Technical Report M41

CLIFF CAVE-KIMMSWICK HYDRAULIC SEDIMENT RESPONSE MODEL STUDY UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MILES 168.0-156.6

By Edward J. Brauer David C. Gordon, P.E. Edward H. Riiff Robert D. Davinroy

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS ST. LOUIS DISTRICT HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULICS BRANCH APPLIED RIVER ENGINEERING CENTER FOOT OF ARSENAL STREET ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63118

Sponsored by and Prepared for: U.S ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS – ST. LOUIS DISTRICT BIOLOGICAL OPINION PROGRAM

In Cooperation With: ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Final Report – SEPTEMBER 2006

Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District initiated a study of the Middle Mississippi River between Miles 168.0 and 156.6 near Kimmswick, Missouri. The purpose of the study was to evaluate environmental design alternatives for the development of side channel and island habitat, utilizing an existing dike field on the Mississippi River.

Mr. Edward J. Brauer, hydraulic engineer, and Mr. Edward H. Riiff, engineering technician, under direct supervision of, Mr. David C. Gordon, P.E. Hydraulic Engineer and Mr. Robert D. Davinroy, Chief of River Engineering, conducted the study between April 2006 and September 2006. Other personnel also involved with the study included: Mr. Leonard Hopkins, Project Manager for the Biological Opinion Program, Mr. Brian Johnson and Mr. Ken Cook from the Environmental Branch of the Planning, Programs, and Project Management Division, Mr. Lance Engle, Dredging Project Manager. Personnel from other agencies involved in the study included: Mr. Butch Atwood from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, and Ms. Joyce Collins, Mr. Robert Cail, Mr. Dick Steinbach from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ms. Elisa Royce from the American Land Conservancy and Mr. Danny Brown from the Missouri Department of Conservation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
1. Study Reach	3
2. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION	4
3. HISTORY	5
A. Planform Changes	5
B. Dredging	6
4. FIELD OBSERVATIONS	6
5. Study Purpose and Goals	14
HSR MODEL DESCRIPTION	15
1. SCALES AND BED MATERIALS	15
2. Appurtenances	15
HSR MODEL TESTS	16
HSR MODEL TESTS 1. MODEL CALIBRATION	
	16
1. MODEL CALIBRATION	16 16
1. MODEL CALIBRATION	
 MODEL CALIBRATION A. HSR Model Operation B. Prototype Data and Observations 	
 MODEL CALIBRATION A. HSR Model Operation B. Prototype Data and Observations	16 16 16 18 19
 MODEL CALIBRATION	

BACKGROUND

Hydraulic Sediment Response (HSR) modeling methodology was used to evaluate sediment transport conditions as well as the impact of various structural alternatives along the Cliff Cave-Kimmswick Reach of the Middle Mississippi River. This study was funded as part of the Biological Opinion Program of the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District.

The primary goal of this study was to diversify aquatic habitat by modifying present dike structures, developing new side channels and bar formations while maintaining the integrity of the navigation channel.

1. Study Reach

The study reach was located approximately 15 miles south of St. Louis, Missouri. The study comprised a 12-mile stretch of the Middle Mississippi River, between Miles 168.0 and 156.6. Plate 1 is a location and vicinity map of the study reach. The study area was located in St. Louis and Jefferson Counties in Missouri, and Monroe County in Illinois. The reach was in the southern portion of the greater St. Louis Harbor, which is an important fleeting area for a large number of terminal facilities located in the St. Louis area.

Plate 2 is a 2006 aerial photograph illustrating the planform and nomenclature of the Middle Mississippi River between Miles 168.0 and 156.6. The right descending bank (RDB) consists of limestone bluffs. The bluffs are approximately 300 feet tall and act as a natural revetment to the channel. Major tributaries in the study reach are; Carr Creek which is located on the left descending bank (LDB) near Mile 165.6, the Meramec River, located on the RDB near Mile 160.6 and Rock Creek on the RDB around Mile 159.0. Adjacent to the left LDB is a large floodplain. The floodplain consists of sand, silts and clays with an occasional sedimentary rock outcrop.

