

Hello Paul,

I like the idea of a combination of 2&2A. Version 3 is quite extensive and looks like it does not consider the BPA row. It is 287ft wide and has room for a second line on the East side. I do think a 1/3 of the flood should go along the west hill base and reenter the river about where your first project is at the carbody hole. I think the mouth of Mill creek should be excavated and made readily accessible for fish. The river is dynamic enough without enhancing it into chaos. The steepness of the river gages rainfall and rain on snow reaction should be A point of measurement to judge the health of the watershed. Slow up and slow down. Not a flush. This will give the aquifer a chance to fill and give cool water to the streams in the holes. Projects designed to slow storm water runoff should be designed upstream. Also less energy will allow the river to build pools and not get blown out. I believe wood is good in the river system, but it should be near the River for shade and recruitment. We have many species of water fowl that need open grass fields to be safe and to feed.

Thanks for your patience and the chance to comment,
Don Swanson