

1-27-2006

Ex. 281-US-419

R2 Resource Consultants, Inc

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/klamath>

Recommended Citation

R2 Resource Consultants, Inc, "Ex. 281-US-419" (2006). *In re Klamath River (Klamath Tribe)*. 236.
<https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/klamath/236>

This Expert Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Hedden-Nicely at Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in In re Klamath River (Klamath Tribe) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. For more information, please contact annablaine@uidaho.edu.

Task Completion Report

Date: January 27, 2006 *Project Number:* 1530.03
Prepared By: Mike Gagner and Dudley Reiser *Trip Date:* October 17-20, 2005
Location: Upper Klamath River Basin
Distribution: M. Dammarell (BIA), B. Scott-Brier (DOI), D. Harder (DOJ), file

Introduction

This Task Completion Report summarizes the procedures and results of stream habitat surveys completed on portions of three streams (Scott Creek, Sand Creek, Wood River) located within the Upper Klamath River basin, Oregon during the October 17-20, 2005 time period. This report and attached materials constitute the final deliverable for Task 3 as outlined in the September 2005 scope of work for contractual services (CMP 000685) being conducted by R2 Resource Consultants (R2) for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The purpose of this task was to locate, map, and evaluate fish habitat conditions within each of the three streams in areas outside of the former Klamath Tribes reservation boundary.

Survey Reaches

The three streams selected for sampling included Scott and Sand creeks and the Wood River. All of these streams are either direct or indirect tributaries to Upper Klamath Lake. Scott Creek, a second order stream, flows approximately 13 miles from numerous springs and spring tributaries on Mt. Scott in Crater Lake National Park to the Antelope Desert where it currently disappears into the subterranean flow about two miles west of Klamath Marsh (USFS unpublished report). The reach surveyed on Scott Creek extends from the U.S. Forest Service campground upstream for a distance of 3,700 feet (Attachment A-1).

Sand Creek is a 4th order stream that originates from its headwaters at 7,680 feet elevation on Mt. Scott in Crater Lake National Park and extends eastward approximately 14 miles to the Antelope Desert where it also currently disappears into the subterranean flow west of Klamath Marsh (USFS unpublished report). The reach surveyed on Sand Creek extends from approximately the old Klamath Reservation Boundary upstream for a distance of 4,141 feet (Attachment A-1).

The Wood River is a 4th order stream that originates from its headwater spring in Jackson Kimball State Park and extends south for approximately 13 miles to Agency Lake. The Wood River is the largest tributary to Agency Lake, and provides the second largest inflow overall to the Agency-Upper Klamath Lake complex (R2 2001). The reach surveyed on the Wood River extends from the headwater spring downstream for a distance of 5,390 feet to the Dixon Road crossing (Attachment A-2).

Field Procedures

The fish habitat surveys were conducted using a modified Hankin and Reeves method originally developed in Region 6 (Oregon and Washington) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (Stream Inventory Handbook, Region 6, 1998). The surveys were conducted during a low flow period to ensure the accurate identification of individual habitat units and the assessment of habitat conditions during a time of naturally limited habitat availability. Each of the measurements described below was selected to provide quantification of habitat size and conditions important to fish migration, spawning, incubation, and rearing.

Field measurements consisted of measuring and defining a number of habitat characteristics. Each survey reach was divided up into discrete habitat units. Habitat units were broken up into the following habitat types: pool, riffle, run, glide, and cascade. They were distinguished using the following criteria:

Pool: A portion of the stream with reduced current velocity, often with water deeper than the surrounding areas, and which is frequently usable by fish for resting and cover.

Riffle: A shallow rapids where the water flows swiftly over completely or partially submerged obstructions to produce surface agitation, but standing waves are absent.

Run: An area of swiftly flowing water, without surface agitation or waves, which approximates uniform flow and in which the slope of the water surface is roughly parallel to the overall gradient of the stream.

Glide: A slow moving, relatively shallow type of run. Calm water flowing smoothly and gently, with moderately low velocities, and little or no surface turbulence.

Cascade: Areas with uneven water surface elevation, extremely turbulent with high velocities, many times containing exposed bedrock and boulder substrate.