		Elevation			Elevation
		(Blue Book) in			(Blue Book) in
Dike Name	Length (ft)	LWRP	Dike Name	Length (ft)	LWRP
167.70L	470	18	161.90L	Not Visible	23
167.50L	730	17	161.50L	700	22
167.40L	260	17	161.10L	1000	22
167.10L	340	17	160.90L	890	17
166.60L	820	15	160.60L	570	22
166.40R	300	18	160.30L	680	17
166.20R	370	16	160.00L	500	17
166.20L	450	19	159.90L	400	17
166.10R	330	23	159.80R	320	9
165.90R	480	16	159.70R	290	16
165.90L	100	19	159.70L	500	17
165.70R	280	18	159.50L	430	17
165.50R	420	16	159.30R	300	17
165.30R	230	16	159.20L	390	17
165.10R	350	16	158.90R	260	18
164.90R	300	16	158.90L	600	17
164.90L	190	21	158.60L	500	17
164.80L	Not Visible	23	158.10L	320	18
164.70R	360	16	158.00L	140	23
164.50L	170	Not Listed	157.80L	550	18
164.25L	180	17	157.50L	610	18
164.00R	430	23	157.40L	635	Not Listed
163.70R	150	22	157.30R	Not Visible	17
163.00L	250	21	157.10L	580	17
162.60L	330	16	156.70L	560	17
162.30L	300	17			

Table 1: Dike Information

2. Problem Description

The limestone bluffs along the RDB and dike structures along both the LDB and RDB contract this reach of the Middle Mississippi River to form a uniformly deep and narrow channel. Figure 1 shows the limestone bluffs along the bankline in the study reach. The contracted channel is excellent for navigation purposes. However, more aquatic habitat diversity is desired throughout the reach. Fish species thrive in slow, shallow channels, deep pools and around bar formations. This type of habitat may be developed from the alteration of existing dikes, i.e. notching, increasing or decreasing length and height, or by adding new dikes, or by a combination of either/or.



Figure 1: Limestone Bluffs

3. History

A. Planform Changes

A historical look at the Cliff Cave-Kimmswick reach of the Middle Mississippi revealed that the channel alignment remained roughly in the same location in the 189 years between 1817 and 2006. The planform in 1817 (Plate 3), extracted from 1817-1821 Government Land Office Surveys, had an average width of about 4200 feet. Three islands were located within the Cliff Cave-Kimmswick reach for a cumulative island area of 1.47 square miles. Over the next sixty years the reach saw a transition into a wider braided canaliform. The average planform width in 1880 (Plate 4), extracted from 1880 Mississippi River Commission surveys, was around 5000 feet. The number of islands increased to 15 with a cumulative area of 3.03 square miles. This increase in island area included scattered sand bars within the channel, Chelsey Island, Beards Island, and a large vegetated island on the RDB between Miles 166.0 and 164.5. In an effort to curtail erosion and maintain a

navigation channel wood pile dikes and side channel closure structures were constructed in the 1880's. By 1928 the present channel alignment had taken shape (Plate 5). In the 50 years between 1880 and 1930 flow in the side channels around Beards Island, Chelsey Island and the large vegetated island on the RDB between Miles 166.0 and 164.5 had been eliminated as the result of closure structures. The islands became part of the bankline.

B. Dredging

Dredging occurred in the Cliff Cave-Kimmswick reach of the Middle Mississippi River 58 times between 1989 and 2005 for a volume of approximately 7,580,000 cubic yards of material. The consistent dredge locations are located (Plate 6):

- at the beginning of the study reach at Miles 168.0-165.5.
- at Miles 161.5-160
- at the end of the study reach at Miles 158.5-157.

4. Field Observations

Personnel from the Applied River Engineering Center inspected the study reach by foot, shallow draft boat and helicopter. These reconnaissance missions allowed the site to be photographed and studied. The site visit is described below with the water surface elevation referenced to LWRP at the St. Louis, Missouri gage.

+2.85 feet LWRP (December 27, 2005)

Field observations were recorded and photographs were taken of the riverside floodplain of the LDB. The photographs can be found in Figures 2 and 3.

The purpose of this field visit was to determine the feasibility and potential locations for the excavation of new side channels. The riverside floodplain contains both farmland and riparian area. Evidence of historic channels was found in the form of ridges and deep holes. Due to time constraints excavated side channel alternatives were not modeled in this study.



Figure 2: Riverside Floodplain, Mile 158.6 L



Figure 3: Riverside Floodplain, Mile 157.3 L

+12.81 feet LWRP (May 19, 2006)

Field observations were recorded and sediment samples were taken on the RDB at river mile 162.6 to help explain anomalous behavior in the model. It was discovered, through the use of sediment samples and hydrographic surveys that a rock shelf exists along the RDB between approximately river miles 163.0 and roughly mile 161.5L.

It was also discovered that a fleeting area exists on the LDB Downstream of Dike 161.5L. Photos of these fleeting areas can be found in Figures 4 and 5. It was learned through coordination with the Regulatory Branch of the Corps of Engineers that fleeting rights are granted for three spots between Miles 161.9 and 160.6. An emphasis was placed on avoiding the fleeting areas if at all possible.



