SOUTH-CENTRAL CALIFORNIA COAST STEELHEAD RECOVERY PLANNING AREA

CONSERVATION ACTION PLANNING (CAP) WORKBOOKS THREATS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Little Sur River estuary, Monterey County

Prepared for:

NOAA-NMFS
Southwest Region
735 State Street, Suite 616
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Contact: Mark Capelli
(805) 963-6478

Prepared by:

Hunt & Associates Biological Consulting Services
5290 Overpass Rd, Suite 108
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Contact: Lawrence E. Hunt
(805) 967-8512

20 June 2008

South-Central California Coast ESU
Steelhead Threats Assessment Methodology

Introduction. The Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) contracted with Lawrence E. Hunt of Hunt & Associates Biological Consulting Services to provide technical support in developing Recovery Plans for steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) populations in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) and the Southern California Coast Steelhead ESU. Specifically, Hunt & Associates was tasked with reviewing existing information on steelhead habitat conditions and assessing the magnitude and extent of threats to steelhead and their habitats and developing recovery planning actions across these two ESUs. This document summarizes the results of an assessment of threats and sources of threats to steelhead in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU, which includes coastal steelhead populations in the Pajaro River watershed of Monterey County southward to the Arroyo Grande Creek watershed in southern San Luis Obispo County, California. Recovery action matrices for each watershed in both ESUs are provided in a separate document.

Methods. Twenty-two coastal basins, representing 27 drainages, were selected for threats assessment analysis and recovery planning actions in this ESU (see Table 1 in Threats Assessment Summary section). Boughton et al. (2006) identified these watersheds as supporting historical and extant steelhead populations. Information on existing steelhead habitat conditions in the project area was gathered from a broad range of books, peer-reviewed scientific publications, technical reports, federal, state, and local environmental documents, EIR/EISs, management plans, passage barrier assessments, habitat evaluations, and field surveys, as well as specific information given by stakeholders and other interested parties at a series of public workshops held throughout both ESUs in 2007. These sources are listed in the bibliography in this document.

A separate CAP Workbook was established for each of the 27 component watersheds analyzed in this ESU. The reader is directed to any of these workbooks for the following discussion:

The Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Workbook, a relational database developed by The Nature Conservancy to identify conservation targets, assess existing habitat conditions, and identify management issues was used to organize and evaluate the large amount of information on current steelhead habitat conditions and threats to steelhead in these watersheds, as gleaned from widely disparate sources. The CAP Workbook methodology provides a number of benefits in assessing the magnitude and extent of threats to steelhead and their habitats:

- It can use quantitative and qualitative (i.e., professional judgment) measures of existing habitat conditions;
- It provides an objective, consistent means for determining changes in the status of each conservation target (steelhead life history stage) over time;

- It provides an objective, consistent way to compare the status of a specific target between watersheds;
- It provides an overall assessment of a watershed's "health" or viability and allows objective comparisons to other watersheds;
- It focuses recovery actions by identifying past, current, and potential threats to steelhead and their habitats;
- It provides a central repository for documenting current knowledge and assumptions about existing conditions;
- It can be continually updated as information on the target's biology and/or existing conditions within watersheds change, and;
- It creates the foundation upon which recovery actions can be monitored and updated, based on changing current conditions.

The CAP Workbook process uses available information on the target's biology in an explicit, objective, consistent, credible, and transparent assessment of current habitat conditions. Assessing threats to particular or multiple life stages does not require "perfect" information. Rather, the CAP Workbook allows the user to input quantitative as well as qualitative (professional judgment) information in order to determine what existing conditions are and what healthy targets should look like. The Workbook is flexible, iterative, and adaptable—it uses the best available knowledge at the time, and can be updated as additional information becomes available.

CAP Methodology—Conservation Targets. The user identifies specific "conservation targets" for analysis. The conservation targets in this case are steelhead life history stages: egg, fry, smolt, and adult. In an effort to balance the specificity inherent in a life history stage approach, a more general conservation target, "Multiple Life Stages", also was established to allow landscape-scale land use and habitat assessment, based on information derived from GIS=based analysis of entire watersheds (see section below describing relationship between Kier Associates' and Hunt & Associates' CAP Workbook analyses).

