

The budget directs the board to distribute the funds in coordination with the Puget Sound Partnership. To improve flexibility and quickly fund projects that are ready for acquisition or construction, the program allocates PSAR funds in several rounds:

1. An accelerated first round, which allocated funds on July 1, 2009 for the 2009 construction season, was completed last May. The board approved funding for five projects.
2. A second round that parallels the timing of the 2009 SRFB round and allocates funds in December 2009; and,
3. Additional rounds conducted, as necessary, depending on project readiness and watershed needs.

The PSAR appropriation was allocated by lead entity using the same allocation formula used for board funds. All the early action PSAR projects are funded within the lead entity's individual 2009 PSAR allocation. The Puget Sound Partnership coordinates with lead entities and the board to submit projects accordingly. PSAR projects must meet the same eligibility requirements and go through the same review process as board-funded projects.

Additional Grant Round

Four lead entities and the Partnership approached RCO staff several months ago to discuss the concept of an additional early-action grant round for PSAR funds. The round would award funds to sponsors with projects that are ready to proceed before the end of the year.

For the first three projects in the table below, the sponsors are asking for the early funding because the acquisitions can close before November 30, 2009. For the fourth project, the early funding is needed to finalize their contracting and to show their local match required for US Army Corps of Engineers construction funding. RCO staff and the Partnership agreed to hold an additional round, and set a timeline for proposal and review.

Project #	Lead Entity	Project Name	Project Sponsor	PSAR Request	Sponsor Match	Total
09-1446A (#1 of 10)	Skagit Watershed Council	Kiket Island Conservation Acquisition	Washington State Parks	\$1,000,000	\$235,325	\$1,235,325
09-1379C (#2 of 7)	Stillaguamish	Klein Farm Acquisition and Restoration	Stillaguamish Tribe	\$900,000	\$170,000	\$1,070,000
09-1482A (#1 of 5)	Island County	Skagit Bay Nearshore 2	Whidbey Camano Land Trust	\$620,000	\$386,000	\$1,006,000 (\$1,516,000)
09-1277R (#1 of 7)	Snohomish River Basin	Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration - Construction	Tulalip Tribe	\$500,000 [†]	\$90,000	\$590,000

^{*} Includes \$510,000 of 2007 SRFB & PSAR funds from #07-1592A
[†] 2007 PSAR Funds from 07-1713A, incomplete project.

Analysis

Each of the projects is on its respective watershed's three-year work plan. These plans have been reviewed by the Puget Sound Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT) to ensure consistency with the regional and watershed recovery strategy. The projects would advance the implementation of the Skagit, Stillaguamish, Island and Snohomish chapters of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan and the Partnership's Action Agenda. The local watershed technical committees and the RITT have completed their reviews, and found these projects to be consistent with the regional and watershed recovery strategies.

The board's technical review panel completed a field review and final application review for each of the four projects. They found that all four have strong technical merit and recommended all four projects for funding consideration. However, the funding recommendation for the Kiket Island Conservation Acquisition includes conditions. Staff will present those conditions at the October board meeting.

Both the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council and the Puget Sound Partnership Leadership Council have reviewed and affirmed the process for identifying PSAR projects.

The attached project summaries and technical review panel evaluation comment forms include more information on these four projects.

Next Steps

If the board approves funding for these projects, RCO staff will begin work to enter into appropriate grant agreements.

Attachments

- A. Project Summary and Technical Review Panel Evaluation for Project #09-1446A, Kiket Island Conservation Acquisition
- B. Project Summary and Technical Review Panel Evaluation for Project #09-1379C, Klein Farm Acquisition and Restoration
- C. Project Summary and Technical Review Panel Evaluation for Project #09-1482A, Skagit Bay Nearshore 2
- D. Project Summary for Project #09-1277R, Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration - Construction

**Puget Sound Acquisition & Restoration Fund
 Puget Sound Recovery Projects
 Application Project Summary**

TITLE: Kiket Island Conservation Acquisition	NUMBER: 09-1446A (Acquisition) STATUS: Application Complete
APPLICANT: State Parks	CONTACT: Bill Koss (360) 902-8629
COSTS:	SPONSOR MATCH:
RCO \$1,000,000 81 %	Donated Labor \$58,825
Local \$235,325 19 %	Donated Materials \$26,500
Total \$1,235,325 100 %	Grant - Private \$150,000

DESCRIPTION:

SRFB funding combined with \$13M in private, state, and federal grants (see acquisition budget in PRISM Attachments for detail) allows State Parks to purchase Kiket Island (96 acres) to expand Deception Pass State Park.