Data collected at each habitat unit included measurement or estimate of wetted channel width, maximum and control depth for pool units, visual characterization of dominant and subdominant substrate composition, available fish cover, and incidental characterization of dominant riparian vegetation and streambank conditions. Habitat unit lengths and widths were measured using a calibrated English units hip chain or a laser range finder. Substrate classes were visually categorized as boulder (>12 inch diameter [30.5 mm]), cobble (3-12 inch diameter [7.6-30.5 cm]), large gravel (1-3 inch diameter [2.5-7.6 cm]), small gravel (0.25 – 1 inch diameter [0.64-2.5 cm]), sand, silt, and vegetation. Stream cover types were also visually estimated and

included overhanging vegetation, undercut bank, and instream cover (e.g., boulder, Large Woody Debris (LWD)). The percent area of each habitat unit providing fish cover was estimated to the nearest whole percentage and the area of available salmonid spawning habitat was also estimated. Bankfull width was measured at approximately every 10th habitat unit. A handheld Global Positioning System unit was used to map the start and end location of each reach and representative photographs were taken throughout each survey reach (Attachment B). All data and anecdotal information were recorded in “Rite in the Rain” level books (Attachment C).

Survey Results

A summary description including information on habitat composition and overall habitat condition is provided below (in the order surveyed) for each of the reaches surveyed during the October 17 – 20, 2005 field effort. A summary of data collected at each of the three streams is presented in Table 1.

Wood River

The Wood River habitat survey was completed on October 17, 2005 at a stream flow of approximately 155 cubic feet per second (cfs) (R2 staff gage reading). The survey reach began at Jackson Kimball State Park (GPS N42.739787 W121.979619) and extended downstream 5,390 feet to the Dixon Road crossing (GPS N42.733669 W121.988417). The average wetted width of the channel throughout the survey section was 130 feet. The reach was characterized by low gradient, relatively high sinuosity, and limited habitat diversity. There were only eight habitat units within the reach, which was made up of 70 percent glide, 17 percent pool, and 13 percent riffle by length. Although only two of the eight units in the reach were pools, they comprised 25 percent of the reach surface area. Both pools were formed by lateral scour on acute meander bends, but only one of the pools contained fish cover. The pools were relatively deep with maximum depth of 4.5 feet or greater. Average residual depth for the pools was just over 2.5 feet. Although spawning sized gravels were somewhat limited in the reach with only 25 percent of the stream area containing spawning substrate, there was an estimated 5,291 square feet of potential salmonid spawning area in the reach. The remainder of the stream bottom (75%) was covered with sand (pumis), silt, or organic type substrates. The total number of LWD pieces found in the reach was low with 78 pieces counted. This was not surprising since the riparian community consists primarily of grasses, willow, and only a few scattered large conifers. Cattle grazing effects were evident along both sides of the stream channel resulting in the loss of riparian vegetation, trampling of stream banks, and compaction of streamside soils.

Table 1. Summary of habitat data collected on three streams in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon, October 17-20, 2005.

Habitat Attribute	Survey Stream		
	Wood River	Sand Creek	Scott Creek
Total Reach Length (ft)	5,390	4,141	3,700
Total Reach Area (sq. ft)	686,664	59,967	54,631
Average Wetted Width (ft)	130	14.7	14.5
Average Bankfull Width (ft)	150	19	25.3
Number of Habitat Units Surveyed	8	69	70
Habitat Composition (% of total reach length)			
Riffle	13	56	24
Pool	17	24	25
Glide	70	0	0
Run	0	20	51
Cascade	0	0	0
Average Maximum Depth of Pool Units (ft)	4.8	2.7	2.4
Average Residual Depth of Pool Units (ft)	2.5	1.8	1.7
Substrate Composition (% of total area)			
Gravels	25	77	59
Sand-Silt-Organics	75	23	41
Potential Spawning Area (sq ft)	5,291	1,508	524
Average Percent Embeddedness of Gravels (%)	25	26	25
Number of LWD pieces	78	354	311
Percentage of Pools with Cover	50	100	100
Average Pool Cover (%)	20	39	20

