the project goals? The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition. Inlcude which species and life stages will benefit from the outcome, and the time of year the benefits will be realized. **Example Goals and Objectives**

The goal of this restoration project is to restore fish access and improve tidal hydrology to Edmonds Marsh , thereby supporting Chinook salmon recovery goals for Puget Sound. Restoring access through an unobstructed tidal channel will allow juvenile Chinook salmon access to this 28 acre barrier estuary complex. Additional benefits include access to spawning areas for other salmonid species, such as coho. The desired future condition of this habitat is an unobstructed, daylight tidal channel from the marsh, across the Unocal property, under the BNSF railway and across the publicly owned Marina Beach Park that maximizes daily tidal exchange, fish access and habitat.

The goal of the current project phase is preliminary design of the daylight tidal channel, habitat features, and riparian buffers and flood abatement features. A second goal is the continued negotiations with WSDOT Ferries to reach an MOU outlining control and tenure of the Unocal property for restoration.

#4: What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achieveable, Relevant, and Time-bound). **Example Goals and Objectives**

The objective of this project phase is to provide a clear understanding and direction to achieve future ownership of the Unocal property and agreements for control and tenure of the property for a tidal channel alignment within one year of funding availability and to provide a preliminary design of the preferred tidal channel alignment within 2 years of funding availability. Upon implementation of the design, we anticipate these specific objectives:

- Replace the existing 1,600 ft buried pipe and vault system with an approximately 2,000 ft meandering, daylight tidal channel providing 2.74 acres of new tidal channel habitat with associated habitat benches
- Creation of 1.3 new acres of wetland estuary habitat
- Creation of 4.5 acres of new riparian buffer habitat along the new tidal channel
- Excavation of tidal channels within the marsh interior and hydraulic reconnection to freshwater streams
- Installation of flood protection berms/walls at key locations around the marsh protecting upland uses

#5: Scope of work and deliverables. Provide a detailed description of each project task/element and how they will lead to the objectives. With each task/element, identify who will be responsible for each, what the deliverables will be, and the schedule for completion.

The following scope of work items will be contracted to engineering firm and overseen by City staff in the Public Works :

- Geotechnical and environmental field explorations- collect soils and groundwater data for channel and geotextile liner design, flood gate foundations, dewatering, and contaminated soils and groundwater handling plans. Deliverable: draft and final reports 4/2022
- Topographic/ planimetric features and boundary survey for real estate and property agreements, rights of way and easements. Deliverable: draft and final reports 4/2022
- Contaminated soils handling and disposal plan. Deliverable: handling and disposal plan
- Final hydraulic modeling. Deliverable: draft and final reports 6/2022
- BNSF Design Elements. Deliverable: foundation protection, temporary shoring, excavation, fencing along BNSF ROW, and rail safety plan 6/2022
- Preliminary design details: constructability review for excavation, contaminated soils handling and disposal, geotextile liner installation, channel bed materials, LWD and in-channel habitat features, vegetation planting plans, quantity takeoff estimates, and specifications for the project. Deliverable: draft and final reports 10/2022
- Landowner Willingness Assessments- continue negotiations with WSDOT, ECY and potential other future owner. Deliverable: reports on all negotiations, landowner agreement, MOU 12/2021
- Prepare permit applications. Deliverable: draft permit applications 11/2022
- Cultural Resources review will be performed by a cultural resources monitor or observer and accompany all field exploration activities. Cultural resources staff will review design plans and update cultural resources studies in progression with the design. The cultural resources staff will coordinate communications of changes with the DAHP office and the tribes. Deliverable: draft and final reports 6/2022
- Informing the Marina Beach Park design. Deliverable: providing tidal channel and shoreline restoration designs to Parks project team 4/2022

#6: What are the assumptions and physical constraints that could impact whether you achieve your objectives? Assumptions and constrains are external conditions that are not under the direct control of the project, but directly impact the outcome of the project. These may include ecological and geomorphic factors, land use constraints, public acceptance of the project, delays, or other factors. How will you address these issues if they arise?