CAP Methodology—KEAs. Assessing the "viability" or "health" of a particular conservation target (life history stage) begins with identifying "Key Ecological Attributes" (KEA) for each target. KEAs are aspects of the conservation target's biology or ecology such that if missing or severely degraded, would result in loss of that target over time. KEAs, such as substrate quality, non-native species, food availability, road density, water quality, etc., were identified for each target and measurable indicators, such as turbidity, water temperature, aquatic invertebrate species richness, presence or absence of non-native predators, miles of road/square mile of watershed, etc., were identified in order to characterize existing conditions in the component watersheds. KEAs were grouped into three categories, based roughly on spatial scale:

- *Size*: target abundance (i.e., number of adult steelhead);
- *Condition*: a measure of the biological composition, structure, and biotic interactions that characterize the target's occurrence (i.e., generally a local measure of habitat quality or composition), and;

- *Landscape Context*: an assessment of the target's environment (i.e., landscape-scale processes, such as connectivity, accessibility of spawning habitat; hydrology).

CAP Methodology—Current Indicators. The range of variation found in each indicator is subdivided into four more or less subjective, but discrete, categories: "Poor", "Fair", "Good", or "Very Good". The current condition of a specific indicator, taken from a field measurement, literature source, or professional judgment, is assigned to one of these four discrete rating categories (see the description of indicators used in the CAP steelhead analyses and the justification for these discrete indicator categories in Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service (2008)). Functionally however, there are essentially two states for the indicator as it relates to the species: "poor-fair", in which the indicator exceeds or barely meets the requirements for species survival and the population is in danger of extirpation, and "good-very good", where habitat conditions are favorable for species persistence.

The CAP Workbook can use local-, regional-, and landscape-scale indicators. For example, land use indicators, such as density of roads per square mile of watershed, has been widely employed as a landscape-scale metric of watershed "health" for salmonids throughout the western United States (see discussion in Kier Associates and NMFS, 2008). These types of landscape-scale metrics were used in the present document to overcome logistical and analytical problems inherent in local-scale metrics of steelhead habitat quality, e.g, water temperature, that exhibit extreme spatial and temporal variation.

The conceptual goal of establishing measurable and objective indicators sometimes exceeded current knowledge of existing habitat conditions in the component watersheds. For example, turbidity is an important steelhead habitat indicator. For the steelhead fry life stage, turbidity was defined as the "number of days turbidity exceeded 25 NTUs" and the "poor" category was defined as "> 30 days during fry development period", while "very good" was defined as "< 10 days during fry development period", with "fair" and "good" conditions intermediate between these boundaries. Currently, there is little or no systematic and widespread collection of turbidity data in most of the subject watersheds drainages to permit a useful analysis. In these instances, subjective information, such as observations of mass wasting of slopes, descriptions of point and non-point sediment inputs, etc., were used to qualitatively assess a current condition and rating for this indicator. A key feature of the CAP Workbook process is its ability to use quantitative information as well as professional judgment to assess current habitat conditions. Because the CAP Workbook analysis is iterative, results can be improved as better quantitative information becomes available.

CAP Methodology—Stresses and Sources of Stress (Threats). The next step in the CAP Workbook analysis is identifying a series of stresses to each steelhead life history stage. These stresses are basically altered KEAs and, ideally, should directly affect the life stage, e.g., degraded hydrologic function, increased turbidity, presence of non-native predators, increased substrate embeddedness). In this CAP Workbook analysis however, the GIS-based surrogate variables used for the "Multiple Life Stages" conservation target actually are sources of stress, not direct stressors on steelhead life stages (e.g., increased road density (a source of stress) contributes indirectly to increased turbidity (a direct stressor). This resulted in some level of redundancy in the analyses. The user assesses the severity (very high, high, medium, or low) and geographic scope (very high, high, medium, and low) of each stress, then the CAP Workbook assigns an overall stress rank (very high, high, medium, or low) to that stress.