Sand Creek

The Sand Creek habitat survey was completed on October 18, 2005 at a stream flow of approximately 16 cubic feet per second (cfs) (Attachment C). The survey reach began near the Klamath Tribes old reservation boundary (GPS N42.845821 W121.915609) and extended upstream 4,141 feet to near the center of Section 31 (GPS N42.839936 W121.929417). The average wetted width of the channel throughout the survey section was 39 feet. The reach was characterized by moderate gradient, low to moderate sinuosity, and moderate to high confinement by surrounding hill slopes. There were 69 habitat units within the reach, comprised of 56 percent riffle, 24 percent pool, and 20 percent run by length. Most pools in the reach were formed by scour around LWD pieces. All pool units in the reach contained LWD cover. Pool habitat was generally complex providing multiple types of fish cover including undercut bank,

overhanging vegetation, and object cover. Average maximum pool depth was relatively high for this size stream at approximately 2.7 feet. Residual depths were also relatively high averaging just over 1.8 feet. Spawning sized gravels comprised 77% of the surveyed reach; the remainder of the stream area (23%) was covered with sand (pumice), silt, or organic type substrates. There was a large supply of LWD found in the reach with 354 pieces counted during the survey. The streambanks were lined by a thick stand of mature conifer and hardwood species providing a good supply of LWD and shade.

Scott Creek

The fish habitat survey of Scott Creek was completed on October 20, 2005 at a stream flow of approximately 8 cubic feet per second (cfs) (Attachment C). The reach survey started at the Forest Service campground near the Klamath Tribes old reservation boundary (GPS N42.885389 W121.9925056) and continued upstream 3,700 feet to the western edge of Section 13 (GPS N42.88370 W121.937330). The average wetted width of the channel throughout the survey section was 14.5 feet. The reach was characterized by low to moderate gradient, moderate sinuosity, and low to moderate confinement. There were 70 habitat units within the reach, comprised of 24 percent riffle, 25 percent pool, and 51 percent run by length. Pool units were generally formed by lateral scour or LWD obstructions. Like Sand Creek, pool habitat in Scott Creek was generally complex providing multiple types of fish cover including undercut bank, overhanging vegetation, and object cover (i.e., LWD). The average maximum pool depth and residual pool depth were relatively high for this size of stream at 2.4 feet and 1.7 feet, respectively. Spawning sized gravels were the dominant substrate in 59 percent of the total survey area. However, Scott Creek had the least amount of potential spawning habitat of the three streams, with only 524 square feet (1% of total area). There was a large supply of LWD pieces found in the reach (311 pieces) providing excellent fish cover and channel complexity. Streambanks were lined by a thick stand of mature conifer and hardwood species.

Habitat Assessment

To evaluate the general condition of fish habitat in each of the three streams, data from the habitat survey reaches were compared to habitat benchmarks developed by the Oregon Watershed Professionals Network (1999) and the Environmental Protection Agency (1997). No single habitat parameter can effectively reflect overall habitat conditions because different species and life history stages use different types of habitat. Integration of the quality of many habitat components and indicators provides a better understanding of overall habitat conditions. A comparison of habitat attributes to habitat benchmarks is presented in Table 2.

For the Wood River, the categories of pool frequency, percent substrate comprised of sand-silt-organics, frequency of LWD, and bank vegetation protection were all characterized as in “poor” condition when compared to habitat condition benchmarks. Pool complexity and residual pool depth were the only attributes to be considered in “good” condition. Pool area and percent gravel composition fell in the “average” range. There are several possible reasons for the “poor” habitat

ratings including, proximity of the survey reach to the source spring, high percentage of pumice in the surrounding bedform material, the effects of grazing, and the sampled reach flows through a meadow area that is largely devoid of riparian vegetation. The downstream third of the survey reach does provide considerable spawning potential with over 5,000 square feet of suitable spawning area identified during the survey; redband trout spawning has been observed on numerous occasions in this section (R2 Trip Report 2004). In addition to providing important spawning habitat, the reach extends just downstream from the major source of spring-fed flow of the Wood River and therefore provides a large, stable source of good quality water that supports and promotes salmonid production in downstream reaches.