Figure 4: Fleeting off of Dike 161.5L



Figure 5: Fleeting at Mile 161.7L

+3.92 feet LWRP (June 27, 2006)

A recurring trend seen in the Middle Mississippi River in the summer of 2006 was the growth of vegetation on sand bars. Due to the drought conditions that had existed since the end of 2002, the vegetation was more prominent than in years past. A photograph of the sandbar on the LDB at RM 158.6 in December 27, 2005 is shown in Figure 6. The same sandbar is shown in Figure 7 on June 27, 2006. During high water the roughness of mature vegetation on a sandbar causes sediment to accrete. This accretion causes the elevation of the sandbar to rise, therefore decreasing amount of time the sandbar is submerged. The cycle then starts over and through the repetition of high water and low water the sandbar could possibly become permanently vegetated and become part of the bankline.



Figure 6: Sandbar December 27, 2005



Figure 7: Vegetation on Sandbar June 27, 2006

+1.5 feet LWRP (September 14, 2006)

Photographs were taken of some of the structures in the reach from a helicopter flying approximately 700 feet above the surface. Emphasis was placed on the site of potential alternatives along the LDB. Photographs taken of some of the structures impacted by the tested alternatives are shown in Figures 8-12.



Figure 8: Dike 163.00L



Figure 9: Dike 162.6L



Figure 10: Dike 162.3L



Figure 11: Dike 161.9L



Figure 12: Dike 160.3L

5. Study Purpose and Goals

The purpose of this study was to design structural modifications to the existing dike fields to enhance the aquatic habitat diversity and flow dynamics within the reach. The study was performed to address two separate sediment transport goals. The first goal was to create island and side channel aquatic habitat within the dike field. The second goal was to maintain current depths in the navigation channel to assure the need for additional dredging would not arise.

HSR MODEL DESCRIPTION

1. Scales and Bed Materials

In order to investigate the sediment transport conditions described previously, a physical HSR model was designed and constructed. Plate 7 is a photograph of the HSR model used in this study. The zero reference plane of the prototype was assumed to be LWRP (low water reference plane) condition. The model employed a horizontal scale of 1 inch = 800 feet, or 1:9600, and a vertical scale of 1 inch = 70 feet, or 1:840, for a 11 to 1 distortion ratio of linear scales. This distortion supplied the necessary forces required for the simulation of sediment transport conditions similar to those of the prototype. The bed material was granular plastic urea, Type II, with a specific gravity of 1.40.

2. Appurtenances

The HSR model insert was constructed according to the 2004 high-resolution aerial photograph of the study reach. The insert was then mounted in a standard HSR hydraulic flume. The riverbanks of the model were constructed from dense polystyrene foam, and modified during calibration. Rotational jacks located within the hydraulic flume controlled the slope of the model. The measured slope of the insert and flume was approximately 0.008 inch/inch. River training structures in the model were made of galvanized steel mesh for proper scaling of roughness.

Flow into the model was regulated by customized computer hardware and software interfaced with an electronic control valve and submersible pump. This interface was used to automatically control the flow of water and sediment into the model. Discharge was monitored by a magnetic flow meter interfaced with the customized computer software. Water stages were manually checked with a mechanical three-dimensional point digitizer. Resultant bed configurations were measured and recorded with a three-dimensional laser digitizer.

HSR MODEL TESTS

1. Model Calibration

The calibration of the HSR model involved the adjustment of water discharge, sediment volume, model slope, and entrance conditions of the model. These parameters were refined until the measured bed response of the model was similar to that of the prototype.

A. HSR Model Operation

In all model tests, a steady state flow was simulated in the Middle Mississippi River channel. This served as the average design energy response of the river. Because of the constant variation experienced in the prototype, this steady state flow was used to theoretically analyze the ultimate expected sediment response. The flow was held steady at a constant flow rate of 2.05 GPM during model calibration and for all design alternative tests. The most important factor during the modeling process is the establishment of an equilibrium condition of sediment transport. The high steady flow in the model simulated an average energy condition representative of the river's channel forming flow and sediment transport potential at bankfull stage.

B. Prototype Data and Observations

To determine the general bathymetric characteristics and sediment response trends that existed in the prototype, several present and historic hydrographic surveys were examined. Plates 8 through 14 are plan view hydrographic survey maps of the Mississippi River from 1959, 1970, 1983, 1996, 1998, 2001, and 2005 respectively.

The bathymetry of the most recent prototype surveys (2001 and 2005) were very similar to each other and were used to calibrate the HSR model. Depths below –15 feet LWRP were maintained in the thalweg throughout most of the study reach, with some areas experiencing depths below –20 feet and –30 feet LWRP.

