
Staff Report
for the Action Plan for the
Scott River Watershed
Sediment and Temperature
Total Maximum Daily Loads



December 7, 2005



State of California
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
5550 Skylane Boulevard, Suite A
Santa Rosa, California 95403
707-576-2220
www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast



TMDL Development Team

Donald A. Coates
Elmer Dudik
Richard Fadness
Rebecca Fitzgerald
Ranjit Gill
Bruce Gwynne
David Leland
Bryan McFadin
Carey Wilder
Ben Zabinsky

Acknowledgments

The TMDL Development Team of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board was responsible for data collection, data interpretation, modeling, and preparation of the report. This effort would not have been possible without the efforts and contributions of many people and organizations, including:

- The University of California Information Center for the Environment, who prepared shade modeling analyses and provided technical support.
- Resource Management Inc., who provided road inventory summaries.
- Fruit Growers Supply Company and Timber Products Corporation, who allowed access to certain lands.
- VESTRA Resources, who performed the aerial photo landslide inventory.
- The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and the U.S. Forest Service, who provided stream and road survey data and information on landslides.

Our thanks and appreciation to you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| TITLE PAGE | i |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | v |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xii |
| LIST OF TABLES | xiv |
| | |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | xvii |
| | |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | 1-1 |
| 1.1 Document Structure & Contents | 1-1 |
| 1.1.1 Scott River TMDL Action Plan..... | 1-1 |
| 1.1.2 TMDL Introductory Language..... | 1-2 |
| 1.2 Rationale | 1-3 |
| 1.3 Purpose and Goals | 1-3 |
| 1.4 Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Efforts | 1-4 |
| 1.4.1 Siskiyou Resource Conservation District..... | 1-4 |
| 1.4.2 Scott River Watershed Council | 1-4 |
| 1.4.3 Joint Projects of the Siskiyou RCD and the SRWC..... | 1-5 |
| 1.4.4 French Creek Watershed Advisory Group | 1-7 |
| 1.4.5 Industrial Timber Companies..... | 1-8 |
| 1.4.6 Siskiyou County & Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program | 1-8 |
| 1.4.7 CDFG’s Coho Recovery Process and Incidental Take Permits | 1-8 |
| 1.4.8 Department of Water Resources..... | 1-9 |
| 1.4.9 United States Forest Service..... | 1-9 |
| 1.4.10 Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force | 1-10 |
| 1.5 Scott River Watershed Characteristics | 1-10 |
| 1.5.1 Area and Location | 1-10 |
| 1.5.2 Population..... | 1-10 |
| 1.5.3 Climate and Hydrology | 1-11 |
| 1.5.4 Topography | 1-14 |
| 1.5.5 Vegetation | 1-15 |
| 1.5.6 Geology | 1-15 |
| 1.5.7 History and Land Use..... | 1-16 |
| 1.5.8 Ownership | 1-17 |
| 1.6 Endangered Species Act Consultation | 1-17 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 2: PROBLEM STATEMENT | 2-1 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 2-2 |
| 2.2 Water Quality Standards | 2-3 |
| 2.2.1 Beneficial Uses..... | 2-3 |
| 2.2.2 Water Quality Objectives | 2-4 |

