

SFEG Response to 10/3/2011 Post Application SRFB Review Comments

1. Is this a draft project of concern (POC) according to the SRFB's criteria? (Yes or No) No.

No Response needed

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

No Response needed

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The Review Panel recognizes the potential benefits of a reconnection project at Swan Lake; however, there are several evident engineering and societal challenges that may limit the likelihood of such a project being undertaken. The Review Panel sees the potential for the assessment to lead to a prohibitively expensive connection to the north. In order to ensure the assessment of a range of possible alternatives that may lead to various levels of public support and cost, the Review Panel is placing the following CONDITIONS on the project:

- 1) one of the alternatives evaluated is some kind of an enhanced fish passable tide gate so if the County proceeds, they do it with a somewhat habitat-friendly way
- 2) an engineered channel at the existing tidegate location, such as that proposed at Shorecrest, is an option considered during the proposed investigation.
- 3) the feasibility analysis needs to be conducted in a fashion that allows a fatal flaw decision making analysis to be conducted. That is, if prohibitive site constraints for establishing a connection between the lake and marine shoreline are identified, no further additional study would be conducted. Conducting supporting studies would not be completed until it is determined that connection to the nearshore is viable.

It has been SFEG and SLWPGs intent all along that the feasibility study will assess at least 3 options for restoring hydrologic conductivity/fish passage at Swan Lake. We will ensure that the alternatives analysis considers at least the two options identified in Conditions 1&2 above, in addition to one or more open channel sites located north of the current lake.

Consultants asked to prepare proposals for completing the feasibility assessment work will be directed to propose a work sequence that will allow them to complete a preliminary "fatal flaw" assessment, including early termination of technical studies if applicable. However, we would caution that the majority of the technical analyses proposed for the assessment are specifically intended to identify potential "fatal flaws". We will conduct the work in a phased sequence to the maximum extent practicable, and will NOT embark on any design work before the fatal flow assessment is completed. If fatal flaws are identified for one or more options we will notify the SRFB Project Manager immediately and request further direction.

4. Other comments:

The project sponsor may want to contact Micah Wait at Wild Fish Conservancy as he has worked on similar projects; Deer Lagoon and Crockett Lake, and may be able to provide some valuable insight.

We have benefitted from Micah's expertise and feedback throughout the proposal process, and will contact him and invite him to it in on preliminary work scoping and alternative analysis meetings.