The exceptions were:

- the crossing between Miles 167.1 and 166.4 (depths between -8 feet and -15 feet LWRP).
- the crossing between Miles 158.2 and 157.5 (depths between -8 feet and -15 feet LWRP).

The thalweg location in the two prototype surveys were as follows:

- Mile 168.0-165.5: along the RDB, with depths below –8 feet LWRP.
- Mile 165.5-163.0: along the LDB, with depths below –16 feet LWRP.
- Mile 163.0-158.5: along the RDB, with depths below –16 feet LWRP.
- Mile 158.5-156.6: along the LDB, with depths below -8 feet LWRP.

Other notable trends found in the two prototype surveys were:

- Scour holes of deeper than 50 feet LWRP off of the following dikes:

Dike	Width* (ft)	Length* (ft)	Dike	Width* (ft)	Length* (ft)
166.20L	300	400	159.80R	200	400
164.90L	200	600	159.30R	100	300
164.50L	200	400	159.90R	200	600
161.1R	200	600			

Table 2: Scour Hole Locations

*Widths and Lengths are approximate

- A scour hole measuring 200 feet wide by 700 feet long off of the end of weir 163.30L
- Scour off of the RDB at Mile 158.5
- A large sandbar upstream of Atwood Chute between Miles 162.6 and 161.1
- A large sandbar at Mile 162.8
- An increase of 600 feet in channel width downstream of the Meramec River from approximately 1000 feet of channel width upstream of the Meramec River to 1600 feet of channel width downstream of the Meramec River.

2. Base Test

Model calibration was achieved once it was determined through qualitative comparisons that the prototype surveys were similar to several surveys of the model. The resultant bathymetry of this calibrated bed response served as the base test of the HSR model (Plate 15). This base test survey served as the comparative bathymetry for all design alternative tests.

Results of the HSR model base test and a comparison to the 2001 and 2005 hydrographic surveys indicated the following similar trends:

- The thalweg crossed from the RDB to the LDB at Mile 166.4 and continued along the LDB at Mile 165.5 where it remained until Mile 163.0. A scour hole with depths greater than -30 feet LWRP developed off the tip of Dike 164.5L.
- A large bar with depths less than -4 feet LWRP developed on the RDB in the dike field between Mile 165.3 and 163.0.
- The thalweg crossed back to the RDB at Mile 163.0 with depths between -14 and -20 feet LWRP. A large scour hole along the RDB between mile 162.3 and 161.0 was prevented in the river by a rock shelf at a depth of -30 feet LWRP extending approximately 700 feet from the bankline. This scour was prevented in the model by adding a non erodeable material in this location. A large scour hole with depths greater than -30 feet LWRP developed off of the tip of Dike 161.10R.
- A large bar with depths less than -4 feet LWRP developed on the LDB in the dike field between Mile 162.6 and 159.7.
- The thalweg remained along the RDB between Mile 163.0 and 158.5 with scour holes having depths greater than -30 feet LWRP developing along the RDB at mile 160.0, off of Dikes 159.8R and 159.7R, off of Dike 158.9R and on the RDB at Mile 158.6.
- The thalweg crossed back to the LDB between Miles 158.6 and 158.0. For the remainder of the study reach the thalweg was aligned along the LDB. The depths at the crossing were as shallow as -10 feet LWRP.

- A bar of depths less than -6 feet formed along the RDB between miles 158.1 and 157.0
- The overall width of the –10 feet LWRP contour, or navigation width, was very similar in the model as compared to the hydrographic surveys, with an average channel width of 1300 feet noted through most of the reach.
- One difference observed in the model was the width of the channel between Mile 161.5 and 160.0. This area has been repeatedly dredged over the past 15 years.

Overall, the trends of the model base test were very similar to the hydrographic surveys and were thus used with confidence for design alternative analysis.

3. Design Alternative Tests

All design alternatives studied in the HSR model utilized the existing dike configurations in the prototype surveys. Since Dikes 166.9L and 166.3L were constructed during the time of this study they were added after the base test was established and prior to testing alternatives. Modifications to the dikes included uprooting, notching and extending. Some design alternatives included the addition of blunt nosed chevrons. Twenty one design alternative plans were model tested to examine methods of modifying the sediment transport response trends that would create aquatic habitat diversity within this reach of the Middle Mississippi River. The effectiveness of each design was evaluated by comparing the resultant bed configuration to that of the base test. Impacts or changes induced by each alternative were evaluated by observing the sediment response of the model.