In general, fish habitat attributes for Scott and Sand creeks would be categorized as average to good when compared to assessment benchmarks. Pool area, pool frequency, and the percentage of substrate comprised of sand-silt-organics were the only attributes that would fall below the “good” condition criteria. Habitat condition for these three attributes would be considered “average,” but they are much closer to the criteria used to define “good” habitat than those used to define “poor” habitat. Habitat conditions within the surveyed reaches of both Scott and Sand creeks indicate these streams provide good quality spawning, incubation, and rearing habitat for salmonid fishes. Unfortunately, neither of these streams is believed to currently support native salmonid fish species (e.g., redband or bull trout) (USFS unpublished report). Moreover, both of these streams are currently isolated from downstream connecting waters (i.e., Williamson River), eliminating the opportunity for natural recruitment of salmonid stocks from downstream waters.

Table 2. Assessment of habitat attributes for three streams in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon using Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Habitat Benchmarks (1999) and Environmental Protection Agency Rapid Bioassessment Protocols (1997).

Habitat Attribute	Habitat Benchmarks		Sand Creek	Scott Creek	Wood River
	Poor	Good			
Pool Area (% area)	<10	>35	21	26	25
Pool Frequency (channel widths between pools)	>20	5-8	11.3	8.5	21
Residual Pool Depth					
Small Stream (<23 ft width) ¹	<0.2	>0.5	1.0	1.7	
Large Stream (>46 ft width) ²	<0.8	>1.5			2.6
Complex Pools (% pools w/cover) ³	<20	>50	100	100	50
Gravel (% area)	<15	≥35	43	59	25
Sand-Silt-Organics (% area)	>25	<12	18	21	75
Large Woody Debris (Pieces/328-ft)	<10	>20	27.7	27.5	4.7
Bank Vegetation Protection ³ (% bank cover)	<50	>70	80	80	40

¹The average width of both Scott and Sand creeks was less than 23 feet.


²The average width of the Wood River was greater than 46 feet.

³Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Rivers 1997.


REFERENCES

- Environmental Protection Agency. 1997. Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Rivers. EPA 841-D-97-002
- U.S. Forest Service. 1998. Stream Inventory Handbook Level I & II. Pacific Northwest Region, Region 6, 1998. Version 9.8. pp 84.
- U.S. Forest Service. Unpublished technical reports. Received from Dick Ford, Winema National Forest, Klamath Falls, Oregon, March 17, 2004.
- Watershed Professionals Network. 1999. Oregon Watershed Assessment Manual. June 1999. Prepared for the Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board, Salem, Oregon.

ATTACHMENT A
Survey Reach Maps



Attachment A-1. Scott and Sand creek fish habitat survey reaches, October 2005.




Attachment A-2. Wood River fish habitat survey reach, October 2005.

ATTACHMENT B
Representative Site Photographs


Scott Creek – 2005 Habitat Survey Reach



Sand Creek - 2005 Habitat Survey Reach



Wood River - 2005 Habitat Survey Reach



ATTACHMENT C

Field Notes

Wood R. 10/17/05

Hubbert Survey

Equipment check

Bushnell Yardage Pro
s/n SD1341

Dist. Ft	Dist. M	Ft
140	43 m	141
120	37 m	121.4
100	30 m	98.4
80	24 m	78.7
50	15 m	49.2

Station Rod checked against
300' fiberglass survey tape
all feet to it. match to within
.05 ft.

stave 42° 44, 3077 stop 42° 41, 024
121.59.000 121.59.292

Wood @ Spring 10/17/05

Photo Log Roll #1

Photo #	Description
25	d/s from stant
24	d/s @ Lake source unit #2
23	d/s from unit 4
22	d/s from mid unit 4
21	d/s from ~ 3/4 dist.
20	d/s " "
19	d/s small island & gravel patch
18	d/s from top unit 5 ripple
17	d/s from top unit 7 ripple
16	d/s @ 1/2 end of survey