The City requires a new easement/property right across the Unocal portion of the site, which is currently under escrow with WSDOT Ferries. Legal actions have been initiated which indicate a pending resolution on the sale agreement; it is anticipated that the transfer will occur this year and staff have been working toward informal agreements. However, the State has made clear that no formal/written agreement will be granted until the property transfer occurs. The City wishes to position the project for success as soon as it transfers and felt waiting for 2023 funding would slow the project down. The City takes no objection to a condition of approval, or alternate approval, which requires an agreement prior to expending any funding.

#7: How have lessons learned from completed projects or monitoring studies informed this project?

Monitoring studies considered for this project include the Beamer et al. (2003) study in the Skagit River estuary and nearshore, which found more juvenile Chinook salmon used pocket estuaries than other nearshore areas, documenting the preference of juvenile Chinook to utilize available pocket estuary habitats. The 2011 investigation of juvenile salmonid use of the lower reaches of small, non-natal tributaries in Puget Sound's Whidbey basin documented juvenile Chinook in 16 of 18 streams sampled (Zackey et al. 2011). During the Early Feasibility Study for this project (11-1553), Zackey provided related site-specific information regarding fry presence based on gradient. He indicated that Chinook fry presence was observed in low gradient areas at the mouths of small streams. In 2019, restoration of Edmonds Marsh connection to Puget Sound ranked as a highest priority in Prioritizing Coastal Streams and Embayments Along Puget Sound Shores with a Railroad (Schlenger and Bloch, 2019).

#8: Describe the alternatives considered and why the preferred was chosen.

Responding to SRFB Technical Review in 2016, the project team developed alternative channel alignments that replaced a straight channel (Alt 1) with a meandering channel alignment (Alt 2-3) . The project team met with WSDOT Ferries in 2017 to present the revised daylight Alternatives 1- 3. Ferries provided feedback regarding an acceptable daylight channel configuration within the context of the future Edmonds Crossing Project. Alt 4 was developed based on this feedback. Following the 2018 sea-level rise assessment as part of the Final Feasibility Study (14-1299), three additional alternatives were created to address SLR impacts. Alt 6 is the current preferred alignment, based on site constraints and performance under SLR conditions.

#9: How were stakeholders consulted in the development of this project? Identify the stakeholders, their concerns or feedback, and how those concerns were addressed.

The City of Edmonds supports the restoration and transfer of property from WSDOT to another long-term conservation steward. The City is engaged in negotiating an MOU w/ Ferries to allow for a tidal channel across the site and has been working to actively engage multiple additional stakeholders including:
Unocal/Chevron: The current holder of title to the property. Unocal/Chevron needs to complete site clean-up before transferring title to WSDOT.
Ecology: Overseeing Clean-up
WSDOT Ferries: To receive property from Unocal, once ECY certifies. Future need for property uncertain, not in long-term ferries plan.
Community: Engaged and interested to advance a robust restoration project.
WDFW: Potential Future Owner
WDNR: Potential Future Owner

#10: Does your project address or accommodate the anticipated effects of climate change?

Yes

#10a: How will your project be climate resilient given future conditions?

In 2019, the project team completed a localized sea-level rise (SLR) study using updated 2018 sea-level rise data from NOAA and USACOE for year 2100 SLR. The study concluded that the daylight channel will require flood protection berms (or floodwalls) and will not require a floodgate. This SLR study found that the daylight tidal channel project along with flood protection berms will ultimately reduce flood risks compared to existing conditions (Final Feasibility Study report in Attachments).

#10b: How will your project increase habitat and species adaptability?

The results of the 2019 SLR study shows the project will not require a floodgate, but rather flood berms or floodwalls, allowing for the natural progression of marsh inundation over time without impacting the ability for juvenile salmon to access the marsh. This project represents the restoration of a critical nearshore habitat type that will remain functional and accessible over time as salmon in our region adapt to climate change and resulting impacts of sea-level rise in our region.

#11: Describe the sponsor's experience managing this type of project. Describe other projects where the sponsor has successfully used a similar approach.