A team participation meeting was held at the Applied River Engineering Center (AREC) in St. Louis, Missouri prior to the testing of alternatives to outline objectives and concerns in the study reach. Personnel from the St. Louis District Corps of Engineers, Missouri Department of Conservation, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the River Industry Action Committee were present at this meeting. It was brought to the team's attention that the bar on

the RDB between Miles 165.0-164.0 contained unique Pallid Sturgeon habitat. It was recommended that, if at all possible, no structures detrimental to this habitat be used in the final design. At this meeting the team decided on two areas of emphasis. These two areas were along the LDB downstream of dike 163.0L and on the LDB downstream of Dike 160.9L.

During the alternative testing process the effect of potential upstream alternatives on possible downstream alternatives was studied. These studies showed the upstream alternatives had no impact on the downstream alternatives. This allows upstream alternatives and downstream alternatives to be used in conjunction with each other.

A second team participation meeting was held at AREC following the testing of Alternatives to conduct a qualitative evaluation of the ramifications to the main channel and the side channels. Personnel from the St. Louis District Corps of Engineers, Missouri Department of Conservation, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the River Industry Action Committee carefully examined and discussed each alternative.

Alternatives tested are described in the below tables and shown on Plates 16-36. Alternatives were labeled as successful if they showed the creation of some form of side channel and bar formation with no negative impact to the navigation channel.

Alternative	Structure	Type of Structure	Dimension/Height (ft)	Alternative	Comments
Number			- · · <i>i</i>	Successful	
	100.001		Upstream Alternat	ives	
	163.00L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200	Nia	Notching dikes had very little impact. Not enough water was
1	162.60L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200	No	diverted to create a sustainable side channel
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200		
	163.00L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	200, -400 / +15 LWRP	ļ	In an attempt to increase flow into the side channel Dike
2	162.60L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	200, -400 / +15 LWRP	No	163.0L was notched and extended. Not enough water was
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	200, -400 / +15 LWRP	ł	diverted to create a sustainable side channel
	161.90L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	200, -400 / +15 LWRP		
	163.00L	Existing Dike-Removed	-	ł	A chevron was added to try to divert flow thus helping create
3	163.00L	Chevron	250 x 250 / +15 LWRP	No	a sustainable side channel. Not enough water was diverted
	162.60L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200	ł	and therefore a side channel was not created.
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200		
	163.00L	Existing Dike-Removed	-	ļ	
	163.00L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP		Chevron 163.0L was moved off the bank and a second
4	162.70L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Yes	chevron was added dowstream. A shallow side channel
	162.60L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200	ļ	developed.
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200		
	163.00L	Existing Dike - Removed	-		
_	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	N.	A small side channel developed but too much water was
5	162.60L	Existing Dike - Removed	-	No	diverted from the navigation channel and created a possible
	162.40L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP		future dredging issue.
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200		
6	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	ł	
	162.60L	Existing Dike - Removed	-		Dike 163.0L was replaced in an effort to sustain depth in the
6	162.40L	Chevron	300 x 300 / +15 LWRP	No	navigation channel. The crossing was still too shallow. A
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200		side channel was formed.
	161.90L	Existing Dike - Notched	-400		
	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	1	
	162.60L	Existing Dike - Removed	-	1	A third chevron was added to help streamline flow thu
7	162.40L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	P No A third chevron was added to help streamline flow creating a continuous side channel. This alternative h	
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Removed	-		extremely negative impact on the navigation channel. A
	162.10L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	1	continuous side channel was not created.
	161.90L	Existing Dike - Notched	-500		
	164.00R	Existing Dike - Extended	200 / +15 LWRP		
	163.70R	Existing Dike - Extended	200 / +15 LWRP	ł	Dikes 163.7R and 164.0R were extended in an effort to
	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	-	maintain depth in the navigation channel while diverting
8	162.60L	Existing Dike - Removed	-	No	enough flow for a sustainable side channel. A shallow side
	162.40L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP		channel was created around a series of small bars but
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Removed	-		negatively effected the navigation channel adjacent to the
	162.10L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP		structures.
	161.90L	Existing Dike - Notched	-400		
	163.70R	Existing Dike - Extended	200 / +15 LWRP	ł	
	163.30R	Dike	1150 / +15 LWRP	ł	
	163.00L	Existing Dike - Removed	-	ł	Dike 163.3R was created to help divert more flow into the
	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Not	side channel while maintaining depth in the navigation
9	162.60L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	250, -400 / +15 LWRP	Completely	channel. A shallow side cahnnel was created. The bar
	162.40L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP		created by the chevrons is too wide into the navigation
6	162.30L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	250, -400 / +15 LWRP	ļ	channel.
	162.10L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	ļ	
	161.90L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	700, -400 / +15 LWRP	l	

