Earth **Surface**
Dynamics
Discussions

EGU

Interactive comment on "Quantifying Restoration Success of Wood Introductions to Increase Coho Salmon Winter Habitat" *by* Russell T. Bair et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 7 May 2019

The manuscript describes an evaluation of a stream restoration project by large wood introduction in three gravel bed streams in the US. A 2D hydrodynamic model is applied, which had been calibrated with field observations. The calibrated model is then applied to study the habitat suitability for a juvenile salmonid species at bankfull discharge. Large wood increases the size of suitable habitat in all three field sites.

I read this manuscript with a lot of interest. I think the subject is very relevant because large wood introduction is a cost-effective stream restoration method, with a lot of benefits for stream ecology. In general, the manuscript is well written and the figures are well prepared. The Introduction contains most relevant information, the methods are clearly described and the results are well presented, as well.

The main critic I have is that the authors only focus on a single discharge (i.e. bankfull)

when presenting the results, while it might not be too difficult to extend the results with other relevant discharge classes as well. When I was reading the Introduction, I had the feeling the authors would go in that direction. On page 2 (lines 22-24) the authors argue that there is a lack of understanding of the effect of large wood on flow conditions under a range of discharges. So why are only results shown for bankfull discharge conditions and not for other conditions? As far as I understand it well, the model was calibrated for several discharge levels (Table 2). So the model calibration would not put limitations for model application at other than bankfull discharge conditions. Furthermore, in this age of abundant computational resources, I would never argue that additional model runs are not possible because of computational costs. Hence, I suggest to extend the results with other relevant discharge conditions to increase the implications of large wood introduction on habitat suitability for the Coho Salmon.

Overall, I think this manuscript has potential to be a valuable addition to the literature, but some works is still required to make it acceptable for publication. Below I have provided general and specific comments to the text.

General comments

1. The Introduction is mainly focused on the effect of large wood on streams in the Pacific Northwest (US). In Europe (and most likely also in other continents) wood is also used in stream restoration, which deserves some attention as well. I suggest to at least add some references to studies where wood is used, not only to improve the habitat conditions for fish, but also to improve conditions for macroinvertebrates.

2. Throughout the manuscript the authors use v and τ to refer to velocity and stress. Sometimes this results in sentences like "...depth-averaged flow v and shear τ..." (Page 12, line 9), which may be difficult to read for readers without much knowl-

edge in hydraulics. Therefore, I suggest to write "velocity" and "stress" in full where possible.

Specific comments

- Page 2, line 34: From "Our objective...". I suggest to start a new paragraph here and first summarize in 1-2 sentences the main limitations of previous research, followed by the objective.

- Page 3, line 12: It is more common to characterize annual precipitation sum in mm, than in cm.

- Page 4, lines 9-11: How was the discharge for the depth-discharge rating curves determined? Through measurements or modelling? Please clarify in the text.

- Page 6, line 32: How were these flow velocity measurements performed? This is not mentioned in the text, please clarify.

- Page 8, lines 5-6: The authors mean that the velocity distribution was more homogeneous before LW introduction and more heterogeneous after LW introduction? Please clarify in the text.

- Page 9, lines 4-6: I suggest to show the percentage increase or decrease, which is more consistent with the previous sentences.

- Page 10, lines 13-14: The authors refer to Fig. 6, but the spatial changes are shown in Fig. 5.

- Page 10, lines 14-17: These sentences are somewhat confusing. The authors are referring to a number of observations, but do you mean simulation results? Also, the results do depend on the chosen transport threshold, hence, the word

"independent" should be "dependent", right? I also would not use the term "significant" in this context, since most readers associate it with statistical significance. In general, the authors are discussing the results here, maybe better to move this to the Discussion section.

- Page 11, lines 8-11: The fitted gamma parameter values are not shown. I suggest to add these values to each of the panels of Fig. 6.

- Page 12, line 7: Please add "in" between "increases" and "the heterogeneity".

- Page 14, lines 2-5: The authors refer here to "small reaches", do you mean "narrow"? Please clarify in the text.

Figures and Tables

- Figure 1: I suggest to use some colors to indicate the wood and WSE rulers. Or maybe use a solid black line for the wood, instead of the pattern fill.