City of Edmonds staff has experience managing local, state, and federal grant funded projects that are complex and multi dimensional. In addition, City of Edmonds has contracted Nature Insight Consulting for project management services for this project. The project engineering team will also have expertise in management of feasibility, design and construction of SRFB funded habitat restoration projects.

#12: Will veterans (including the veterans conservation corps) be involved in the project? If yes, please describe.

No

Planning Supplemental

#1: Is the project an assessment / inventory?

No

#2: Is your project a Barrier / Screening Diversion Inventory Project?

No

#3: Is this a fish passage design / screening design project?

Yes

#3a: List additional upstream and downstream fish passage barriers, if any. Identify current or future plans for correction.

There are no additional barriers downstream of the proposed daylighted tidal channel. There are fish passage barriers upstream, on both creeks. The scope of Willow Creek basin restoration intends to address upstream barriers on Willow Creek in the future.

#3b: Describe the amount and quality of habitat made accessible if the barrier is corrected. Include the Priority Index (PI), or Screening Priority Index (SPI), if applicable.

This project will improve accessibility to 28 acres of barrier marsh habitat and improve fish passage attractants and connectivity within the system. Habitat estimates from the study include 3.2 acres of mudflats, 5.9 acres of low salt marsh vegetation, 11.4 acres of freshwater marsh, and 6.1 acres of forested wetland. A portion of the freshwater (cattail) marsh will convert to tidal marsh habitat resulting from the increased salt water tidal prism to the marsh.

#3c: If you will be designing a culvert or arch to resolve the fish passage problem, what crossing design option will you use?

Other

N/A. A pre-fabricated 33ft span bottomless box culvert is already in place under the existing BNSF railroad.

#4: Will the project develop a design?

Yes

#4a: Will a licensed professional engineer design of the project?

Yes

#4b: Will you apply for permits as part of the project scope?

No. We anticipate applying for permits before beginningthe final design phase.

Planning Metrics

Worksite: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore (#1)

Area Encompassed (acres) (B.0.b.1)	28.0
Miles of Stream and/or Shoreline Affected (B.0.b.2)	0.25

DESIGN FOR SALMON RESTORATION

Preliminary design

Total cost for Preliminary design	$515,000
Project Identified in a Plan or Watershed Assessment. (1220) (B.1.b.11.a)	https://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/pu WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council. 201
Priority in Recovery Plan (1222) (B.1.b.11.b)	Project occurs in a Tier 1 priority in the WRIA 8 Plan (nearshore), targets a priority species (juvenile Chinook) and meets requirements for salmon recovery strategy of restoration of barrier estuary in the nearshore.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources

Total cost for Cultural resources	$15,000
Acres surveyed for cultural resources	0.50

Overall Project Metrics

COMPLETION DATE

Projected date of completion	06/30/2023

SPONSOR MATCH: MONETARY FUNDING

Amount of other monetary funding (A.12)	$80,000
Source of other monetary funding (A.12.a)	City of Edmonds
Timing of other monetary funding	City of Edmonds Stormwater Funding is available for the full project window. See attached cost summary for additional leveraged funding, not included as match. **Note:** Requested RCO+NFWF+City = Full PS&E package/shovel-ready

SPONSOR MATCH: DONATED UN-PAID LABOR (VOLUNTEERS)

Value of Donated Unpaid Labor (Volunteers) (A.13.a.2)	$0
Source of Donated Un-paid labor contributions (A.13.a.4)	n/a

SPONSOR MATCH: DONATED PAID LABOR

Value of Donated Paid Labor (A.13.b.1)	$0
Source of Donated Paid Contributions (A.13.b.2)	n/a

SPONSOR MATCH: OTHER IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS

Value of Other In-Kind Contributions (A.13.c.1)	$0
Source of Other In-Kind Contributions (A.13.c.3)	n/a
Description of other In-Kind contributions (A.13.c.2)	n/a
Metric Match Total	$80,000

