15% Design Review Comments

Comments					Responses		
#	From	Date	Location	Remarks	From	Response	Closed (Yes/No)
1	Kris	6/30/2022	BDR pg iv	Is the project in the restoration reach, and some people might not like the cost, but if the work is good the benefit may be high for steelhead and potential future Chinook.	Rio	Project is identified as Reach C-7 in the Upper Touchet Geomorphic Assessment and is identified as a high priority reach within that document.	
2	Kris	6/30/2022	BDR pg iv	It would be good to see some pre/post project habitat information into the reach to measure performance.	Rio	I am not sure what preproject biological data has actually been collected in Coppei Creek, but will work with WWCCD to identify and how to use it for post project comparison.	
3	Kris	6/30/2022	BDR pg iv	Just as a note, in the past, like 2010 WDFW lobbied to put this reach into protection reach following a number of the conservation easements that were purchased. I think Reach 1 Carpenter was one of them. I believe that Smith just below the project is one of the others.	Rio	Noted.	
4	Snake River	7/1/2022	BDR pg iv	It's in restoration reach. regardless of conservation easements, it's not in great shape IMO...	Rio	The geomorphic assessment called for levee removal, riparian plantings, and large wood additions. A significant portion of the channel is now no longer in a CREP area as it avulsed around the historic CREP plantings.	
5	Snake River	7/1/2022	BDR pg 1	WWCCD you mean?	Rio	Yes, that was a typo and is corrected.	
6	Snake River	7/1/2022	BDR pg 1	BPA funding being used?	Rio	I believe so, but will validate that with WWCCD.	
7	Snake River	7/1/2022	BDR pg 2	Some mention of improving gravel retention/sorting for spawning as well might be a good idea?	Rio	Noted.	
8	Snake River	7/1/2022	BDR pg 3	http://wwbwc.org/monitoring/surfacewater/24-monitoring/surface-water/79-coppei.html Coppei gage. I don't know that it's still active but you can see the older data.	Rio	This gage was active from April 2012 through May 2016. Given the short range of data this gage was not utilized in our hydrologic analysis.	
9	Kris and Snake River	7/1/2022	BDR pg 6	If we are going to use rock weirs or constructed riffles it is important to incorporate cover materials up river and down-river. It is also important not to be reducing channel length as it will lead to further stream power issues. I would also guess the review panel would have concerns with grade control structures....they are going to want techniques that follow natural processes and have had concerns with even boulders at times (as they cited they were not "naturally" existing in the area). All to say, I encourage use of channel spanner LWD over grade control weirs.	Rio	Proposed constructed riffles and channel spanning LWD is not being proposed in locations that would shorten or reduce channel length, they are being proposed in areas to increase hydraulic diversity and increase floodplain inundation. There are areas within the project area that could benefit from reducing the level of entrenchment of the existing channel. While we are trying to lean on more natural barriers like channel spanning wood structures constructed riffles seem to be appropriate given the close proximity to bedrock in both the channel and adjacent left valley wall. If this channel was shifted eastward boulders would likely not be present, but given the fact that it largely hugs the left valley wall they seem to exist naturally and could be used as a treatment option.	

15% Design Review Comments

Comments					Responses		
#	From	Date	Location	Remarks	From	Response	Closed (Yes/No)
10	Snake River	7/1/2022	BDR pg 7	You mean levees/berms? in seeing the design, is there a way to reduce the length of the proposed levee. Seems substantial? I do see the barn is right on the edge of the creek though and would be an obvious concern for landowner.	Rio	Berm, topographic high areas, levees are all synonms, but levees are typically more associated with regulated and certified methods of controlling water. We are no longer proposing the construction of any topographic berms in the 30% design. The landowner where the largest concern for infrastructure risk is located accepts the current situation and believes it functions approriately enough for their operations.	
11	Snake River	7/1/2022	BDR pg 7	Prefacing that I haven't scrolled to designs yet but this is reading like it's already moving well away from process-based in favor of designs restricted substantially with a tone of "controlling" the creek. From SRFB perspective, they're going to want to see multiple design alternatives, even if perhaps not the most feasible with landowner constraints. If you don't show you've considered them, design review feedback will likely ask why they weren't modeled or considered at all. Also, are your alternatives considering any of the ssuggestions proposed through the Touchet Conceptual Plans for this reach? Don't see much mention of it in the doc so far. SRFB will also likely ask the same. Also, when modeling, make sure you're looking at low flows, average winter flows, etc that fish will commonly experience. Past review critiques emphasize the need to run models at flows fish will experience regularly. (you can still run 50-100 yr flows but those are less for fish and more for determining infrastructure issues)	Rio	This design is process based, that is why 90% of the work proposed is simply wood structure placement versus channel fill, excavation, etc. The infrastructure throughout the properties are located in areas of high flood risk (areas in 10- to the 100-year flood extents) and if alternatives to reset the floodplain increase flood risk to these structures they are a non-starting alternative. It is not important to state alternatives that are not feasible based on project constraints. The constraints of all projects define the viable alternatives. Modelling efforts include evaluating the 95%, 50%, and 5% annual daily exceedance flows in addition to bankfull and above flows so that we can evaluate habitat uplift at more fish critical flows.	
12	Kris	6/30/2022	BDR pg 7	I would like to see more detail on what the relocation of the expansion zone is. I would be concerned if that translates to putting the river back where it belongs....	Rio	After discussion with the landowner through this area they are not that concerned with how the river is continuing to adjust through this area and the proposed berm will not be constructed nor will the expansion area attempt to be relocated downstream, we will let nature continue to drive the process here.	

15% Design Review Comments

Comments					Responses		
#	From	Date	Location	Remarks	From	Response	Closed (Yes/No)
13	Kris	6/30/2022	BDR pg 9	I'm not really a fan of this section. I'm not sure to say that in stream structures are hazards in their own right or is this something that has been established. I'm kind of thinking that peoples action are their own choices when structure are just that. Maybe way off base.	Rio	This is a section of our typical report and design limitations and are general statements versus something specific about this project or site. While it is a personal choice to climb on or be in a channel where wood structures are present, but the minute that person's safety is compromised liability can fall on others based on today's society. Wood in a river comes with associated risk and hazards, if it didn't Washington State House Bill 1194 would not exist.	
14	Kris	6/30/2022	15% Design Plans Sheet 6	It would good to know what the old channel looked like and know why there is no work proposed in it or if they believe it would be recaptured in the future or during this effort? The channel in reach 3	Rio	There is no proposed work in the old channel in Reach 3 other than trying to promote more flow into it to establish a multi-threaded system or a system that has the ability to shift between the old channel and the new channel as they both evolve. The old channel still has bed and banks, pool diversity and existing roughness through wood structure. Given the success of the riparian plantings in this area futuree wood additions will occur naturally if this channel migrates laterally in the future. Accessing this area would create more disturbance than leaving it function in the future as it currently exists.	