

***Interactive comment on “The need for
complementary hydraulic analysis in
post-restoration monitoring of river restoration
projects” by T. A. Endreny and M. M. Soulman***

T. A. Endreny and M. M. Soulman

te@esf.edu

Received and published: 20 April 2011

Thank you for your positive feedback on this article and your question:

"Did the designers of this restoration project project a timeline (starting from completion of restoration) identifying 'when' the restored reach would be stable?"

From what was explained to me, the designers did not set a timeline for when the design would become stable. I understand from your quote of Rosgen (1996) the channel morphology is anticipated to change toward stability. The designers of this Catskill Batavia Kill project were under the impression their design was dynamically

C1009

stable. They did not anticipate the morphology would fundamentally change.

I had hoped to present the Batavia Kill project to share new data on the NCD design and subsequent avulsions so more scientists know of this approach and recognize we need to get involved in monitoring and modeling. The monitoring data can document change, and with modeling the projected change may exceed dynamic equilibrium. If the projected trend in aggradation or degradation is forecast to cause avulsions, we may need to intervene. There may be sites, however, where such avulsions are acceptable and part of the progression toward stability. What a wonderfully complex subject.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 2609, 2011.