Planning Cost Estimates

Worksite #1: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore

Category	Work Type	Estimated Cost	Note
Cultural Resources	Cultural resources	$15,000	
Design for Salmon restoration	Preliminary design	$515,000	
	Subtotal:	$530,000	
	Total Estimate For Worksite:	$530,000	

Summary

Total Estimated Costs:	$530,000
Total Estimated Planning Costs:	$530,000

Cost Summary

	Estimated Cost	Project %	Admin/AA&E %
Planning Costs			
Planning	$530,000		
SUBTOTAL	$530,000	100.00 %	
Total Cost Estimate	$530,000	100.00 %	

Funding Request and Match

FUNDING PROGRAM

Salmon State Projects	$450,000	84.91 %

SPONSOR MATCH

Category	Amount	Project %
Appropriation - Local	$80,000	
Match Total:	$80,000	15.09 %
Total Funding Request:	$530,000	100.00 %

Questions

#1: Explain how you determined the cost estimates

Project cost estimates were determined by developing a thorough scope of services and cost estimates supported by updated budget estimates provided in the Final Feasibility Study. While this project is unique in scope, other projects in Puget Sound have similar elements and cost estimates of those projects were considered while developing the budget for this project phase. The unit prices used in the cost estimates were derived from other recent fish habitat restoration projects in Puget Sound.

Cultural Resources

Project Application Report - 20-1056

Worksite #1: Edmonds Marsh & Nearshore

#1: Describe any planned ground disturbing pre-construction/restoration work. This includes geo-technical investigation, fencing, demolition, decommissioning roads, etc.

Geotechnical and environmental field explorations- collect soils and groundwater data for channel and geotextile liner design, flood gate foundations, dewatering, and contaminated soils and groundwater handling plans.

#2: Describe the existing project area conditions. The description should include existing conditions, current and historic land uses and previous excavation/fill (if depths and extent is known, please describe).

Edmonds Marsh is a 28 acre remnant barrier estuary located in the City of Edmonds in the northern extent of the nearshore of the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish watershed (WRIA8). The immediate extent of the project is west of SR 104, south of the Port of Edmonds' Harbor Square business park, east of the Port of Edmonds' Marina and the BNSF Railway's right of way, and west of the former Unocal/Chevron property (see site area vicinity map attached).

#3: Will a federal permit be required to complete the scope of work on the project areas located within this worksite?

Yes

#3a: List the agency that will be issuing the permit and the date you anticipate applying for and receiving the permit. Will the federal permit cover ALL proposed ground disturbing activities included in the project?

US Army Corps of Engineers will be federal permitting agency, but application will be submitted in future phase.

#4: Are you utilizing Federal Funding to complete the scope of work? This includes funds that are being shown as match or not.

Yes

#4a: Please list the federal agency and funding sources.

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)

#4b: Does the federal funding you are utilizing as match require you to receive state funding?

No

#5: Do you have knowledge of any previous cultural resource review within the project boundaries during the past 10 years?

Yes

Cultural Resources review will be performed by a cultural resources monitor or observer and accompany all field exploration activities. Cultural resources staff will review design plans and update cultural resources studies in progression with the design. The cultural resources staff will coordinate communications of changes with the DAHP office and the tribes. Deliverable: draft and final reports.

#5a: Summarize the previous cultural resource review; including lead agency and date of review, reference name and numbers, etc. If RCO, include the prior phase grant number. NOTE: Do not provide any site-specific information considered confidential. Attach previous surveys or other reference documents.

A previous cultural resources study was conducted for geotechnical investigation under the feasibility phase of this project which was funded through an RCO grant (14-1299). Archaeological monitoring of ground disturbance was recommended. See attachments. An updated or expanded cultural resources study is anticipated with the next phase of work ahead construction activities.

#6: Are there any structures over 45 years of age within this worksite? This includes structures such as buildings, tidegates, dikes, residential structures, bridges, rail grades, park infrastructure, etc.