2.09 staff gage reading

Unit #	Unit (m)	Hub	Unit (m)	Ave (m)	Area (m ²)	Depth (m)	Wet well	Depth (m)	Pool Area	% Substrate	% sand	Substrate	% wood	Area	% UCB
1	40	2530	24	3.8					20						
2	80	50	7	2.8											
3	50	25	2.5	2.5					10						
3	131	2.6							3						
4	52, 58, 58	40	1.9						3, 9, 6						20% UCB 40%
5	80, 62, 51	50-40 m							5					16' x 25'	40% UCB
6	45	35							6, 10					12' x 18' 57' x 50'	40% UCB
7	100	70							15					25' x 25'	
8	84, 56, 18	20							8						
9	43, 130								7						

Wood R. 10/17/05
Unit # Ave (m) Area (m²) Depth (m)
Wet well Depth (m) Pool Area

* right bank has no riparian veg. (low positive)
left bank has some timber w/ willow (alien)
* habitat is very homogeneous

* LWSL provides cover habitat along channel
Knapgrass, 0.1% of reach had no
stream grass (sand/silt/peat)

~~Sand Cr. Discharge STA Depth Vel Comments~~
10/18/05

Sand Cr. Hab. Survey
10/18/05
Crews: M. Guggis, M. Romero

Equipment: swiffer #
prop #

4x20, 15' Hip Chain #1
start: 12:51 5:45:55
stop:
calibration
marked Top of

Photo Log: Roll #1

#	Description
15	start of survey looking up
14	o/s @ 210' from start
13	looking o/s from to unit #5
12	" o/s from to warty debris pool sampler
11	" o/s from unit #12
10	" @ ground patch in unit #13
9	looking o/s
8	" o/s from unit #28
7	" o/s from top unit #28
6	" o/s from top of unit #46
5	" o/s from mid unit #47 ground patch
4	" o/s @ bottom fracture unit #37
3	" " " "
2	" o/s " " "

Photo Log: Roll #2

#	Description
25	looking o/s from top unit #1
24	" o/s from bottom unit #66

Survey

10/18/05

Unit #	Habitat	Sand Cr. Ave Length	Habitat Ave Length	Depth	Area	Sample	#	Count	% Covers	Spann. Area
1	pool	20	13	2.0	0.9	em green sand	20	3	20	3' x 3'
2	riff	55	15	0.7		em green sand	10	30	40	2' x 2' patches
3	pool	12	30	0.8	1.9	em green sand	15	15	60	
4	riff	50	12	0.7		em green sand	10	1	25	2' x 2' patches
5	pool	19	16	2.3	1.0	sand, silt	50	7	30	
6	riff	35	20	2.8		em green sand	20	2	20	
7	pool	15	18	3.0	1.1	sand, silt	1	1	60	4' x 2'
8	riff	175	17	1.2		sand, silt	15	4, 4, 3	15	7.5' x 12'
9	pool	51	16	2.7	1.0	sand, silt	1	3, 2	40	2' x 2'
10	run	49	9	1.3		em green sand	20	2	50	
11	pool	19	12	3.1	1.2	silt sand	1	6	70	4' x 2'
12	run	208	15	2.9		silt sand	1	7	20	8' x 8'
13	riff	40	14	2.2		em green sand	20	2		1' x 1'
14	pool	65	13	3.2	0.7	sand, silt	1	25	70	4' x 2'
15	run	97	13	1.0		em green sand	25	12	30	4' x 2'
16	run	55	106	1.6		em green sand	25	6	15	4' x 2'
17	step pool	66	12	3.7	1.0	sand, silt	1	16	50	
18	run	41	10	1.5		em green sand	40	15	70	
19	run	41	11	1.5		em green sand	20	7	10	
20	pool	12	16	3.0	1.5	sand, silt	1	10	30	
21	riff	28	15	1.0		em green sand	15	2	10	2' x 2'
22	run	127	11	3.4	1.3	em green sand	20	15	60	2' x 2'