2.3 Salmonid Populations and Periodicity 2-4

2.3.1 Salmonid Populations 2-4

2.3.2 Salmonid Habitat 2-6

2.3.3 Salmonid Periodicity 2-8

2.4 Sediment Problem Statement..... 2-9

2.4.1 Sediment Desired Conditions 2-9

2.4.1.1 Instream Desired Conditions for Sediment 2-10

2.4.1.2 Watershed Desired Conditions for Sediment 2-10

2.4.2 Instream Sediment Conditions in the Scott River Watershed 2-16

2.4.2.1 Benthic Macroinvertebrate Assemblages 2-17

2.4.2.2 Embeddedness Conditions 2-19

2.4.2.3 Large Woody Debris Conditions 2-19

2.4.2.4 Pool Distribution and Depth Conditions 2-20

2.4.2.5 Percent Fines Conditions 2-22

2.4.2.6 Thalweg Profile Conditions 2-23

2.4.2.7 V* Conditions 2-24

2.4.3 Watershed Sediment Conditions in the Scott River Watershed 2-25

2.4.3.1 Stream Crossings with Diversion or Significant Failure Potential 2-25

2.4.3.2 Hydrologic Connectivity 2-26

2.4.3.3 Annual Road Inspection and Correction 2-26

2.4.3.4 Road Location, Surfacing, & Sidecast 2-26

2.4.3.6 Disturbed Areas 2-27

2.5 Temperature Problem Statement 2-27

2.5.1 Salmonid Temperature Requirements 2-27

2.5.1.1 Temperature Metrics 2-28

2.5.2 Temperature Desired Conditions 2-29

2.5.2.1 Effective Shade 2-29

2.5.2.2 Thermal Refugia 2-30

2.5.3 Temperature Conditions in the Scott River Watershed 2-33

2.5.3.1 Summary of Temperature Conditions 2-33

2.5.3.2 Scott River Mainstem 2-33

2.5.3.3 West Headwaters / South Fork Scott River 2-34

2.5.3.4 East Headwaters 2-34

2.5.3.5 Westside Tributaries 2-34

2.5.3.6 Eastside Tributaries 2-34

2.5.3.7 Canyon Tributaries 2-34

CHAPTER 3: SEDIMENT **3-1**

3.1 Study Methods..... 3-2

3.1.1 Sampling Approach and Rationale 3-2

3.1.2 Subwatersheds Used in Compilation 3-2

3.1.3 Combined Geologic Units 3-3

3.1.4 Description of Geologic Units 3-3

3.1.4.1 Quaternary Deposits 3-3

3.1.4.2 Granitic Bedrock 3-4

3.1.4.3 Mafic and Ultramafic Bedrock 3-4

- 3.1.4.4 Sedimentary and Metamorphic Bedrock..... 3-4
 - 3.1.4.5 Extent of Geologic Units..... 3-4
 - 3.1.5 The Role of DG Soils..... 3-5
 - 3.1.6 Effects of Multiple Interacting Human Activities 3-6
 - 3.1.7 Sources of Information 3-7
 - 3.1.8 South Fork Pilot Study..... 3-8
 - 3.2 Road Related Sediment Delivery** 3-8
 - 3.2.1 Two Estimates Made..... 3-8
 - 3.2.2 Discrete Sediment Sources (Road Inventory and Field-Check) 3-10
 - 3.2.3 Granitic Substrate and Road-Associated Sediment – The DG Factor 3-11
 - 3.2.4 Estimates of Road-Related Sediment Contribution 3-13
 - 3.3 Aerial Photo Landslide Survey** 3-15
 - 3.3.1 Methods..... 3-15
 - 3.3.2 VESTRA Aerial Photo Interpretation..... 3-15
 - 3.3.3 Estimation of Sediment Delivery Rates..... 3-16
 - 3.3.4 Volume Estimate of Slide Features 3-16
 - 3.3.4.1 Polygon features 3-16
 - 3.3.4.2 Line features 3-17
 - 3.3.4.3 Point features 3-17
 - 3.3.5 Initial Estimate of Connectivity and Age..... 3-17
 - 3.3.5.1 Connectivity 3-17
 - 3.3.5.2 Age..... 3-17
 - 3.3.6 US Forest Service Landslide Inventory 3-17
 - 3.3.6.1 1992 Photo Inventory 3-18
 - 3.3.6.2 1997 Photo Inventory 3-18
 - 3.3.6.3 Discussion of USFS Landslide Inventory 3-18
 - 3.3.7 Estimate of Sediment Delivery Rate..... 3-19
 - 3.3.8 Summary of VESTRA Landslide Inventory..... 3-20
 - 3.3.8.1 West Canyon Subwatershed..... 3-20
 - 3.3.8.2 East Canyon Subwatershed 3-20
 - 3.3.8.3 Eastside Subwatershed 3-20
 - 3.3.8.4 East Headwater Subwatershed 3-21
 - 3.3.8.5 West Headwater Subwatershed..... 3-21
 - 3.3.8.6 Westside Subwatershed..... 3-21
 - 3.3.8.7 Scott Valley-Eastern Valley Side Subwatershed..... 3-21
 - 3.4 Streamside Sediment Delivery** 3-22
 - 3.4.1 Soil Creep Contribution..... 3-22
 - 3.4.2 Streamside Mass Wasting & Erosion Features - Stratified Random Sampling... 3-24
 - 3.4.3 Effects of Multiple Interacting Human Activities 3-25
 - 3.4.4 Estimation of Sediment Delivery from Small and Large Features 3-28
 - 3.4.5 Streamside Large Discrete Features..... 3-29
 - 3.4.5.1 Feature 92 – A Special Case..... 3-29
 - 3.4.5.2 East Boulder Creek – A Special Case 3-30
 - 3.4.6 Streamside Small Discrete Features..... 3-31
 - 3.4.7 Callahan Area Dredger Tailings 3-31
 - 3.5 Sediment Analysis Summary, TMDL, Allocations, & Margin of Safety** 3-32