Yes

#6a: List the structure(s) and the properties that they are located within the project area. Identify which structures will be removed or altered as part of this proposal. Attach at least one photo of each structure. The photo must be labeled so that the structure may be geographically located within your project area.

The existing railroad and existing tide-gate on the existing storm line may exceed 45 years in age. The rail road will not be altered by the project as a bridge has already been constructed to pass the daylight channel underneath the railroad. The tide-gate is necessary for flood control in the current marsh configuration but will be removed or abandoned as part of the project construction and will eliminate a partial fish barrier.

Project Permits

Permits and Reviews	Issuing Organization	Applied Date	Received Date	Expiration Date	Permit #
Archeological & Cultural Resoures (EO 05-05)	DAHP				
Clear & Grade Permit	City/County				
Cultural Assessment [Section 106]	DAHP				
Dredge/Fill Permit [Section 10/404 or 404]	Army Corps of Eng.				
Hydraulics Project Approval [HPA]	Dept of Fish & Wildlife				
SEPA	Local or State				
Water Quality Certification [Section 401]	County/Dept of Ecy.				
Shoreline Permit	City/County				

Note: We anticipate applying for these permits in the final design phase.

Attachments

Required Attachments	6 out of 6 done
Applicant Resolution/Authorizations	✓
Cost Estimate	✓
Map: Area of Potential Effect (APE)	✓
Map: Planning Area	✓
Photo	✓
RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet	✓

PHOTOS (JPG, GIF)

Photos (JPG, GIF)


414368


414369


436384

PROJECT DOCUMENTS AND PHOTOS

Project Documents and Photos

Project Application Report - 20-1056

File Type	Attach Date	Attachment Type	Title	Person	File Name, Number Associations	Shared
	06/30/2020	Project Review Comments	Project Review Comments Report, 20-1056P(accepted 06/30/20 1	ElizabethB	Project Review Comments Report - 20-1056 (accepted 06-30-2020_14-58-03).pdf, 436757	✓
	06/30/2020	Application Review Report	Grant Manager Comments Report, 20-1056P(compl 06/30/20 14:57	ElizabethB	Grant Manager Comments Report - 20-1056 (compl 06-30-2020_14-57-18).pdf, 436756	✓
	06/29/2020	Project Application Report	Project Application Report, 20-1056P (sub 06/29/20 12:14:01)	ZacharyR	Project Application Report - 20-1056 (submitted 06-29-2020_12-14-01).pdf, 436473	✓
	06/29/2020	Landowner acknowledgement form	Summary Memo & Land Owner Letters	ZacharyR	20200629_Land Status Memo.pdf, 436453	
	06/29/2020	Applicant Resolution/Authorizations	20200629_Resolution Letter.pdf	ZacharyR	20200629_Resolution Letter.pdf, 436413	✓
	06/29/2020	Letters of Support	Letter of Support from NFWF Application.pdf	ZacharyR	Letter of Support from NFWF Application.pdf, 436386	✓
	06/29/2020	Photo	2018 Aerial of Marsh	ZacharyR	vlcsnap-2019-07-15-14h35m15s368.jpg, 436384	✓
	06/29/2020	Design document	2019 Council Presentation Slide Show	ZacharyR	WILLOW_CRK_OCT-22-2019_FULL.pdf, 436372	✓
	04/10/2020	Application Review Report	Application Review Report, 20-1056P(rtnd 04/10/20 10:53:19)	ElizabethB	Project Application Report - 20-1056 (rtnd 04-10-2020_10-53-19).pdf, 421015	✓
	02/27/2020	Environmental Site Assessment Report	WILLOW-CRK_WQ-SEDQ_RPT_20190711.Reduced	ElizabethB	WILLOW-CRK_WQ-SEDQ_RPT_20190711.Reduced.pdf, 417525	✓
	02/21/2020	Map: Area of Potential Effect (APE)	Update APE Map	ZacharyR	FINAL_APE Map.pdf, 416688	
	02/21/2020	Cultural Resources: Cultural Resources Survey	Previous Phase Cultural Resources Survey	ZacharyR	WILLOW_CRK_DAYLIGH_CULTURAL-RESOURCES_20140914.pdf, 416625	
	02/19/2020	Application Review Report	Application Review Report, 20-1056P(rtnd 02/19/20 13:46:21)	ElizabethB	Project Application Report - 20-1056 (rtnd 02-19-2020_13-46-21).pdf, 416377	✓
	02/12/2020	Project plan document	2019 Alternative Analysis Report_Figures 11-23_3 of 3	ZacharyR	WILLOW_CRK_EXPANDED_ALTS_R…23.pdf, 415657	✓
	02/12/2020	Project plan document	2019 Alternative Analysis Report_Figures 1-10_2 of 3	ZacharyR	WILLOW_CRK_EXPANDED_ALTS_R…10.pdf, 415655	✓
	02/12/2020	Project plan document	2019 Alternative Analysis Report_BODY_1 of 3	ZacharyR	Willow_Creek_2019_Report_Only.pdf, 415647	✓
	02/04/2020	Cost Estimate	SAL-CostEstimate 20-1056 Willow Creek Daylighting Prelim Des	KeeleyO	SAL-CostEstimate 20-1056 Willow Creek Daylighting Prelim Design.xlsx, 414607	✓
	02/04/2020	Map: Planning Area	Edmonds_Marsh_Vicinity Map_07-2014.pdf	KeeleyO	Edmonds_Marsh_Vicinity Map_07-2014.pdf, 414604	✓
	02/04/2020	Map: Planning Area	Edmonds Marsh_Project location map.pdf	KeeleyO	Edmonds Marsh_Project location map.pdf, 414602	✓
	02/03/2020	Photo	Edmonds_Marsh_aerial_2013	KeeleyO	IMG_4159.jpg, 414369	✓
	02/03/2020	Photo	Edmonds_marsh_image2012.JPG	KeeleyO	Edmonds_marsh_image2012.jpg, 414368	✓
	02/03/2020	RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet	FiscalDataCollectionSheet_2020.pdf	KeeleyO	FiscalDataCollectionSheet_2020.pdf, 414365	