Directly east of Deception Pass and within the boundaries of the Swinomish Reservation, Kiket Island is a peninsula connected to Fidalgo and Flagstaff Islands by tombolos. This acquisition will protect important Skagit River delta marine riparian habitat for endangered salmon and provide public shoreline access for passive recreation and environmental education.

Protecting Kiket from development will benefit diverse nearshore habitat including feeder bluffs, kelp & eelgrass that support Chinook, chum, and coho salmon, steelhead, and bull trout. Herring, surf smelt, and sand lance spawn along the Kiket Island shore. A rare and high functioning pocket estuary fed by freshwater seeps through a palustrine scrub shrub wetland offers important habitat to juvenile salmonids, forage fish, and numerous waterfowl and shorebirds. Marine riparian forested uplands with old growth trees shade the Kiket beaches.

Seattle City Light owned the property in the 1970's with plans to build a nuclear power plant. Fortunately the island remains mostly undeveloped, and the baseline assessments completed 30 years ago render this the most studied nearshore area in the Puget Sound. The Trust for Public Land holds a time sensitive Option to Purchase the property expiring in Dec 2009.

LOCATION INFORMATION:

West Fidalgo Island

COUNTY: Skagit

GOAL & OBJECTIVE:

The goal of the project is to protect intact habitat from degradation.

The objective of the project is to protect salmon refugia and habitat that is part of a key ecological process.

PERMITS ANTICIPATED:

Archeological & Cultural Resources (EO 05-05) None - No permits Required

SALMON INFORMATION: (* indicates primary)

Species Targeted

Bull Trout	Pink
Chinook (Threatened (06/06))*	Searun Cutthroat
Chum (Not Warranted (06/06))	Sockeye
Coho (Species of Concern (06/06))	Steelhead (Proposed Threatened (06/06))

Habitat Factors Addressed

Estuarine and Nearshore Habitat*	Water Quality
Riparian Conditions	

LAST UPDATED: September 2, 2009

DATE PRINTED: September 17, 2009

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

POST APPLICATION INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **SRFB Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Skagit Watershed Council**

Project Location: **Puget Sound, west side of Fidalgo Island**

Project Sponsor: **Washington State Parks Trust for Public Land**

Project Name: **Kiket Island Conservation Acquisition**

Project Number: **09-1446A**

Date: **September 28, 2009**

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?

The biggest concern is the long-term State Park plans for the property. Including the island within Deception Pass State Park does not automatically translate into salmon habitat protection, and on the contrary allowing public access will likely cause greater impact to the nearshore environment than has been the case under the current private ownership.

See grant agreement condition on the next page.

Special Condition:

State Parks will use Kiket Island for day-use recreational activities only. Development of camping sites and overnight camping activities are not allowed on the acquired site.

State Parks will restrict public access to sensitive nearshore habitat areas (forage fish and salmon habitat) during critical spawning and rearing seasons. Specific habitat areas and seasonal timing restrictions will be established from multiple sources of on-site habitat data, including but not limited to, the Pentec Kiket Island Biological Assessment, dated May 2008. Refer to the “tidal pond (pocket estuary)” section, on pages 7 and 8, the “forage fish habitat and use” section, on page 10, and the “salmonid habitat and use” section, on pages 10 and 11 of this document for initial guidance. These restrictions will be incorporated into the Kiket Island long-term stewardship plan that will be developed through the formal planning process initiated by State Parks, using an extensive public outreach program.

State parks will allow only non-motorized trails on the site. Trail development in the riparian buffer area should be kept to a minimum and should utilize existing cleared areas to minimize the removal of shoreline vegetation.

4. Other comments.

2009 Early Review Panel Comments

Great acquisition of a 96 acre island in an important nearshore marine area. Site includes salt water lagoon and potential restoration options along the nearshore. The applicant should be sure to emphasize the fish benefits of this area.

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.