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------|
| 3.5.1 | Sediment Source Analysis Results..... | 3-32 |
| 3.5.2 | Sediment TMDL | 3-32 |
| 3.5.3 | Load Allocations..... | 3-33 |
| 3.5.4 | Margin of Safety | 3-34 |
| 3.5.5 | Seasonal Variation and Critical Conditions..... | 3-35 |
| CHAPTER 4: TEMPERATURE..... | | 4-1 |
| 4.1 | Introduction..... | 4-3 |
| 4.1.1 | Temperature Sources: Stream Heating Processes..... | 4-3 |
| 4.1.2 | Stream Heating Processes Affected by Human Activities..... | 4-5 |
| 4.1.2.1 | Stream Shade | 4-6 |
| 4.1.2.2 | Groundwater | 4-6 |
| 4.1.2.3 | Surface Water | 4-8 |
| 4.1.2.4 | Channel Geometry..... | 4-9 |
| 4.1.2.5 | Microclimate | 4-9 |
| 4.2 | Methods..... | 4-10 |
| 4.2.1 | Sources of Information | 4-10 |
| 4.2.2 | Approach and Model Selection..... | 4-11 |
| 4.2.3 | Collection and Use of Stream Temperature and Meteorology Data..... | 4-12 |
| 4.2.4 | Collection and Use of Infrared Imagery | 4-12 |
| 4.2.5 | Rectification and Use of Color Imagery | 4-13 |
| 4.2.6 | Mapping and Classification of Land Cover | 4-14 |
| 4.2.7 | Collection and Use of Flow Data..... | 4-14 |
| 4.2.8 | Estimation of Stream Diversions | 4-14 |
| 4.2.9 | Measurement and Estimation of Channel Geometry and Morphology | 4-14 |
| 4.2.10 | Development of Potential Condition Scenarios..... | 4-15 |
| 4.2.10.1 | Shade | 4-15 |
| 4.2.10.2 | Flow..... | 4-16 |
| 4.2.10.3 | Width..... | 4-16 |
| 4.2.10.4 | Sinuosity | 4-16 |
| 4.2.10.5 | Combined Factors..... | 4-17 |
| 4.3 | Model Applications | 4-17 |
| 4.3.1 | Scott River Mainstem | 4-17 |
| 4.3.1.1 | Boundary Conditions..... | 4-18 |
| 4.3.1.2 | Channel Geometry and Substrate Representation | 4-18 |
| 4.3.1.3 | Flow Simulation | 4-19 |
| 4.3.1.4 | Shade Simulation..... | 4-20 |
| 4.3.1.5 | Meteorological Data | 4-21 |
| 4.3.1.6 | Model Calibration and Validation..... | 4-21 |
| 4.3.1.7 | Results and Discussion..... | 4-23 |
| 4.3.2 | South Fork Scott River..... | 4-27 |
| 4.3.2.1 | Boundary Conditions..... | 4-28 |
| 4.3.2.2 | Channel Geometry and Substrate Representation | 4-28 |
| 4.3.2.3 | Flow Simulation | 4-29 |
| 4.3.2.4 | Shade Simulation..... | 4-29 |
| 4.3.2.5 | Meteorological Data | 4-30 |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------|
| 4.3.2.6 | Model Calibration and Validation | 4-30 |
| 4.3.2.7 | Results and Discussion | 4-30 |
| 4.3.3 | East Fork Scott River | 4-31 |
| 4.3.3.1 | Boundary Conditions | 4-31 |
| 4.3.3.2 | Channel Geometry and Substrate Representation | 4-32 |
| 4.3.3.3 | Flow Simulation | 4-32 |
| 4.3.3.4 | Shade Simulation | 4-33 |
| 4.3.3.5 | Meteorological Data | 4-34 |
| 4.3.3.6 | Model Calibration and Validation | 4-34 |
| 4.3.3.7 | Results and Discussion | 4-34 |
| 4.3.4 | Houston/Cabin Meadows Creeks | 4-36 |
| 4.3.4.1 | Boundary Conditions | 4-36 |
| 4.3.4.2 | Channel Geometry and Substrate Representation | 4-36 |
| 4.3.4.3 | Flow Simulation | 4-37 |
| 4.3.4.4 | Shade Simulation | 4-37 |
| 4.3.4.5 | Meteorological Data | 4-38 |
| 4.3.4.6 | Model Calibration and Validation | 4-38 |
| 4.3.4.7 | Results and Discussion | 4-38 |
| 4.3.5 | Conclusions of Model Applications | 4-41 |
| 4.4 | Temperature TMDL and Allocations | 4-42 |
| 4.4.1 | Development of Pollutant Load Capacity and Surrogate Measures | 4-42 |
| 4.4.2 | Load Allocations | 4-44 |
| 4.5 | Synthesis | 4-45 |
| 4.5.1 | Mainstem Scott River | 4-45 |
| 4.5.2 | Scott River Tributaries | 4-46 |
| 4.6 | Recommendations for Additional Study and Future Action | 4-47 |
| 4.7 | Margin of Safety & Seasonal Variation | 4-48 |
| CHAPTER 5: IMPLEMENTATION | | 5-1 |
