

From: Berriz, Sonia (Consultant)
To: Raheem, Yacoub <yacoub.raheem@aecom.com>
Date: 2025-07-28 15:38:29.307505-07:00
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Juanita Creek RCSR Forms

Hi Yacoub,

I reviewed the comments and the following two I will close on behalf of HQ hydraulics due to the contract terms surrounding low lateral migration.

Thank you,

-Sonia

Sonia Berriz, P.E.
 berriz@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov
 (425) 876-6283 (cell)

39	28	G Ng		You need to explain what the FPW and/or valley width of this confined stream as that is your outer limits for Channel Migration.	R	YTR	To be revised for RFC submittal	UR	I appreciate the expansion in this section, however it appears it doesn't provide much clarity on the limits of channel migration. You added that W5007 compiled meander belt width estimate of 50ft. Please include or reference that analysis.
41	28	G Ng		While anthropogenic features can control and limit channel migration they are not a basis for assessing low or limited migration. Heavy vegetation, like mature trees would be signs of later/bank stability as well as steep banks with coarser gravels/boulders if they are present. Bolstering this section will better support the retaining wall designs.	R	YTR	To be revised for RFC	UR	Meeting on 6/13/25 discussed use of bio/technical countermeasures HEC-23 Vol 1. The application of bio/technical (heavy planting of streambanks proposed by AECOM) does not account for other considerations outlined in HEC-23 "... vegetation alone should not be seriously considered as a countermeasure against severe bank erosion where a highway facility is at risk. At such locations, vegetation can best serve to supplement other countermeasures. "... a stable channel bed must be achieved before the banks are addressed. Scour and erosion of the bank toe produce the dominant failure modes (see HEC-20)." While the heavy vegetation and LWM is a benefit to the stream and function, it cannot be relied upon as a stand alone countermeasure.