

From: [Brokes, Brendan J \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Amy Trainer](#); [SEPADesk2 \(DFW\)](#); [Windrope, Amy \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Eric Beamer](#); [Greg Hood](#); [Lorraine Loomis](#)
Subject: RE: Swinomish Tribe comments re SEPA DNS 20-021 - N. Leque Island Restoration
Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 11:50:59 AM

Hello Amy,

Thank you for your comments and questions regarding SEPA DNS 20-021, the North Leque Island Restoration proposal.

The 2016 memo provided by Skagit River Systems Cooperative (SRSC) to WDFW referenced in your comments helped WDFW decide to move forward with the project and to include eight tidal channel connections in the design. WDFW would like to continue to collaborate with SRSC on this project and would welcome adding the North Leque project to the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program Learning Project proposal under development by SRSC. Please work with our regional staff Loren Brokaw (loren.brokaw@dfw.wa.gov) and Belinda Rotton (belinda.rotton@dfw.wa.gov) if additional information is needed for the proposal and to facilitate site access if the proposal is funded.

Answers to your specific questions are as follows:

- It is not clear if the entire northern dike will be removed or if only limited breaches will occur were channel reconnections will be made?

Sheet 5 shows the northern dike stationing from station 0+00 at the highway bridge to station 34+00 at the Northwesterly end. Sheet 6 shows typical section 3 from station 0+00 to 18+50 and section 4 from 18+50 to 34+00. These sections show the removal of the dike in its entirety.

- If there will only be breaches, it is not clear how wide the breaches will be?

There will be 8 breaches in addition to the dike removal listed above. Section B on sheet 6 shows the breach dimensions. Station, length, bottom width, and elevation are listed in the table associated with the typical section.

- The cross-sections of the channel reconnections are not specified in any way, not even in a general way, can WDFW clarify?

See the typical tidal channel section B on sheet 6. This, along with the associated table, shows channel width, depth and side slopes.

- It is unclear how necessary or desirable the channel plugs are. There should be a clear rationale for these plugs, what is it?

Aerial photos show that there were several outlets to this estuary area prior to the dikes. When the tide gates blew out and the site was reduced to one channel, the drainage of the system changed dramatically. There has been excessive scour over the recent years through the only functional channel. Without plugs, the deepest and widest channel will continue to be used to the detriment of the full channel system by preventing a complex channel network from being maintained over time. If SRSC staff feel this is not needed, we would be happy to discuss further.

Additionally, safety of the neighbor's dike was taken into consideration. The recent scour of the neighbor's dike is likely to continue unless channel plugs are used to manipulate flow away from the channel.

- Pre- and post-project monitoring of juvenile salmon:

Again, we would welcome inclusion of this site in SRSC's monitoring proposals. We are expecting construction of the project to occur either during the fall of 2020 or summer of 2021, pending successful permitting and grant applications and would be happy to discuss how our timelines can be coordinated with the monitoring plan.

Hopefully, these responses adequately answer your questions. Please let me know if they don't and, as I mentioned in our last conversation, I am still available for a call if you would like. I am free between 11 and 1 tomorrow, hopefully that still works for you.

Sincerely,
Brendan