| 5.1. | Implementation Actions | 5-2 |
| 5.1.1 | Introduction to Implementation Actions | 5-2 |
| 5.1.1.1 | Prioritization of Implementation Actions | 5-4 |
| 5.1.2 | Road and Sediment Discharge Implementation Actions for Individuals | 5-4 |
| 5.1.2.1 | Encouragement of Road-Related Sediment Control Actions | 5-4 |
| 5.1.2.2 | Erosion Control Plans & Monitoring | 5-5 |
| 5.1.3 | Road Implementation Actions for Caltrans | 5-7 |
| 5.1.4 | Road Implementation Actions for the County of Siskiyou | 5-8 |
| 5.1.5 | Ground Disturbance Implementation Actions for the County of Siskiyou | 5-9 |
| 5.1.6 | Dredge Mining Implementation Actions | 5-10 |
| 5.1.7 | Implementation Actions to Address Water Temperature and Vegetation | 5-13 |
| 5.1.8 | Water Use Implementation Actions | 5-16 |
| 5.1.8.1 | Water Conservation Implementation Actions | 5-16 |
| 5.1.8.2 | Water Use Implementation Actions | 5-17 |
| 5.1.9 | Flood Control and Bank Stabilization Implementation Actions | 5-18 |
| 5.1.10 | Timber Harvest Implementation Actions | 5-20 |
| 5.1.10.1 | Timber Harvest Project Approval Process | 5-20 |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------|
| 5.1.10.2 | Timber Harvest General WDRs & Waivers..... | 5-21 |
| 5.1.10.3 | Habitat Conservation Plans | 5-22 |
| 5.1.11 | Implementation Actions for the U.S. Forest Service | 5-23 |
| 5.1.11.1 | Sediment-Related Efforts | 5-23 |
| 5.1.11.2 | Temperature-Related Efforts..... | 5-24 |
| 5.1.11.3 | Grazing-Related Efforts | 5-25 |
| 5.1.11.4 | Implementation Actions | 5-26 |
| 5.1.12 | Implementation Actions for the U.S. Bureau of Land Management | 5-27 |
| 5.1.13 | Grazing Implementation Actions..... | 5-29 |
| 5.1.13.1 | Encouragement of Grazing-Related Sediment and Temperature Control Actions | 5-29 |
| 5.1.13.2 | Grazing & Riparian Management Plans..... | 5-29 |
| 5.1.14 | Implementation Actions for the Scott River Watershed Council and the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District | 5-32 |
| 5.1.14.1 | Strategic Action Plan..... | 5-33 |
| 5.1.14.2 | Grazing Management Practices..... | 5-34 |
| 5.1.14.3 | Historic Mining Issues..... | 5-34 |
| 5.1.14.4 | Implementation Actions | 5-35 |
| 5.1.15 | Implementation Actions for the Natural Resources Conservation Service and University of California Cooperative Extension..... | 5-35 |
| 5.1.16 | Implementation Actions for the California Department of Fish and Game..... | 5-36 |
| 5.1.16.1 | 1600 Permits..... | 5-36 |
| 5.1.16.2 | Outreach Efforts | 5-37 |
| 5.1.16.3 | Coho Recovery Strategy..... | 5-37 |
| 5.1.16.4 | Incidental Take Permits..... | 5-39 |
| 5.1.16.5 | Implementation Actions | 5-39 |
| 5.2 | Permitting and Enforcement Actions..... | 5-43 |
| 5.2.1 | Permitting..... | 5-43 |
| 5.2.2 | Enforcement..... | 5-43 |
| 5.3 | Compliance with the Non-Point Source Policy | 5-44 |
| 5.3.1 | Non-Point Source Pollution Control Programs and the Five Key Elements | 5-44 |
| CHAPTER 6: MONITORING | | 6-1 |
| 6.1 | Types of Monitoring | 6-1 |
| 6.1.1 | Implementation Monitoring | 6-1 |
| 6.1.2 | Upslope Effectiveness Monitoring | 6-1 |
| 6.1.3 | Instream Effectiveness Monitoring..... | 6-2 |
| 6.1.4 | Compliance & Trend Monitoring | 6-2 |
| 6.2 | Monitoring Requirements..... | 6-3 |
| 6.2.1 | General Monitoring Requirements | 6-3 |
| 6.2.2 | Compliance and Trend Monitoring Requirements | 6-4 |
| 6.2.3 | Monitoring Requirements Specific to the County, USFS, and BLM | 6-5 |
| 6.2.4 | Monitoring Requirements Specific to Erosion Control Plans and Grazing and Riparian Management Plans..... | 6-5 |

