|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lead Entity | Date | Application Complete | Status |
| Early App. Review-Site Visit | April 19 | No | NMI |
| July Review Panel Mtg. |  |  | Flagged |
| Post Application | 10/2011 | Yes | Conditioned |
| Final |  |  |  |
| Status Options | | | |
| NMI | Need More Information | | |
| POC | Project of Concern (Post Application and Final only) | | |
| FLAGGED | Needs full panel discussion | | |
| CLEAR | Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process. | | |

Lead Entity: Island County

Project Number: 11-1297

Project Name: Swan Lake Engineering Feasibility Assessment

Project Sponsor: Skagit Fish Enhancement Group

Grant Manager: Mr. Mike Ramsey

# Early Application Review/Site Visit - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: April 21, 2011

Panel Member(s) Name: Patty Michak and Paul Schlenger

**Early Project Status: NMI**

Project Site Visit? Yes (April 19)

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

The priority of the proposed engineering assessment should be for determining if functional fish passage is possible, with modeling data analysis to address the fish passage questions prior to design work being initiated for any alternative.

The project would be strengthened if the project sponsor can provide some level of interest from the landowners to the north of the county property that are most likely to be impacted should the project go forward with a channel to the north, which at this time seems to be the favored route.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

Landowner acknowledgment forms for the parcels to the north that will be investigated in the study.

3. Comments/Questions:

The proposal states: “As a result, even if the technical evaluation concludes that establishing a connection that would ensure fish passage is not feasible, a solution that maintains hydrologic connectivity and sustains the current saltmarsh habitat while minimizing increases in flood impacts will be necessary. In the absence of a feasible fish habitat restoration alternative, secondary alternatives that focus on restoring and maintaining the saltmarsh habitat function may need to be pursued.” It needs to be determined very early on if fish passage can be created and sustained. If it is determined that fish passage is not feasible the project supported by SRFB funding should cease and other funding sources, as available, should be utilized to address the marsh ecological restoration.

There are numerous issues with the site that need to be addressed and many are infrastructure management issues such as: road elevation and flooding, county tidegate operations, flood management and stormwater management. Each of these may be exacerbated by projected sea level rise associated with climate change. Fish habitat restoration seems to be a secondary focus and benefit of the proposed project.

## EARLY APPLICATION Review/Site VISIT - lead entity & project sponsor responses

**Directions:** Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manager an e-mail.

All Flagged and NMI projects will be reviewed at the July 6th full Review Panel meeting. Sponsor responses received no later than one week prior to the meeting will be considered by the Review Panel.

Response:   
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# JULY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: July 22, 2011

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

**Early Project Status: Flagged for additional full panel review**

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

2. Missing Pre-application information.

Land Owner Acknowledgement Forms

3. Comments/Questions:

The sponsor has provided a response to the earlier comments; however the Review Panel has remaining concerns about the likelihood of success and cost benefit of the future nearshore connection project. The proposed activities and landowner outreach appear to be the appropriate steps for advancing the possibility of ecological enhancements at the site, however based on review of the Preliminary Feasibility Study and site observations, it appears very likely that the findings of the proposed analysis will determine that providing and maintaining fish access to the area will be highly intermittent (both in terms of tidal cycle and in year-to-year variability) and/or highly engineered. It appears that site enhancements that are cost-effective and not highly engineered will either not be possible or not provide significant benefits to salmon. With this speculation, it appears to be a proposal to advance the feasibility of a project that is unlikely to be constructible, cost effective or provide substantial long-term benefits.

If the sponsor and lead entity choose to further pursue the application, more information is needed on how the feasibility assessment will incorporate infrastructure limitations and evaluate future climate change forecasts for sea level rise. Would the site enhancement project be dependent upon, negatively impacted by, or impede upon by other actions that may be necessary to address current site issues of road/property storm inundation and future sea level rise effects on the areas surrounding the proposed project site?

## JuLY 6th REVIEW PANEL MEETING - lead entity & project sponsor responses

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:   
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# Post Application - REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: 10/3/2011

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

**Application Project Status: Conditioned**

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 (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or No) 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 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.

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.

## Post application - lead entity & project sponsor responses

Directions: Lead Entity or Sponsor must post their response to Review Panel comments in **PRISM** with document name: Response to Review Panel Comments. Attach this as a separate document in PRISM to become part of your application, and send your grant manger an e-mail.

Response:   
*Attach Response to PRISM, and send your Grant Manager an e-mail.*

*Grant Manager will put in the PRISM attachment number here.*

# FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

Date:

Panel Member(s) Name:

**Final Project Status:**

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 (POC) according to the SRFB’s criteria? (Yes or 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?

4. Other comments: