Summary of Comments Received on Stream Restoration Expert Panel Report and Proposed Options for Resolving Them

Urban Stream Restoration Expert Panel

February 19, 2013

Tom Schueler, Chesapeake Stormwater Network
Bill Stack, Center for Watershed Protection

Issues with Protocol 1, Prevented Sediment Approach

Issues

- Limited studies in Bay Watershed
- Does not account for incision, over predicts consolidated sediments, rating curve only available for Coastal Plain, other issues
- Concern over the 50% reduction efficiency for floodplain reconnection projects

Response

- The report thoroughly documents issues and studies that show how to improve accuracy
- 50% efficiency was chosen to account for uncertainty
- Will work with USFWF and MSRA to improve accuracy

Issues with Protocol 2, Hyporheic Box Method

Issues

- Limited studies in Bay Watershed
- Does not account for hyporheic exchange in flood plain, palustrine wetlands
- Doesn't account for confined layers in channel bed or shallow bedrock
- Could lead to overly wide channels prone to sediment deposition

Response

- Best science available. Reserachers. Kaushal and Meyer)believe conservative denitrification rates.
- Modify report to account for confined layers and bedrock.
- Allow credit for hyporheic exchange in FP for qualifying projects
- Verification process will prevent bad designs

Issues with Protocol 3, Floodplain Reconnection Method

Issues

- Jordan Study (2010) not appropriate
- Doesn't account for hyporheic exchange during base flow
- Design examples biased towards Natural Channel Design method
- Concern over use of 1% floodplain area to watershed ratio

Response

- Jordan study most accurate available and only part of methodolgy
- Credit for base flow load will be allowed for qualifying projects
- Design examples are urban. Add language to address bias concern
- The 1% rule to be determined by panel

General comments.

Issues

- Concerns over sediment transport, deposition, methods don't account for physiographic differences
- Non-urban streams are not adequately addressed.

Response

- Will work w/ Modeling Team to improve how streams are modeled in Phase 6
- Add additional language to the revised draft to better account for non-urban streams