CHAPTER 7: REASSESSMENT..... 7-1

CHAPTER 8: ANTIDegradation 8-1

8.1 State and Federal Antidegradation Policies 8-1

8.2 Applicability to the Scott River TMDL Action Plan 8-2

CHAPTER 9: ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS 9-1

9.1 Environmental Analysis Requirements 9-2

9.2 Scoping Meeting 9-3

9.3 Functionally Equivalent Substitute Document 9-3

9.4 Alternatives & Staff Recommendation 9-3

 9.4.1 Alternative 1: No Action..... 9-5

 9.4.2 Alternative 2: Scott River TMDL Action Plan 9-6

 9.4.3 Alternative 3: WDR-based Implementation Actions 9-7

 9.4.4 Staff Recommendation..... 9-7

9.5 CEQA Checklist 9-7

9.6 Analysis of Environmental Impacts 9-8

9.7 Mitigation Measures 9-8

CHAPTER 10: ECONOMIC ANALYSIS..... 10-1

10.1 Legal Framework..... 10-2

10.2 Scope of the Economic Analysis..... 10-3

 10.2.1 Existing Requirements 10-3

 10.2.2 Geographic Scope 10-3

10.3 Benefits..... 10-4

 10.3.1 Fishing – Commercial, Subsistence, & Cultural..... 10-4

 10.3.2 Flooding 10-5

 10.3.3 Properly Functioning Ecosystems..... 10-6

 10.3.4 Recreation 10-6

 10.3.5 Remediation – Habitat Restoration and Road Maintenance 10-7

 10.3.6 Residential Land Prices..... 10-9

 10.3.7 Water Conveyance and Storage Facilities 10-9

10.4 Costs 10-10

 10.4.1 Methodology 10-10

 10.4.2 Estimated Costs for the Scott River TMDL Action Plan..... 10-11

10.5 Sources of Funding 10-13

CHAPTER 11: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 11-1

11.1 Scott River TMDL Technical Advisory Group..... 11-1

11.2 Scoping Meeting 11-3

11.3 Presentations to the Regional Water Board 11-3

11.4 Other Activities 11-3

11.5 Public Draft 11-4

11.6 Future Public Participation Opportunities 11-4

REFERENCES..... R-1

GLOSSARY..... G-1

APPENDICES

A. Current and Potential Riparian Forest Condition along Scott River Tributaries A-1
B. Aerial Surveys Using Thermal Infrared & Color Videography.....B-1
C. Calibration & Validation Results, Scott River Temperature TMDL AnalysesC-1
D. Erosion Control Plan Guidance D-1
E. CEQA Checklist.....E-1
F. Peer Review Comments and Responses F-1
G. Public Comments and Response G-1