The CAP Workbook automatically inputs the overall rank of each stress into a table that relates the stress to a series of anthropogenic sources of stress (also called Threats) that have been identified by the user as relevant to that watershed (e.g., roads, grazing practices, logging, recreational facilities, agricultural conversion of watershed lands, dams, groundwater extraction, in-channel mining, etc.). The user ranks each threat on the basis of its relative "contribution" (very high, high, medium, or low) and "irreversibility" (very high, high, medium, or low) to each stress (e.g., increased turbidity). The CAP Workbook then ranks the threat (source of stress) as "Very High', "High", "Medium", or "Low" and inputs that rank into the next step of the analysis. This process was repeated for each conservation target (steelhead life history stage--egg, fry, juvenile, smolt, and adult), as well as the "Multiple Life Stages" conservation target.

CAP Methodology—Summary of Threats. The CAP Workbook ranks the threat sources for the various conservation targets (life history stages) from the previous analysis into a "Summary of Threats" table that lists all the threat sources for all life history stages and assigns a composite "Overall Threat Rank" to each threat source (e.g., dams and surface water diversions), as well as an overall threat rank to that watershed for all threat sources combined. The Workbook derives a second table ("Stress Matrix") that shows the rank of each stress on each life history stage. The final step in the steelhead CAP analysis was the derivation of a third table entitled, "Overall Viability Summary", that ranks the viability of each life history stage and KEA category (size, condition, and landscape context) by calculating a composite rank of the current habitat indicators from the "Viability" page of the workbook, as well as an overall "Project Biodiversity Health Rank", which is a measure of watershed "health" based on current habitat conditions. The first and third summary tables proved most useful in analyzing stresses and sources of stress to steelhead in the South-Central California Coast and Southern California Coast steelhead ESUs.

Data Gaps. The pages in the CAP Workbooks for the present study have many blank cells. Blank cells indicate a lack of available information. Watersheds that have been intensively studied have fewer blank cells than watersheds with few studies. In general, the level of available information on current watersheds conditions, with a few notable exceptions, increased dramatically south of the Santa Monica Mountains (e.g., the Mojave Rim Biogeographic Population Group watersheds and most of the Orange and San Diego county watersheds). As previously stated, a feature of the CAP Workbook methodology is the ability to update the analyses as information becomes available.

Relationship between CAP Workbook analyses developed by Hunt & Associates and Kier Associates. The CAP Workbooks analyses prepared by Kier Associates are meant to complement, not duplicate, those prepared by Hunt & Associates. During the initial stages of CAP Workbook analyses by Hunt & Associates, it was determined that, in some cases, surrogate indicators covering regional spatial scales and derived from GIS-based watershed analysis, might be useful in overcoming the spatial and temporal problems associated with habitat indicators that rely on point measurements, such as water temperature, turbidity, riparian corridor width and composition, etc. A separate conservation target category "Multiple Life Stages" was developed for the CAP Workbook analyses that used GIS-based surrogate indicators as input. Surrogate indicators, such as density of roads per square mile of watershed, density of roads within 300 feet of streams per square mile of watershed, human population density, percent of watershed converted to agriculture; percent of watershed converted to impervious surfaces, percent of watershed burned in past 25 years, and others provided a general measure of existing watershed conditions as they affect multiple steelhead life history stages. For example, road density, especially riparian road density, and percent of watershed as impervious surface, has strong predictive power of general habitat conditions for steelhead because paved surfaces have manifold effects on habitat quality, water quality, and hydrology of streams.

Kier Associates was subsequently contracted by NOAA-NMFS to provide GIS-based metrics and values for individual watersheds as support for the CAP Workbook analyses in-progress by Hunt & Associates. Kier Associates analyzed 54 watersheds across both steelhead ESUs (23 in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU and 31 in the Southern California Coast Steelhead ESU), using the GIS-based regional indicators. Their workbooks also include information on a small number of point-based measurements, such as dissolved oxygen, water temperature, etc.

