

Joe Wichmann

When the project is completed, the only visible indication of Ecology's efforts will be better access for boating during low flow/low lake conditions, the enhanced spit which may or may not really be noticed, and the hillside improvement. The hillside improvement will be by far the most visible outcome of the project. I strongly believe the hillside improvement choice should be Optional Recreational Enhancement 2. This choice will dramatically enhance the potential use of the site. Although the most expensive option, I believe it offers the best site improvement per dollar of the three options. If funding becomes a choke point, Optional Recreational Enhancement 1 would be a distant second choice. The baseline hillside plan is too minimal to be seriously considered.

I really don't think you can go wrong with any of the proposed beach approaches. That said, I'm not sure the benefit of side channel construction in Alternative 2 warrants the additional expense. I think Alternatives 1 and 3 are the primary choices to move forward with. If construction truck traffic becomes a significant issue with the community, Alternative 3 would be an excellent choice. If Optional Recreational Enhancement 2 is chosen, as I propose, this may be the best choice for minimizing truck traffic. It will offset the additional excavation traffic from the hillside Optional Recreational Enhancement 2 option.

I do have a few questions concerning the Bay and Public Dock Subarea plan of the FS. Will the existing floating boat dock and ramp be extended to take advantage of access at lower river levels? Is the concrete boat launch to be removed and replaced during the proposed excavation? Will the boat launch be extended to take advantage of access at lower river levels?