10/18/05

Unit #	Substrate	Substrate % cover	Spawning Area	Substrate	Substrate % cover	Spawning Area
23	cliff	14	22	0.9	2.4	1.1
24	pool	18	10	1.0	2.4	0.5
25	cliff	12	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
26	pool	11	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
27	cliff	8	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
28	pool	13	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
29	cliff	13	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
30	cliff	16	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
31	cliff	14	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
32	pool	15	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
33	pool	13	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
34	pool	14	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
35	pool	20	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
36	cliff	14	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
37	pool	17	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
38	cliff	15	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
39	pool	14	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
40	cliff	16	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
41	pool	14	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
42	cliff	14	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
43	pool	14	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
44	cliff	18	35	0.8	3.2	1.0
45	pool	16	35	0.8	3.2	1.0

10/18/05

Unit #	Sand C. Handbook Summary		Depth	Pool Grade	Pool Depth	Substrate	% Emb.	#	Cover Type	% Cover	S.D. Area
	Unit Type	Unit Length									
46	concrete	80	15	1.3		sm. grav, med. grav	25	6	obj, vnt	20	5' x 8.5'
47	c/b	125	16	0.8	2.6		20	5	obj	5	6' x 8.5'
48	pool	25	17	0.8	2.6						
49	c/b	35	15	0.8	2.6	sm. grav, med. grav	40	2	obj, vnt	30	
50	pool	35	5	1.0	1.0	sm. grav, med. grav					
51	c/b	28	13	0.7	2.7	sm. grav, med. grav	25		web	70	
52	pool	22	12	2.1	1.0	sm. grav, med. grav		2	web	25	5' x 8.5'
53	c/b	23	14	0.8	2.4	sm. grav, med. grav	15	3	obj, vnt	40	4' x 12'
54	pool	53	17	0.7	2.4	sm. grav, med. grav	25	4	obj, vnt	10	4' x 12'
55	c/b	141	15	0.7	2.3	sm. grav, med. grav		5	"	25	4' x 11'
56	pool	43	18	0.7	2.3	sm. grav, med. grav		3	obj	2	2' x 2'
57	c/b	22	17	1.0	2.4	sm. grav, med. grav	30	2	obj	15	4' x 10'
58	pool	30	12	0.9	2.4	sm. grav, med. grav		1	obj	10	4' x 20'
59	c/b	40	18	0.9	2.4	sm. grav, med. grav	15	3	obj	5	4' x 10'
60	run	45	19	1.5	2.5	sm. grav, med. grav	25	1	obj	20	4' x 20'
61	c/b	122	17	0.6	2.3	sm. grav, med. grav	20	1	obj	1	4' x 20'
62	pool	21	13	0.6	2.3	sm. grav, med. grav	40	2	obj	5	4' x 10'
63	c/b	215	15	0.6	2.3	sm. grav, med. grav	20	3, 2	obj	2	4' x 10'
64	pool	60	23	0.6	2.7	sm. grav, med. grav		2	obj	20	3' x 8'
65	run	50	14	1.2	2.7	sm. grav, med. grav	25	1	obj	5	4' x 20'
66	c/b	105	15	0.6	2.0	sm. grav, med. grav	15	4	obj, vnt	30	
67	pool	25	14	0.7	2.0	sm. grav, med. grav	40	2	"	10	
68	run	40	14	1.2	2.0	sm. grav, med. grav	10	2	"	30	
69	pool	37	16	0.9	2.9	sm. grav, med. grav		4	"	30	

Sand Cr. Discharge 10/13/05

Scott G. Haberkort Survey

STA Depth Vel. ~~Area~~ Comments

Row	Sta	Depth	Vel	Area	Comments
4.0					
4.1	0.45		1.40		
4.5	0.55		1.78		
5.0	0.50		1.78		
5.5	0.55		1.86		
6.0	0.65		2.10		
6.5	0.67		2.05		
7.0	0.72		2.30		
7.5	0.80		2.33		
8.0	0.85		2.36		
8.5	0.78		2.28		
9.0	0.80		2.14		
9.5	0.87		2.18		
10.0	0.87		2.31		
10.5	0.85		2.37		
11.0	0.85		2.33		
11.5	0.80		1.97		
12.0	0.80		1.69		
12.5	0.80		1.91		
13.0	0.90		2.26		
13.5	0.90		2.31		
13.9	0.80		1.25		
14.0	0.80		0.00		