**Salmon Program
 State Recovery Projects
 Application Project Summary**

TITLE: Klein Farm Acquisition and Restoration	NUMBER: 09-1379C (Combined) STATUS: Application Complete
APPLICANT: Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians	CONTACT: Jason Griffith (360) 631-0868
COSTS:	SPONSOR MATCH:
RCO \$900,000 85 %	Cash Donations \$60,000
Local \$160,000 15 %	Donated Labor \$50,000
Total \$1,060,000 100 %	Donated Materials \$50,000

DESCRIPTION:

This project is to acquire 60 acres of floodplain, remove 300 feet of bank armoring, and enhance 28 acres of riparian habitat on the South Fork Stillaguamish. Project objectives are to protect the land from development, restore natural channel migration and habitat forming processes in the floodplain, reduce stream temperatures, and provide a source of LWD for instream habitat.

The primary problem facing the subject property is that it is threatened by development (the property is currently on the market). As this land is zoned Ag-10, there could be six houses placed on the floodplain adjacent to the South Fork Stillaguamish. It is unlikely that future landowners will allow bank armoring to be removed if there were residences nearby. Additionally, there is a maturing forest buffer on the eastern boundary of the field that would not be protected (by county code) from clearing by some future landowner. By purchasing and restoring floodplain functions on this piece of land, we will address the primary threats and problems (from a salmon perspective) facing these parcels. Protecting and enhancing the riparian areas will help to reduce stream temperatures and provide a source of large woody debris (LWD) for instream habitat. Removing bank armoring will allow for natural channel processes to resume at this site.

Restoring floodplain functions in the Stillaguamish has also been identified as a cultural priority for the Stillaguamish Tribe.

LOCATION INFORMATION:

South Fork Stillaguamish

LEAD ENTITY ORG: Stillaguamish LE

COUNTY: Snohomish

WRIA: Stillaguamish (5)

GOAL & OBJECTIVE:

The goal of the project is to protect and restore freshwater in-stream channel meander migration patterns.

The objective of the project is to protect and restore the flood plain meander functions, sediment transport functions, dissipation, and water storage.

The goal of the project is to protect and restore native riparian vegetation along salmon bearing streams.

The objective of the project is to protect and restore natural streamside vegetation, improve stream temperature, reduce erosion, filtration, and recruit large woody debris.

PERMITS ANTICIPATED:

Archeological & Cultural Resources (EO 05-05)	SEPA
Endangered Species Act Compliance [ESA]	Shoreline Permit
Hydraulics Project Approval [HPA]	

SALMON INFORMATION: (* indicates primary)

Species Targeted

Bull Trout	Pink
Chinook (Threatened (06/06))*	Rainbow
Chum (Not Warranted (06/06))	Searun Cutthroat
Coho (Species of Concern (06/06))	Steelhead (Proposed Threatened (06/06))
Cutthroat	

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

POST APPLICATION INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **SRFB Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**

Project

Sponsor: **Stillaguamish Tribe**

Project Name: **Klein Farm Acquisition and Restoration**

Project
Location:

Project
Number: **09-1379C**

Date: **September 28, 2009**

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 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?

The Review Panel thanks the project sponsor for addressing all information requests and issues raised during the early review, particularly the detailed plans for removing bank armoring, the specific development threats, and the issue of opposition by the local agricultural advisory board related to conversion of agricultural land.

4. Other comments.

2009 Early Review Panel Comments

The review panel feels that this well-tailored proposal's great potential benefit for local salmon recovery speaks for itself. The applicant may want to add a modest "A&E" budget for engineering and permitting for removing the bank armoring. Include a good quality site plan showing the subject parcel in relation to the larger entire Klein Farm property. The review panel also appreciates the applicant's candor in stating the Stillaguamish Tribe's opposition to the Snohomish County Agricultural Advisory Board's recommendations for agricultural land preservation, and suggests that discussion of this issue should focus on how the issue will be addressed. In the final application provide any additional information that is available on the issue of conversion of agricultural land, and how this issue will be resolved to allow the project to go forward should it be funded.

Show any neighboring properties upstream and downstream of the project site, especially any public lands or other lands held in conservation/protection, that contribute to a larger area of protected floodplain area. Describe any anticipated effects to the property from the bank armoring removal, and to neighboring properties. Discuss if any set-back armoring would be necessary to protect neighboring parcels. Discuss the development threat to the property (in the field review it was mentioned that ~6 homes could be constructed on the parcel up along the hillside) and why acquisition is needed versus an easement or other alternative.

Clarify length of bank armoring to be removed; it varies from 300 to 1000 feet in project descriptions.