	164.00R	Existing Dike - Extended	250 / +15 LWRP						
	163.70R	Existing Dike - Extended	250 / +15 LWRP	4					
i —		Dike	800 / +15 LWRP	+					
i –	163.30R 163.00L	-	-200	ł	A side channel with deep pools developed. The effect on the				
10		Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200 350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Yes	navigation was minimal.				
_	162.80L 162.60L	Chevron	-200	ł	navigation was minimal.				
_		Existing Dike - Trimmed		ł					
_	162.50L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	ł					
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Notched	-200						
i –	164.00R	Existing Dike - Extended	300/ +15 LWRP	ł					
i –	163.70R	Existing Dike - Extended	200/ +15 LWRP	4					
i –	163.30R	Dike	800 / +15 LWRP	4					
	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Not	A deep side channel developed. The crossing in the				
11	162.60L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200	Completely	navigation channel was too shallow and may create a				
	162.60L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP		dredging issue.				
	162.40L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	1					
l L	162.30L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200	1					
	162.20L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP						
L	164.00R	Existing Dike - Extended	200 / +15 LWRP	ļ					
L	163.70R	Existing Dike - Extended	200 / +15 LWRP	1					
L	163.30R	Dike	600 / +15 LWRP	1					
	163.00R	Dike	600 / +15 LWRP	1					
i L	163.00L 2 162.80L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200	Not	A deep side channel developed. The crossing in the				
12	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Completely	navigation channel was too shallow and may create a				
	162.60L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200		dredging issue.				
	162.60L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP						
	162.40L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP]					
l L	162.30L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200						
	162.20L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP						
	163.00L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-250						
i L	163.00L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP						
	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP]					
	162.60L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-250	/RP	A deep side channel developed. This alternative had little				
13	162.60L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Yes	impact to the navigation channel.				
í E	162.50L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP]	impact to the navigation channel.				
	162.40L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	T					
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-150	1					
	162.10L	Dike	600 / +15 LWRP	1					
	163.00L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200						
	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	1					
	162.60L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200	1					
14	162.60L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Yes	A shallow side channel developed. This alternative had little				
14	162.50L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Tes	impact on the navigation channel.				
	162.40L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	1					
	162.30L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-150]					
	162.10L	Dike	650 / +15 LWRP	1					
	163.00L	Dike-Remove	-						
i F	162.80L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	1					
i F	162.60L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200	1					
	162.60L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	×	A varying side channel with varying depth developed. This				
45	162.50L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Yes	alternative had little impact on the navigation channel.				
15 —				<u>.</u>					
15 _		Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP						
15 -	162.40L 162.30L	Chevron Existing Dike - Trimmed	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP -150	ł					

			Downstream Alterna	atives					
	160.90R	Dike	500 / +15 LWRP						
	160.30L	Existing Dike - Notched	-250	Ī	Three chevrons were added into the dike field downstream				
	160.30L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Not	of Dike 160.3L in an effort to create a side channel and bar.				
16	160.00L	Existing Dike - Notched	-250	Completely	A shallow side channel was created but the bar extends into				
	160.00L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Completely	the navigation channel.				
	159.90L	Existing Dike - Removed	-	Ī	the havigation channel.				
	159.90L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Ī					
	160.90R	Dike	500 / +15 LWRP						
	160.30L	Existing Dike - Removed	-	I					
	160.30L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Ī	A deep side channel was created by three staggered				
17	160.00L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-400	Not	chevrons. The bar creeps into the navigation channel				
17	160.00L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Completely	leaving a channel as narrow as 670 feet.				
	159.90L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-300	I	leaving a channel as harrow as 070 leet.				
	159.90L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	I					
	159.70L	Existing Dike - Notched	-350	Ī					
	160.30L	Existing Dike - Removed	-						
	160.30L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Ī					
	160.00L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-400	Ī	A shallow side channel developed. The navigation channel				
18	160.00L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Yes	has a minimum width of 900 feet through the adjacent reach				
	159.90L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-300	Ī	Thas a minimum width of 900 leet through the adjacent reach				
	159.90L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	1					
	159.70L	Existing Dike - Notched	-400	Ī					
	160.30L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP						
	160.30L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-250	I					
	160.00L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Ī	A shallow side channel with deep pools was created around				
19	160.00L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-350	Yes	a shallow bar. The navigation channel has a minimum width				
	159.90L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Ī	of 900 feet through the adjacent reach.				
	159.90L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-300	Ī					
19	159.70L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-350	Ī					
	160.30L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP						
	160.30L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-250	I	A shallow side channel with a deep pool was created around				
20	160.00L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Yes	a shallow bar. The navigation channel has a minimum width				
20	160.00L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-250	165	of 900 feet through the adjacent reach.				
	159.95L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	I	or soo leet through the adjacent reach.				
	159.90L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	250, -400 / +15 LWRP						
	163.30L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200						
	163.30L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	1					
	160.00L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-350	Not	A shallow side channel with deep pools developed. The bar				
21	160.00L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Completely	creeps into the navigation channel creating a possible				
20	159.95L	Chevron	350 x 350 / +15 LWRP	Completely	dredging issue.				
	159.90L	Existing Dike - Extended, Notched	250,-4 00 / +15 LWRP	Ι					
	159.70L	Existing Dike - Trimmed	-200	<u> </u>					