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | Page |
|-------------|--|-------------|
| Figure 1.1 | Index map..... | Back |
| Figure 1.2 | Interaction of ground water and surface water | 1-11 |
| Figure 1.3 | Annual precipitation measured at Fort Jones..... | 1-13 |
| Figure 1.4 | Peak flows by water year, Scott River near Fort Jones 1942-2004 | 1-13 |
| Figure 1.5 | Minimum flows by water year, Scott River near Fort Jones 1942-2004 | 1-14 |
| Figure 1.6 | Distribution of ownership in the Scott River watershed..... | Back |
| | | |
| Figure 2.1 | Scott River fall chinook spawner escapement | 2-7 |
| Figure 2.2 | Scott Juvenile coho estimates from electroshocking surveys on five reaches of French Creek from 1992-2004 | 2-8 |
| Figure 2.3 | Salmonid periodicity in the Scott River watershed..... | 2-9 |
| Figure 2.4 | French Creek monitoring results – fine sediment in pools (V*)..... | 2-24 |
| Figure 2.5 | Effective shade vs. channel width, Douglas Fir forest | 2-31 |
| Figure 2.6 | Effective shade vs. channel width, Klamath Mixed Conifer forest | 2-32 |
| Figure 2.7 | Effective shade vs. channel width, oak woodland | 2-32 |
| | | |
| Figure 3.1 | Subwatersheds in the Scott River watershed | Back |
| Figure 3.2. | Geologic map of the Scott River watershed | Back |
| Figure 3.3 | Map of aerial photo coverage | Back |
| Figure 3.4 | Locations of landslides in photo-analysis by Vestra Resources | Back |
| Figure 3.5 | Locations of randomly stratified streamside sampling sites | Back |
| Figure 3.6 | Index map showing locations of areas detailed in Figures 3.7 – 3.14 | Back |
| Figure 3.7 | Orthophoto showing 0% disturbance history, Jackson Creek | Back |
| Figure 3.8 | GIS showing 0% disturbance history, Jackson Creek | Back |
| Figure 3.9 | Orthophoto showing 25% disturbance history, unnamed tributary | Back |
| Figure 3.10 | GIS showing 25% disturbance history, unnamed tributary | Back |
| Figure 3.11 | Orthophoto showing 50% disturbance history, NF French Creek | Back |
| Figure 3.12 | GIS showing 50% disturbance history, NF French Creek..... | Back |
| Figure 3.13 | Orthophoto showing 75% disturbance history, NF Kelsey Creek..... | Back |
| Figure 3.14 | GIS showing 75% disturbance history, NF Kelsey Creek..... | Back |
| | | |
| Figure 4.1A | Daily heat flux, Scott River at Island Road | Back |
| Figure 4.1B | Daily heat flux, Scott River at Jones Beach..... | Back |
| Figure 4.1C | Daily heat flux, South Fork Scott River downstream of Blue Jay Creek | Back |
| Figure 4.1D | Daily heat flux, South Fork Scott River upstream of Highway 3..... | Back |
| Figure 4.2 | Water table measurements, Scott Valley. | Back |
| Figure 4.3A | Scott River and River Mile 3.1 to 3.9 | Back |
| Figure 4.3B | South Fork Scott River at River Mile 4.7 to 5.3 | Back |
| Figure 4.3C | Scott River at River Mile 39.6 to 40.6..... | Back |
| Figure 4.3D | East Fork Scott River at River Mile 3.1 to 3.9..... | Back |
| Figure 4.4 | Scott River bankfull area-to-drainage area relationship | Back |
| Figure 4.5 | Scott River bankfull width-to-drainage area relationship..... | Back |

Figure 4.6 Scott River watershed data collection sites and modeled segments Back

Figure 4.7 Particle size and embeddedness, Scott River mainstem Back

Figure 4.8 Stream gradient, Scott River mainstem Back

Figure 4.9 Manning’s n values, Scott River mainstem Back

Figure 4.10 Modeled stream flows, Scott River mainstem Back

Figure 4.11 Estimated groundwater accretion flows, Scott River mainstem Back

Figure 4.12 Current and potential effective shade, Scott River mainstem, July 30, 2003 ... Back

Figure 4.13 Longitudinal profiles of temperature modeling results quantifying effects of groundwater accretion, Scott River mainstem; 3:00 PM, July 30, 2003.....Back

Figure 4.14A Modeled average land cover heights, left bank, Scott River mainstem..... Back

Figure 4.14b Modeled average land cover heights, right bank, Scott River mainstem..... Back