The Kier Associates' workbooks supplement those prepared by Hunt & Associates. Hunt & Associates' workbooks are based on review of a large number and broad range of ground-based steelhead surveys, habitat and barrier assessments, and other fieldwork, as well as the GIS-based indicators for the "Multiple Life History" target category developed by Kier Associates. Hunt & Associates developed CAP Workbooks for 73 watersheds across both steelhead ESUs (27 in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU and 46 in the Southern California Coast Steelhead ESU).

Kier Associates' workbooks are provided as a separate document (Kier Associates and NMFS, 2008). In order to avoid confusion and explain discrepancies in the overall assessment of steelhead habitat conditions in watersheds found in the present document and Kier Associates' document, Table 1 compares the results of the two documents for watersheds in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU. It should be noted that the difference between a "poor" and "fair" habitat rating or a "good" and "very good" rating is often a matter of professional judgment and does not represent important differences in habitat quality. Of real concern, are habitat differences between the "poor-fair" and "good-very good" indicator categories. Table 1 explains discrepancies between "poor-fair" and "good-very good" categories between the Hunt & Associates and Kier Associates CAP Workbook analyses.

Table 1. Assessment of Overall Habitat Conditions for Steelhead in Component Watersheds in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU Between Two CAP Workbook Analyses*

Watershed	**Steelhead Habitat Rating**		**Reasons for Discrepancy**
	Hunt & Associates	**Kier Associates**	
Pajaro River			Minor difference in cutoff points between indicator categories; difference in number of indicators used to determine steelhead life history stage viability
Lower Salinas River			
Upper Salinas River			
Carmel River			
San Jose Creek			Minor difference in cutoff points between indicator categories; difference in number of indicators used to determine steelhead life history stage viability
Garrapata Creek			Minor difference in cutoff points between indicator categories; difference in number of indicators used to determine steelhead life history stage viability
Bixby Creek			
Little Sur River			
Big Sur River			**Difference in rating floodplain connectivity and number of available indicators used in analysis**
Willow Creek			
Salmon Creek			**Natural barrier (waterfall) in lower reach is limit of anadromy. Kier rates entire watershed as poor on this basis; Hunt & Associates rates only accessible reach.**
San Carpoforo Creek			
Arroyo de la Cruz			
Little Pico Creek			
Pico Creek			**Kier includes point measurements for dissolved oxygen for fry, juvenile, and smolt life stages (rated as "poor"); difference in number of available indicators**
San Simeon Creek			

Santa Rosa Creek			**Minor difference in cutoff points between indicator categories; difference in number of indicators used to determine steelhead life history stage viability**
Morro Creek			
Chorro Creek			Minor difference in cutoff points between indicator categories; difference in number of indicators used to determine steelhead life history stage viability
Los Osos Creek			Minor difference in cutoff points between indicator categories; difference in number of indicators used to determine steelhead life history stage viability
San Luis Obispo Creek			
Pismo Creek			
Arroyo Grande Creek			Minor difference in cutoff points between indicator categories; difference in number of indicators used to determine steelhead life history stage viability

*** Overall habitat condition rating taken from "Project Biodiversity Health Rank" rating in "Overall Viability Summary" table in Summary section of individual CAP Workbooks (composite rating of habitat conditions for all steelhead life history stages combined). Watersheds analyzed only by Hunt & Associates are not shown.**

Key: dark green = very good conditions; light green = good conditions; yellow = fair conditions; red = poor conditions.

The results of the two analyses closely agree. There are four discrepancies (bolded table entries) that can be explained by the type (point measurements) and lower number of indicators used in each analysis by Kier Associates. This is a consistent difference between Kier Associates' and Hunt & Associates' workbooks. As the number of indicators decreases, the relative weight given to each indicator in the analysis correspondingly increases, and if these indicators are based on point measurements, such as water temperature or dissolved oxygen, that exhibit extreme spatial and temporal variation, then different results can be obtained. Despite these differences, again, the results closely agree.