CONCLUSIONS

1. Evaluation and Summary of the Model Tests

Several alternative design tests were conducted in the HSR model. Each alternative was evaluated using the following two objectives along with an effort to reduce the need for dredging in the reach:

- 1. The creation of some form of side channel and bar formation
- 2. No negative impact to the navigation channel

Alternative Number	Creation of some form of side channel and bar formation	No negative impact to the navigation channel
1		Х
2		Х
3		Х
4	Х	Х
5	Х	
6	Х	
7	Х	
8	Х	
9	Х	
10	Х	Х
11	Х	
12	Х	
13	Х	Х
14	Х	Х
15	Х	Х
16	Х	
17	Х	
18	Х	Х
19	Х	Х
20	Х	Х
21	Х	

Table 3: Summary of Alternatives

Alternatives 4-21 (Plates 19-36 respectively) were successful in creating some form of side channel. Eleven alternatives had no negative impact to the navigation channel. Alternatives 4, 10,13,14,15,18,19,20 (Plates 19,25,28,29,30,33,34,35)

respectively) created some from of side channel with no negative impact on navigation. These 8 alternatives were analyzed to determine the most effective alternative using the least amount of material. The combination of Alternatives 14 and 19 was chosen as the most economically beneficial. This combination creates side channels in two areas of the study reach and has no negative effect on the navigation channel.

2. Recommendations

The combination of Alternatives 14 and 19 is the recommended plan to diversify aquatic habitat in the Cliff Cave-Kimmswick reach. The addition of Chevrons creates two bars surrounded by side channels. The partial removal rather than the entire removal of existing structures creates scour holes adding diversity to the side channels. Eliminating one of the two recommended alternatives will not have a detrimental effect on the effectiveness of the chosen alternative, therefore the two alternatives can be constructed over two phases in any order. In the recommended alternative 7 chevrons were added, 7 dikes partially removed, and 1 dike added. The structures are configured as follows:

- Alternative 14 (Shown blown up over the 2006 aerial photograph in Plate 37):
 - Trim existing dike 163.00L 200 feet from the tip.
 - Install chevron 162.8L at +15 LWRP with dimensions of 350 feet by 350 feet.
 - Trim existing dike 162.6L 200 feet from the tip.
 - Install chevron 162.6L at +15 LWRP with dimensions of 350 feet by 350 feet.
 - Install chevron 162.5L at +15 LWRP with dimensions of 350 feet by 350 feet.
 - Install chevron 162.4L at +15 LWRP with dimensions of 350 feet by 350 feet.
 - o Trim existing dike 162.3L 150 feet from the tip.
 - Install dike 162.1L at +15 LWRP with a length of 650 feet

- It is recommended all material removed by trimming existing dikes be used as material for new structures.
- Alternative 19 (Shown blown up over 2006 aerial photograph in Plate 38):
 - Install chevron 160.3L at +15 LWRP with dimensions of 350 feet by 350 feet.
 - Trim existing dike 160.3L 250 feet from the tip.
 - Install chevron 160.00L at +15 LWRP with dimensions of 350 feet by 350 feet.
 - Trim existing dike 160.0L 350 feet.
 - Install chevron 159.9L at +15 LWRP with dimensions of 350 feet by 350 feet.
 - Trim existing dike 159.9L 300 feet from the tip.
 - Trim existing dike 159.7L 350 feet from the tip.
 - It is recommended all material removed by trimming existing dikes be used as material for new structures.

3. Interpretation of Model Test Results

In the interpretation and evaluation of the results of the tests conducted, it should be remembered that the results of these model tests were qualitative in nature. Any hydraulic model, whether physical or numerical, is subject to biases introduced as a result of the inherent complexities that exist in the prototype. Anomalies in actual hydrographic events, such as prolonged periods of high or low flows are not reflected in these results, nor are complex physical phenomena, such as the existence of underlying rock formations or other non-erodible variables. Flood flows were not simulated in this study.