Figure 4.15 Longitudinal profiles of temperature modeling results quantifying effects of riparian vegetation in the Scott River mainstem; 3:00 PM, July 30, 2003 Back

Figure 4.16 Stream temperature differences resulting from current and potential vegetation; Scott River Mainstem; July 31, 2003, 3:00 PM..... Back

Figure 4.17 Longitudinal profiles of temperature modeling results quantifying effects of changes in surface water diversions in the Scott River Mainstem; 3:00 PM, July 30, 2003 Back

Figure 4.18 Longitudinal profile of temperature modeling results quantifying effects of changes in stream geometry in the Scott River mainstem; 3:00 PM, July 30, 2003 Back

Figure 4.19 Longitudinal profiles of temperature modeling results quantifying effects of combined scenarios, July 30, 2003, Scott River mainstem..... Back

Figure 4.20 Relationship of flow at South Fork Scott River gage to measured flows at the upper model boundary Back

Figure 4.21 Stream gradients, South Fork Scott River Back

Figure 4.22 Current and potential effective stream shade, South Fork Scott River, July 26, 2003 Back

Figure 4.23 Longitudinal profiles of temperature modeling results quantifying effects of vegetation and surface diversions, South Fork Scott River; 3:00 PM, July 26, 2003. Back

Figure 4.24 Relationship of flows at East Fork Scott River gage to measured flows at the upper model boundary Back

Figure 4.25 Stream gradients, East Fork Scott River Back

Figure 4.26 Modeled Stream Flows, East Fork Scott River, July 25, 2003 Back

Figure 4.27 Modeled groundwater accretion, East Fork Scott River..... Back

Figure 4.28 Current and potential effective stream shade, East Fork Scott River, July 25, 2003 Back

Figure 4.29 Longitudinal profiles of temperature modeling results quantifying effects of vegetation and surface diversions, East Fork Scott River; 3:00 PM, July 25, 2003 Back

Figure 4.30 Stream gradients, Houston and Cabin Meadows Creeks Back

Figure 4.31 Longitudinal profiles of temperature modeling results quantifying effects of changes in surface water flow in Houston and Cabin Meadows Creek; 3:00 PM, August 2, 2004 .. Back

Figure 4.32: Diurnal temperature modeling results quantifying effects of CA Forest Practice Rules' threatened and impaired riparian buffer requirements and potential microclimate effects 3:00 PM, August 2, 2004 Back

Figure 4.33: Diurnal temperature modeling results quantifying effects of CA Forest Practice Rules' standard riparian buffer requirements and potential microclimate effects; 3:00 PM, August 2, 2004. Back

Figure 4.34: Current and desired effective shade exceedence curves, Scott River watershed. Back

Figure 4.35: Distribution of current and desired effective Shade, Scott River Watershed..... Back

