Hi Walt,

Thanks very much for the revised conceptual plans for Friendly Village Phase II to reflect the comments you have received thus far.  Christa and I have reviewed the revised drawings and appreciate the smaller scale of the proposed 2016 effort with respect to the footprint of the project, as well as the planting zones.  We are also appreciative and very hopeful with regards to removal of the existing footbridge—glad to hear the owner is receptive to this idea.

We have some additional thoughts and comments on this new plan:

1.      The proposed excavation to create a floodplain bench seems like it would be extremely costly and result in disturbance that may not be necessary to achieve the goal of floodplain connectivity—strategic placement of LWD will result in stream bed aggradation and enhance floodplain connectivity by raising the stream bed in depositional areas.  A significant amount of disturbance will result from placement of wood by itself—we would recommend that these areas be resloped to a 3:1 slope but would want to see more justification for the excavation of a floodplain bench outside of the LWD placement areas.

2.      Strategic placement of LWD should include placement of large wood so that at least 1/3 of the length of the log is interacting with the low flow channel—this is a comment that Christa had on the last project and we would like to see the wood placed even further into the channel on this proposed project.

3.      We would still like to see some more extensive reasoning and logic behind LWD placement that is based on a reach assessment and tied directly to project goals (e.g., placement in pools to enhance juvenile rearing habitat—identify habitats within the reach and explain why LWD placement is proposed in each location).

Thanks for keeping us in the loop!

Have a great week,

Angie

.      The 2014 project seems to be having a positive effect on deposition of fines and wood debris (see photos 24 and 26).

8.      The conceptual design for Reach 6 includes planting in a very large area, including two areas that have been planted in the past (upstream on the right bank—although additional plantings in the bank would be beneficial here; and downstream on the left bank (downstream of an existing footbridge)—additional plantings in the bank would also be beneficial here—see photos 2, 3, and 4).  I recommend noting these two additional previous projects on the conceptual Reach 6 plan drawings.

9.      If improving juvenile salmon rearing habitat is a priority for this reach, I recommend that Adopt a Stream do a more detailed reach analysis to focus LWD placement in pools—some of the LWD placements do not appear to be in pools—is stream bank stability a concern in these locations (if so, that project goal should be clearly stated, not presented as a salmon habitat enhancement component)?

10.  There are three overwater structures/stream crossings in this area, including the vehicle bridge, a craft house/bridge, and a footbridge.

a.      I would like to see the craft house relocated to an upland location to reduce unnecessary overwater cover and eliminate the man-made stream constriction at this location.

b.     I would like to see the footbridge removed (see photos 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 29, and 30).  It looks like it may be causing some erosion immediately under the existing footings, is larger/wider than it needs to be, and is not grated (does not allow natural light penetration in this location).  If the bridge cannot be removed, can it be replaced with something smaller and grated?

Overall, the 2014 project is looking good, and the conceptual plan looks good but could be improved as suggested above.

Let me know if you’d like me to resend any of the photos.

Thanks!

Angie