Since the property is currently for sale, if this proposal is approved for funding by the lead entity, consider putting an "option" on the property to ensure it isn't sold out from under you prior to the SRFB funding meeting in December. An option will prevent the landowner from selling to other interested parties until some agreed upon date, but it does not lock the landowner into having to accept your offer once you make it. They still have the right to not sell to you.

**Salmon Program
 State Recovery Projects
 Application Project Summary**

TITLE: Skagit Bay Nearshore 2			NUMBER: 09-1482A (Acquisition)
			STATUS: Application Complete
APPLICANT: Whidbey Camano Land Trust			CONTACT: Patricia Powell (360) 222-3310
COSTS:			SPONSOR MATCH:
RCO	\$620,000	62 %	Conservation Futures \$225,000
Local	\$386,000	38 %	Grant - Private \$161,000
Total	\$1,006,000	100 %	

DESCRIPTION:

Whidbey Camano Land Trust will acquire 39 acres with over 2,140 feet of Skagit Bay waterfront. This project is in Tier 1, identified in the WRIA 6 Salmon Recovery Plan as the highest priority area for protection and restoration. The project purpose is to protect nearshore processes and habitats beneficial to juvenile and adult salmon. The nearshore habitat provides the greatest number of functions to the greatest number of salmon and trout stocks and life history stages in WRIA 6. A primary project goal is to protect degraded habitat (diked land on Skagit Bay) from development with the near-term goal to restore habitat for salmon by restoring habitat functions.

The nearshore is a high protection priority for juvenile salmon and forage fish. It is within an ebb tide (day's migration) from the Skagit River Delta. Its location near the mouth of the North Fork Skagit River is particularly important as it is part of a distributory pathway where density dependent migration of fry migrant Chinook salmon is the highest within the Skagit tidal delta (Beamer et al 2005). The project is adjacent to continuous eelgrass beds and nearshore that are priority herring and smelt spawning areas. This grant request is a cost increase supplementing a previously funded SRFB grant from 2007 (07-1592A - \$510,000 SRFB/PSAR not showing in this proposal).

LOCATION INFORMATION:

Skagit Bay

LEAD ENTITY ORG: Island County LE

COUNTY: Island

WRIA: Island (6)

GOAL & OBJECTIVE:

The goal of the project is to protect degraded habitat from further degradation with the intent to restore the habitat.

The objective of the project is to protect degraded salmon refugia, and habitat part of key ecological processes.

PERMITS ANTICIPATED:

None - No permits Required

SALMON INFORMATION: (* indicates primary)

Species Targeted

Bull Trout	Coho (Species of Concern (06/06))
Chinook (Threatened (06/06))*	Cutthroat
Chum (Not Warranted (06/06))	Pink

Habitat Factors Addressed

Biological Processes	Water Quality
Estuarine and Nearshore Habitat*	Water Quantity
Loss of Access to Spawning and Rearing Habitat	

LAST UPDATED: September 17, 2009

DATE PRINTED: September 17, 2009

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 Location: **Dugualla Bay, Whidbey Island**

Project Name: **Skagit Bay Nearshore 2 (Acquisition)**

Project Number: **09-1482A**

Date: **September 28, 2009**

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?

Thanks for addressing our early comments. It was helpful understand the associated habitat restoration plans by specifically explaining the context of the related 09-1468N proposal, “Skagit Bay Nearshore Design.” This acquisition proposal is necessary to make the restoration possible – the restoration application includes a much better description of how the project has evolved out of former grant products and how the acquisition and restoration proposals are linked.

4. Other comments.

2009 Early Review Panel Comments

Very little information on design concepts is available to the review panel in the application and discussions on site were very conceptual. Comments provided are based on little information and should be viewed as preliminary and subject to change with additional information.

The proposed acquisition project area received a previous SRFB grant but the appraisal came back higher than the prior grant so additional funds are being requested. This acquisition is a pre-requisite to the other project proposed this round that would restore habitat on the same property in the diked portions. Both the acquisition and the restoration project builds on grant products from 2005 and 2007; the Skagit Basin Nearshore Feasibility Assessment and the Origins of Juvenile Chinook in WRIA 6 Nearshore, respectively. The Ducken Property targeted for protection and restoration is former diked tideland that would restore freshwater inputs, upland forested habitat connectivity where seeps are located and tidal channels through breaching or other connections through a dike, requiring a setback levee to protect a nearby county road.

The fish benefits from protection and restoration appears high for Skagit River juvenile Chinook outmigrants preferring a pocket-estuary rearing life history strategy.

