

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

POST APPLICATION INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel
Member

Name: SRFB Review Panel

Lead Entity: Island County

Project

Sponsor: Whidbey Camano Land Trust

Project

Name: Livingston Bay Pocket Estuary Restoration

Date: October 30, 2009 (No change from September 29, 2009 comments)

Project
Location: Livingston Bay in Port
Susan Bay, Camano
Island

Project
Number: 09-1463R

Refer to Manual # 18, Appendix E-1, for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “Why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

1. Is this a draft project of concern according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Yes ☐ No ☒

Why?

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?

Thank you for clearly addressing the pre-app comments and providing your TAC & WRAC responses as well.

4. Other comments.

EARLY APPLICATION COMMENTS (Summer 2009):

Panel Member
Name: **Pat Powers and Kelley Jorgensen**

Lead Entity:	Island Co	Project Location:	
Project Sponsor:	TNC	Project Number:	09-1463

Project Name: **Livingston Bay Pocket Estuary Restoration**
Date: **6/8/9**

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

This project is part of the third phase of a series of acquisitions (the current and related 43-acre acquisition proposal is a separate application but this restoration relies on that acquisition) which collectively will protect over 7100 acres of salt marsh, tide flat and beach habitat in Port Susan Bay. The restoration proposal is to remove 100 ft of an 80-year old dike to restore connectivity to the 10-acre pocket estuary. The 100-foot removal was a negotiated amount of removal area with the land owner and is apparently a restriction as part of the sale agreement.

There was discussion on site about the correct opening location, amount of opening needed and the cost. This is a construction project but does not yet have any design information available. The \$414,000 cost estimate seems very high for only 100 feet of removal in an area where borrow ditches can be filled. The sponsor needs to justify the costs and have some conceptual design information to move forward.

2. Missing Preapplication information.

Conceptual Design Plans or Sketch

Budget Breakdown

Criteria

For restoration and protection-related projects:

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.
2. Information provided or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
3. The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.
4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor and lead entity have failed to justify the cost.
5. The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
6. The project may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments, or restoration actions in the watershed.
7. The project uses a technique that has not been considered successful in the past.
8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives.
9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objective.
10. There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the project is not completed.
11. The project design is not adequate or the project is improperly sited.
12. The stewardship description is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance and this would likely jeopardize the project's success.
13. The project has not been shown to address an important habitat condition or watershed process in the area.
14. The main focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.

For assessment, design, feasibility, and research projects:

15. It is not clear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing (per the research plan).
16. The project does not address an information need important to understanding the watershed, is not directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will not clearly lead to beneficial projects.
17. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.
18. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits.
19. The assessment or research does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed, may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat assessment or restoration activities, or may be inconsistent with a larger assessment or research need.
20. The assessment uses a technique that has not been proven successful in past applications.
21. There are significant constraints to the implementation of high priority projects following completion of the assessment.
22. It is unclear how the assessment will achieve its stated objectives.
23. It is unlikely that the assessment will achieve its stated objective.
24. The main focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.