Application Status

Application Due Date: null

Project Application Report - 20-1056

Status Name	Status Date	Submitted By	Submission Notes
Application Complete	06/30/2020	Elizabeth Butler	Thank you! Your application is complete and will be reviewed by the SRFB Technical Review Panel for funding in July. If your project is cleared or conditioned for funding you will be eligible to receive funds from the LE. If awarded a grant, the SRFB will be approving the projects at their Sept 16th meeting and we should be able to proceed with the grant agreement shortly there after. Safe Passage, Elizabeth
Application Resubmitted	06/29/2020	Zachary Richardson	
Application Returned	04/10/2020	Elizabeth Butler	Thank you for your efforts on the Edmonds Marsh Estuary Restoration Design application. The SRFB Technical Review Panel comments are now available (and the grant manager questions may have changed slightly as well). Please work with Jason Wilkinson to determine whether you wish to continue with this application. If you do wish to re-submit, please update your proposal in response to comments, and also respond directly to the comments from the Review Panel. Final applications are due by noon on June 29, 2020. As always, let me know if you have questions or need assistance with PRISM. I'm here to help! safe passage, Elizabeth
Application Resubmitted	02/21/2020	Zachary Richardson	
Application Returned	02/19/2020	Elizabeth Butler	Thank you! There are a few more elements we need your help with before site visits. Please see the pdf attachment with my comments. Just let me know if you have any questions.
Application Submitted	02/12/2020	Zachary Richardson	This is a bit a of a working draft. We will continue to update and alter as we get new information or to address any concerns or question raise by the committee.
Preapplication	01/09/2020		

I certify that to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is true and correct. Further, all application requirements due on the application due date have been fully completed to the best of my ability. I understand that if this application is found to be incomplete, it will be rejected by RCO. I understand that I may be required to submit additional documents before evaluation or approval of this project and I agree to provide them. (Zachary Richardson, 06/29/2020)

Date of last change: 08/05/2020