Project area descriptions and maps are somewhat confusing; the application would be strengthened by:

1. maps labeled to better coincide with the project descriptions and clarify the existing vs proposed phases of protection/restoration, and
2. discussion addressing the discrepancy in the funding gap between the prior grant and the current grant request.

**Salmon Program
 State Recovery Projects
 Application Project Summary**

TITLE: Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration - Construction	NUMBER: 09-1277R (Restoration) STATUS: Application Complete									
APPLICANT: Tulalip Tribe	CONTACT: Maria Calvi (360) 716-4597									
COSTS: <table border="0"> <tr> <td>RCO</td> <td>\$500,000</td> <td>85 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local</td> <td>\$90,000</td> <td>15 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td><u>\$590,000</u></td> <td><u>100 %</u></td> </tr> </table>	RCO	\$500,000	85 %	Local	\$90,000	15 %	Total	<u>\$590,000</u>	<u>100 %</u>	SPONSOR MATCH: Grant - Federal \$90,000
RCO	\$500,000	85 %								
Local	\$90,000	15 %								
Total	<u>\$590,000</u>	<u>100 %</u>								

DESCRIPTION:

The Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration Project represents a broad-based interagency and community effort to restore historic tidal processes and a functioning estuary intertidal marsh system to 350 acres of isolated floodplain within the lower Snohomish River estuary. The project will also restore natural hydrologic connection and functions to two stream systems and provide unrestricted fish access to 16 miles of upstream spawning and rearing habitat. Restoration will involve breaching the levee along Ebey Slough, installing a setback levee to protect adjacent properties located in the floodplain, filling ditches, excavating stream and tidal channels, and planting native shrub and tree species in shoreline riparian areas. This project requests **\$500,000** for construction activities; specifically, setback levee construction, levee breach, and project management tasks. These funds will supplement \$1,455,000 in tribal and state funds to meet a 35% local cost-share obligation for working with the US Army Corps of Engineers under the Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Program. Additional federal funds will be used for interior site preparation (i.e. ditch filling, channel excavation, riparian planting) and the levee breach. Total project cost is \$7,800,000. However, only a fraction of this full amount is reflected in the grant funding request.

LOCATION INFORMATION:

The project will occur adjacent to Ebey Slough (at river mile 3)

LEAD ENTITY ORG: Snohomish County LE

COUNTY: Snohomish

WRIA: Snohomish (7)

GOAL & OBJECTIVE:

The goal of the project is to restore estuarine and nearshore conditions and processes in the marine environment.
 The objective of the project is to restore shoreline habitat diversity and function.

PERMITS ANTICIPATED:

Building Permit	Hydraulics Project Approval [HPA]
Clear & Grade Permit	NEPA
Cultural Assessment [Section 106]	SEPA
Dredge/Fill Permit [Section 10/404 or 404]	Shoreline Permit
Endangered Species Act Compliance [ESA]	Water Quality Certification [Section 401]

SALMON INFORMATION: (* indicates primary)

Species Targeted

Bull Trout	Cutthroat
Chinook (Threatened (06/06))*	Pink
Chum (Not Warranted (06/06))	Steelhead (Proposed Threatened (06/06))
Coho (Species of Concern (06/06))	

Habitat Factors Addressed

Biological Processes	Loss of Access to Spawning and Rearing Habitat
Channel Conditions	Water Quality
Estuarine and Nearshore Habitat*	

LAST UPDATED: September 11, 2009

DATE PRINTED: September 17, 2009

Salmon Recovery Funding Board

POST APPLICATION INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

Panel Member

Name: **SRFB Review Panel**

Lead Entity: **Snohomish River Basin**

Project

Sponsor: **Tulalip Tribes**

Project Name: **Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration -
Construction**

Project
Location:

Project
Number: **09-1277R**

Date: **September 28, 2009**

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?

The project sponsor has addressed early review comments.

4. Other comments.

2009 Early Review Panel Comments

The project would restore natural estuarine processes to approximately 300 acres of potentially high value habitat. The sponsor will need to provide more details on the project tasks and budget. A lot of good background work has been done for this complex project, and the application will just require more details on specific restoration work.

In regards to the rerouting of Jones and Allen Creek – What is the likelihood of maintaining the proposed reroute of creeks as future sediment deposition occurs? Are there any potential issues if the creeks shift back towards their current alignment or create a new alignment?

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.