Low
- Swiffer Unit #3602
Proprietary 2A
Photo #23 of discharge measured
@ bridge #103

Census: Bill Engstrom, N. Reservoir
weather: clear, cool w/ 45°F
No prec. in past several days
Location: unable to obtain GPS
precision, started survey
@ western most extremity of
FS swampground

N 42° 53.09' E
W 121° 56.05' S
2' tend survey

Photo Log: Roll #2
Looking up from south
#8 " 1/3 from unit #5
#7 " 1/3 from top Unit 22
#6 " 1/3 " " 37
#5 " 1/3 from top Unit #3
#4 " 1/3 " bottom Unit #9
#3 " 1/3 " top unit #68
#2 " from 175' up point 71
#1 " 1/3 from end of survey (west)

Unit #	Unit Type	Unit Count	Unit Width	Unit Depth	Unit Area	Unit Volume	Unit Description	Unit Material	Unit Cost	Unit Notes
1	run	35	12.0	18	0.7	150	run	run	10	19/29/05
2	pool	48	12.0	2.5	0.8	120	pool	pool	30	
3	run	30	14	0.8	0.8	168	run	run	10	
4	pool	54	16	2.4	1.0	216	pool	pool	20	
5	run	37	15	0.7	0.7	157.5	run	run	5	
6	pool	44	17	2.9	0.7	198	pool	pool	20	
7	run	156	17	1.1	0.7	193.2	run	run	10	
8	run	22	15	0.7	0.7	165	run	run	5	
9	pool	41	14	1.9	0.7	126	pool	pool	20	
10	run	167	14	1.1	0.7	162.6	run	run	15	
11	pool	52	15	1.9	0.7	136.8	pool	pool	20	
12	run	32	15	0.9	0.7	153	run	run	20	
13	pool	22	16	2.2	0.7	112	pool	pool	30	
14	riff	20	14	0.8	0.7	112	riff	riff	5	
15	run	32	15	1.1	0.8	144	run	run	10	
16	pool	26	17	2.7	0.8	117	pool	pool	30	
17	riff	15	14	0.8	0.7	126	riff	riff	5	
18	pool	19	13	3.2	0.7	85.8	pool	pool	30	
19	run	15	10	0.4	0.7	105	run	run	5	
20	pool	25	14	2.1	1.1	105	pool	pool	10	
21	run	34	15	0.9	0.7	153	run	run	10	
22	riff	50	17	0.7	0.7	225	riff	riff	2	
23	pool	22	16	2.6	0.4	112	pool	pool	2	

Unit #	Scott Unit Type	Cu. Length	Horizontal Width	Sounding Depth	Pool Control	Substrate	LWD	#	Cover Type	% Cover	10/20/05 Sparm. Area
24	run	37	16	0.8		subgr. sand	20	2	veg. sh.	10	2'x2'
25	pool	25	17	0.8	0.7	subgr. sand		4	veg. sh.	20	2'x2'
26	riff	20	16	0.8		subgr. sand	20	1	veg. sh.	2	
27	pool	35	16	2.5	0.7	subgr. sand		3	veg. sh.	15	
28	run	106	18	1.1		subgr. sand	20	10	veg. sh.	10	
29	pool	20	17	2.5	0.6	subgr. sand		4	veg. sh.	10	
30	pool	34	14	2.3	0.6	subgr. sand		3	veg. sh.	15	
31	riff	57	17	0.7		subgr. sand	20	3	veg. sh.	2	4'x15'
32	pool	20	14	2.2	0.7	subgr. sand		4	veg. sh.	20	
33	run	46	15	0.9		subgr. sand	20	2	veg. sh.	5	
34	pool	67	20	2.2	0.7	subgr. sand		1	veg. sh.	20	
35	run	103	11	70		subgr. sand	25	2	veg. sh.	10	3'x5'
36	pool	38	16	2.3	0.7	subgr. sand		2	veg. sh.	5	
37	run	177	15	1.0		subgr. sand	25	3	veg. sh.	5	2'x2'
38	pool	23	15	2.8	0.2	subgr. sand		3	veg. sh.	15	
39	pool	45	14	2.6	0.6	subgr. sand		3	veg. sh.	15	
40	run	81	15	0.7		subgr. sand	20	5	veg. sh.	2	3'x15'
41	pool	30	15	2.3	0.6	subgr. sand		1	veg. sh.	15	
42	riff	30	14	0.9		subgr. sand	25	2	veg. sh.	5	
43	pool	27	11	0.2	0.7	subgr. sand	25	1	veg. sh.	15	
44	riff	20	9	0.8		subgr. sand	25	3	veg. sh.	5	2'x2'
45	pool	17	16	2.3	0.6	subgr. sand		6	veg. sh.	20	3'x15'
46	riff	138	16	0.7		subgr. sand	20	14	veg. sh.		

