

Subject: : Conservation

Topic: : Dam removal.

Re: Dam removal.

Author: : RyanR

Date: : 2013/10/3 21:38:34

URL:

I agree that pool habitat is important but so is riffle habitat and to decry a dam removal project for the sake of one plunge pool is near-sighted in my opinion. Playing armchair quarterback on a project and stream based on a few snapshots is not fair to the project or the people that put in the many years, yes YEARS, of effort and time required just to get to the the actual physical removal portion of the project. Removal is normally only one part of these projects which for several reasons typically have to be done in stages. Agree with it or not but it's often just not feasible to do all the work of an entire project at one time. I know for a fact that with some of these projects, it is often decided the best practice is to give the stream a chance to sort of figure its own path out before installing habitat and stabilization devices.

Another aspect I think some might overlook is the relevance of owner liability in these removals. Maintaining a dam is an enormous financial and potential legal burden. That is a big impetus in removing the actual dam and doing so takes precedent over maintaining a simple plunge pool that never would have been there in the first place without the dam. I think just removing a sediment trap does more for improving stream health & habitat than a single plunge pool provides.