

Stream Simulation Designed Road-Stream Crossings beyond Aquatic Organism Passage



55th Annual ACE Conference Claremont, CA September 2016

Kurt Gernerd Assistant Director – Engineering, Technology and Geospatial Services Washington, DC





Stream Simulation Designed Road-Stream Crossings beyond Aquatic Organism Passage







What's the Problem?





What are the Passage Objectives & Constraints Relative to Design Method



Caring for the land and serving people









National USFS AOP "Policy"

"Protect and Restore the Physical, Biological and Chemical integrity of the nations waters" (Intent of the Clean Water Act)

Primary Design Priority:

• Aquatic organism passage and ecological connectivity is the goal and the first design priority for crossing streams that provide habitat for aquatic life.

Other Design Considerations:

- Minimizing the consequences of plugging and overtopping, including the ability to prevent stream diversion.
- Sufficient hydraulic capacity, including the requirement that headwater depth does not cause pressurized flow at the maximum flood.
- Maximize benefits while minimizing life cycle cost.



Road-Stream Crossing Design Methods

- <u>Stream Simulation Design</u>: Bridge, arch, or embedded culvert designs providing stream simulation. The USDA Forest Service stream simulation design guidelines should be used when possible.
- <u>Geomorphic-based Channel Design</u>: Reconnects the upstream and downstream channel while meeting most fish and other aquatic organism movement and habitat needs.
- <u>Hydraulic Design</u>: Designs based primarily on hydraulic capacity should be limited to low stream gradients, where the structure is constantly partially submerged. Baffled culverts or structures designed with a fishway are discouraged and should be used as a last resort, especially if they also hinder terrestrial organism passage.





How Structures Fail

Hydraulic capacity exceeded
Sediment "Slug"
Debris flow (wood, etc.)

Why Structures Fail

- Undersized hydraulic capacity
- Abrupt transitions
- Poor vertical alignment with channel
- Poor stream to structure geometry
- Poor geomorphic location or design not accounting for diversion potential



Increasing Plugging Hazard

Poor horizontal alignment

Furniss et al 1998



What are the Site & Geomorphic Conditions Relevant to Choosing the Design Method

- Is the channel stable or incising? How much will it change over time
- How much Elevation differential exists (Inlet to Outlet)?
- •Are there road impounded wetlands upstream or other features that must be maintained?
- •Are you on an alluvial fan or is the area prone to debris flows?
- Is woody debris a problem?
- Is there high bed load transport?



Caring for the land and serving people







Stream Simulation Design

- Geomorphic and ecologically-based approach
- Mimics natural channel structure, sediment characteristics, water velocity & depths, and resting areas for aquatic organisms

At bankfull flow

Simulated high gradient channel Mitkof Island, AK.Tongass NF





TYPICAL LOW GRADIENT CHANNEL How do the Different Design Methods Fit the Channel



Natural channel with

- Bankfull channel
- Flood plain
- Ecological processes





Hydraulic Design Method Perspective View on a Road Crossing Site

Typically constrict the natural channelRigid structure in dynamic environment







Stream Simulation Design Method Perspective View on a Road Crossing Site

No constriction the natural channel bankfull width

Accounts for floodplain conveyance, most geomorphic processes, and all aquatic passage needs
Flexible design to account for long term changes in bed elevations





Stream Simulation Design Method Perspective View on a Road Crossing Site

No constriction the natural channel & floodplain width
Accounts for floodplain conveyance, all geomorphic processes, and terrestrial & aquatic passage needs
Flexible design to account for long term changes in bed elevations



What Are The Engineering Constraints Relevant To Choosing The Design Method

- •Alignment (Vert. & Horiz.) Can they be changed?
- •Can the road be relocated?
- •Are there Right of Way constraints?
- •Are utilities present? Can they be relocated?



USDA FOREST SERVICE Caring for the land and serving people





State wide 1,477 structures were damaged or destroyed





Tropical Storm Irene August 28, 2011











Damage on the GMNF

- 24 Forest Service System Roads (21 miles)
- Estimates repair costs = \$6.4+ million
- 11 stream crossing failures
- No stream simulation design failures (3)





Fort Goff Creek Bridge Project Klamath National Forest

- State: California
- Removed 15 foot diameter culvert
 that restricted anadromous fish access
 in Fort Goff Creek and replaced culvert
 with a single concrete span bridge.
- Provided unrestricted access to 1.6 miles of Coho Salmon and Chinook Salmon spawning habitat and 3.4 miles of steelhead trout spawning habitat.
- Forest Service Contribution: \$10,000



- Partner Contribution: \$3,490,000
- Project Costs: \$3,500,000
- External Partners:
- California Department of Transportation
- California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- Pacificorp





Lion Creek Dam Removal Project in Support of AOP Los Padres National Forest

- State: California
- Removed a 4-foot tall by 25 feet wide check dam that restricted anadromous fish access to Lion Creek, a tributary to the wild and scenic Sespe Creek
- Collaborative interagency project that provided unrestricted access to 3.7 miles of Southern CA steelhead (SCS) spawning habitat

External Partners:

- National Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin (NOAA)
- California Conservation Corps
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife







Thank you, any questions ?





Before: shallow, over-widened channel at low After: bridge after installation.

water crossing where poor channel habitat retarded upstream fish passage.

Note: narrowed stream channel with reconstructed banks for improved aquatic habitat.

Caring for the land and serving people