Figure 4.36: Desired effective shade, Scott River watershed Back

LIST OF TABLES

| | Page |
|------------|--|
| Table 1.1 | Relative extent of vegetation types in Scott River watershed..... 1-15 |
| Table 2.1 | Water quality objectives applicable to the Scott River TMDL..... 2-4 |
| Table 2.2 | Instream Desired Conditions for sediment 2-11 |
| Table 2.3 | Russian River Index of Biological Integrity 2-13 |
| Table 2.4 | Watershed Desired Conditions for sediment 2-13 |
| Table 2.5 | Instream sediment conditions in the Scott River watershed 2-17 |
| Table 2.6 | Embeddedness of gravels in the Scott River and four tributaries 2-19 |
| Table 2.7 | LWD Key Piece Volume Criteria 2-21 |
| Table 2.8 | Recommended Criteria for summer maximum water temperatures 2-28 |
| Table 2.9 | Stream MWATs, Scott River mainstem, 1995-2004 2-35 |
| Table 2.10 | Stream MWATs, South Fork Scott River, 1996-2004..... 2-35 |
| Table 2.11 | Stream MWATs, East Fork Scott River, 1998-2004 2-35 |
| Table 2.12 | Stream MWATs, westside tributaries of Scott River, 1996-2004 2-36 |
| Table 2.13 | Stream MWATs, eastside tributaries of Scott River, 1997-2001 2-36 |
| Table 2.14 | Stream MWATs, tributaries of canyon section of the Scott River, '96-'03 2-37 |
| Table 3.1 | Areas and stream miles in geologic units in the Scott River watershed Back |
| Table 3.2 | Areas and stream miles in geologic units in the subwatersheds Back |
| Table 3.3 | Mileage of roads and distances from streams, Scott River watershed..... Back |
| Table 3.4 | Mileage of roads and distances from streams, Subwatershed..... Back |
| Table 3.5 | Road-related sediment contribution, South Fork Scott River Back |
| Table 3.6 | Road-related sediment contribution, Scott River watershed..... Back |
| Table 3.7 | Road-related sediment contribution, Scott River watershed..... Back |
| Table 3.8 | Road-related granitic sediment delivery, Scott River watershed..... Back |
| Table 3.9 | Summary of number of features photointerpreted as possible landslides..... Back |
| Table 3.10 | Summary of the sediment delivery from photointerpreted features Back |
| Table 3.11 | Tons/year of landslide sediment, human-activity related. Back |
| Table 3.12 | Comparison of soil creep contribution estimates Back |
| Table 3.13 | Soil creep estimates in seven subwatersheds, including granite..... Back |
| Table 3.14 | Soil creep estimates in seven subwatersheds, excluding granite Back |
| Table 3.15 | Large and small discrete features sediment contributions Back |
| Table 3.16 | Large discrete features sediment contributions, Scott River watershed Back |
| Table 3.17 | Large discrete features sediment contributions, Subwatersheds..... Back |
| Table 3.18 | Small discrete features sediment contributions, using data from stream surveys in all geologic units. Back |
| Table 3.19 | Small discrete features sediment contributions, using data from Quaternary, Mafic, and Sedimentary/Metamorphic geologic units..... Back |
| Table 3.20 | Small discrete features sediment contributions, no direct human activity associations Back |
| Table 3.21 | Small discrete features sediment contributions, documented associated with human activity..... Back |

| | | |
|------------|--|-------|
| Table 3.22 | Scott River Watershed Sediment Source Summary..... | Back |
| Table 3.23 | Load Allocations for Sediment. | Back |
| Table 4.1 | Data required for operation of the Heat Source model..... | Back |
| Table 4.2 | Data used in the development of stream temperature model applications..... | Back |
| Table 4.3 | Measured and estimated flows..... | Back |
| Table 4.4 | Modeled and measure effective shade, mainstem Scott River | Back |
| Table 4.5 | Distribution of data used to define meteorological conditions | Back |
| Table 4.6A | Model calibration results, August 27 to September 10, 2003..... | Back |
| Table 4.6B | Model validation results, July 28 to August 1, 2003 | Back |
| Table 4.7 | South Fork Scott River model calibration and validation results | Back |
| Table 4.8 | East Fork Scott River model calibration results | Back |
| Table 4.9 | Performance of Houston / Cabin Meadows Creek temperature model. | Back |
| Table 4.10 | Constants used to develop microclimate depictions. | Back |
| Table 4.11 | Summary of stream lengths in shade classes. | Back |
| Table 5.1 | Water right adjudications..... | 5-16 |
| Table 5.2 | Waiver Categories..... | 5-21 |
| Table 5.3 | Riparian Reserve Buffer Widths for the Lower Scott River..... | 5-24 |
| Table 5.4 | Riparian Reserve Buffer Widths for the Callahan Management Area | 5-25 |
| Table 5.5 | Recommended Grazing Management Practices | 5-30 |
| Table 5.6 | Strategic Actions from the Strategic Action Plan | 5-33 |
| Table 5.7 | Tasks and Actions from the Coho Recovery Strategy | 5-38 |
| Table 5.8 | Incidental Take Permit Application’s measures | 5-40 |
| Table 5.9 | Summary comparison of the ITP and the Scott River TMDL Action Plan | 5-42 |
| Table 5.10 | Comparison of Coho Recovery Strategy, ITP, SAP, & TMDL Action Plan.... | Back |
| Table 5.11 | Summary of the NPS Policy’s Five Key Elements..... | 5-45 |
| Table 7.1 | Reassessment considerations | 7-2 |
| Table 9.1 | Comments & responses from the CEQA Scoping Meeting..... | 9-4 |
| Table 10.1 | Costs of typical habitat restoration activities | 10-9 |
| Table 10.2 | NRCS Program Costs Management Measures | 10-11 |
| Table 10.3 | Estimated costs for the Scott River TMDL Action Plan..... | 10-12 |