Unit #	Scott Unit Type	Crs. Unit Length	Habitat Ave	Width	Survey Depth	Depth	Area	Subst	3576	A	Count	10/20/05
47	run	73	17	1.0	2.5	0.8	1.3	1, 3	25	10	10	10
48	pool	18	11	2.3	0.8			3, 2	3	15	15	15
49	pool	30	13	2.3	0.8			"	5	20	20	20
50	run	112	14	1.3	2.6	0.8		3, 4	30	15	15	15
51	pool	25	11	1.3	0.8			3, 2	2	10	10	10
52	run	55	15	1.3	2.6	0.8		3, 4	30	15	15	15
53	riff	100	16	0.9				3, 4	20	7	7	7
54	run	170	15	1.3				4, 5	25	15	15	15
55	pool	18	16	1.2	3.0	0.9		4, 3	25	3	3	3
56	run	87	15	1.2	2.2	0.7		3, 2	25	2	2	2
57	pool	16	13	1.2	2.2	0.7		3, 4	25	3	3	3
58	run	51	14	0.8				3, 2	25	3	3	3
59	riff	53	15	0.8				4, 5	25	1	1	1
60	pool	23	14	1.9	0.7			3, 2	25	3	3	3
61	run	43	15	1.1				3, 4	25	3	3	3
62	pool	14	12	2.5	0.5			2, 3	25	3	3	3
63	run	30	13	1.2				3, 4, 3	25	4	4	4
64	pool	40	12	2.2	0.8			2, 3	25	3	3	3
65	riff	91	14	0.8				4, 5	25	3	3	3
66	run	47	13	1.2				4, 5	25	4	4	4
67	riff	25	13	0.9				3, 4	25	6	6	6
68	run	106	13	1.1				4, 5	25	1	1	1
69	riff	87	14	0.7				4, 5	25	10	10	10

Unit #	Unit Type	Unit Length	Unit Width	Depth	Area	Volume	Stream % of Bank	# LWD	Cover Type	% Cover	Span
70	run	120	15	0.8			4.5	20	alg, silt	15	2' x 3'
71	pool	22	16	2.0	2.0	0.5	3.4	4	"	25	
72											
73											
74											
75											
76											
77											
78											
79											
80											

Scott Cr. Habitat Survey
10/20/05

Unit # 70: Unit Type run, Unit Length 120, Unit Width 15, Depth 0.8, Area, Volume, Stream % of Bank 4.5, # LWD 20, Cover Type alg, silt, % Cover 15, Span 2' x 3'

Unit # 71: Unit Type pool, Unit Length 22, Unit Width 16, Depth 2.0, Area 2.0, Volume 0.5, Stream % of Bank 3.4, # LWD 4, Cover Type "", % Cover 25, Span

Unit # 73: contained walking w/ 330' ups of consistent with run e. r. file habitat

Unit # 76: good supply of small & medium excellent cover provided by LWD riparian zone is healthy with Alnus The stream channel has a large volume overall the channel appears to juvenile and adult nesting

Unit # 77: good @ all stream points undercut bank and overhanging vegetation willow understory & large, mature canopy overstory of LWD with frequent key piece sized logs provide good spanning & excellent habitat

Unit # 71: the channel/habitat is very