This model study was intended to serve as a tool for the river engineer to guide in assessing the general trends that could be expected to occur in the actual river from a variety of imposed design alternatives. Measures for the final design may be modified based upon engineering knowledge and experience, real estate and construction considerations, economic and environmental impacts, or any other special requirements.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information about HSR modeling or the Applied River Engineering Center, please contact Robert Davinroy, David Gordon, P.E. or Edward Brauer at:

Applied River Engineering Center U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - St. Louis District Hydrologic and Hydraulics Branch Foot of Arsenal Street St. Louis, Missouri 63118

Phone: (314) 263-4714, (314) 263-4230 or (314) 263-8094 Fax: (314) 263-4166

E-mail:

Robert.D.Davinroy@mvs02.usace.army.mil David.C.Gordon@mvs02.usace.army.mil Edward.J.Brauer@mvs02.usace.army.mil

Or you can visit us on the World Wide Web at:

http://www.mvs.usace.army.mil/eng-con/expertise/arec/welcome_page_2.html

APPENDIX OF PLATES

Plate number 1 through 36 follow:

- 1. Location and Vicinity Map of the Study Reach
- 2. 2006 Aerial Photograph of the Study Reach
- 3. 1817 Government Land Office Survey
- 4. 1880 Topographic and Hydrographic Survey
- 5. 1929 Aerial Photograph
- 6. Dredge Locations Within the Study Reach
- 7. Hydraulic Sediment Response Model Photograph
- 8. 1959 Hydrographic Survey
- 9. 1970 Hydrographic Survey
- 10.1983 Hydrographic Survey
- 11.1996 Hydrographic Survey
- 12.1998 Hydrographic Survey
- 13.2001 Hydrographic Survey
- 14.2005 Hydrographic Survey
- 15. Base Test
- 16. Alternative 1
- 17. Alternative 2
- 18. Alternative 3
- 19. Alternative 4
- 20. Alternative 5
- 21. Alternative 6
- 22. Alternative 7
- 23. Alternative 8
- 24. Alternative 9
- 25. Alternative 10
- 26. Alternative 11
- 27. Alternative 12

- 28. Alternative 13
- 29. Alternative 14
- 30. Alternative 15
- 31. Alternative 16
- 32. Alternative 17
- 33. Alternative 18
- 34. Alternative 19
- 35. Alternative 20
- 36. Alternative 21
- 37. Alternative 14 over 2006 Aerial Photograph
- 38. Alternative 19 over 2006 Aerial Photograph





536	,000	538	,000	540	,000	542	,000	544	000	546	,000	548	,000	550	,000	552	,000	554,	000	556	,000	558	,000	560,0	000	562,0		4,000
																								Dike 1 St	6.40R	Ň		2 Ke 186
 							-																	Dike 166.	.20R		JE	-
																								Dike 166.	相同		11	166.20L
 															-				-				6	like 165.9	BOR	18	Dike 1	65.90L
																							DI	ke 165.70	or Ĵ	1		17
													1				0		7				Dike	165 50R		1	CAR	CREE
																							Dike 1	65.30R	Į.		St .	1
 																			-			A	Dike 165	10R		PULL	TIGHT	LAN
																						Dik	ae 164.901	R		Dike	164.90L	
																10.54						Dike 16	4.70R	1				_
			Am	old												akvil	le			1			y		Jan Barris		Cast	
									5										100	Dike	164 NAF				Accel	164.50/		_
																		E al	Dike 16	3 708				Z	Dike 16	4.25		
									-				1		-		-	and it		4			e Meir	164 00	1			
																A		1		1		Wein Wein 16	Weir Veir 163.8 r 163.70L 3.55l	OL				
																and the second		0		#	We Weir 16	r 163.45	SL _					
															-		gr -	8	1	12	A States	7						
							-							4		1		1	7	B	EARD	ISL	AND					
													And And	- Res	/		1	Dik	e 162.60	IL								
												1		14			Dike	182,30	and the second second									
											4		-				all and	and the second s										
												S. A.		5	- it	Dike	161.90L											
								INC 122		A THE REAL	H		.1		C.	A.S.												
									DIR DIR	161.1R				T	Elike 161.	50L												
								in the second	PIVER	/		F		ke 161.1	IDL ID CHU	TC												
			-				A Start		7		1		ke 160.			15	- 13						_					E
					CHE	LSE	y 15	LAND				ke 160.6	DI															
			Im	perial]		Γ																		
			uni	Jena			-/	18	and the first	1	te 160.3	ΦL																
						159.80)	RL			Dike 16	C.C.																	
					Dike 159	9.70R	4	1	Dike 15	e 159.9																		
				Dikt	159.30R	4		L	ke 159.5						-													
			1			1				1																		
		К	imms	SWICK CREE	90R	10		Dike	159.20L																			
			ROCK	CREE	K		A	Dike 158	.901																			
		WA	TERS	5 POI	INT			æ 158.60)L																			
		A		DY	1		R	ALL ALL				_												-				










































