South-Central California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area
CAP Workbooks Threats Assessment Summary

Location and Component Watersheds. The South-Central California Coast Steelhead Environmentally Significant Unit (ESU) encompasses four Biogeographic Population Groups (BPGs) identified by the NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team for the South-Central/Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Domain. These BPGs extend from the southern end of the Santa Cruz Mountains southward through the Coast and Interior Coast ranges to the western end of the Transverse Range, and includes portions of Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito, and San Luis Obispo counties. The component watersheds of the four BPGs analyzed in this document using the CAP analyses are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Component BPGs, Watersheds, and Corresponding CAP Workbooks for the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU.

Biogeographic Population Group	Watershed (North to South)	CAP Workbook
Interior Coast Range	Pajaro River	Main stem Pajaro River
		Uvas Creek
	Lower Salinas Basin	Main stem Salinas River
		Gabilan Creek
		Arroyo Seco
	Upper Salinas Basin	San Antonio River
		Nacimiento River
Carmel River Basin	Carmel River	Carmel River
Big Sur Coast	San Jose Creek	San Jose Creek
	Garrapata Creek	Garrapata Creek
	Bixby Creek	Bixby Creek
	Little Sur River	Little Sur River
	Big Sur River	Big Sur River
	Willow Creek	Willow Creek
	Salmon Creek	Salmon Creek
San Luis Obispo Terrace	San Carpoforo Creek	San Carpoforo Creek
	Arroyo de la Cruz	Arroyo de la Cruz
	Little Pico Creek	Little Pico Creek
	Pico Creek	Pico Creek
	San Simeon Creek	San Simeon Creek
	Santa Rosa Creek	Santa Rosa Creek
	Morro Creek	Morro Creek
	Morro Bay Estuary	Chorro Creek
		Los Osos Creek
	San Luis Obispo Creek	San Luis Obispo Creek
	Pismo Creek	Pismo Creek
	Arroyo Grande Creek	Arroyo Grande Creek

Threats. The type and intensity of land use varies widely across the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU. The amount of public ownership of these watersheds, which includes lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, California Department of Parks and Recreation, local parks departments, and other public agencies, varies from nearly 100% to 0% of the individual watersheds. In general, the Big Sur Coast BPG watersheds have the greatest amount of land in public ownership.

However, ownership is not always a predictor of watershed health for steelhead. For example, the Arroyo de la Cruz and Little Pico Creek watersheds have almost no land within their boundaries under public ownership yet provide the highest quality steelhead spawning and rearing habitat of any watershed in this ESU. The Big Sur River, Arroyo Seco, San Antonio River, and Nacimiento River watersheds, with more than half their areas under public ownership, are impacted to varying degrees by recreational, passage barriers, and water management issues.

The majority of land in all of the component watersheds across this ESU is open space (78% to 100% of total watershed area). However, the spatial configuration and intensity of land use within these watersheds is what determines the type and magnitude of impacts to steelhead. A relatively small amount of urban or agricultural development can have disproportionately large impacts on instream, riparian, and estuarine habitat conditions for steelhead. The typical pattern of urban and agricultural development concentrates on the flatter portions of a watershed, typically within the floodplain and usually along the main stem of the drainage and one or more tributaries, thereby magnifying potential impacts to steelhead even if the vast majority of the watershed remains undeveloped.

Although agricultural conversion of watershed lands in this ESU is small, averaging less than 4% of total watershed area (range = 0% to 19%), agricultural practices are important sources of threats to steelhead. Agriculture situated on the floodplain and flanking the main stem of the drainage frequently leads to loss or degradation of the riparian corridor and frequently channelization. Habitat impairments stemming from agricultural development may range from increased water temperature, incision of the streambed and loss of structural complexity and instream refugia (meanders, pools, undercut banks, etc.), increased sedimentation, turbidity, and substrate embeddedness, and nutrient loading.

Urban and suburban development in the watersheds in this ESU also is generally low, averaging 2.8% of total watershed area (range = 0% to 16%). However, population density varies widely between watersheds (Fig. 1; Table 2). High population densities occur in the northernmost watersheds in this ESU, along the main stem of the Salinas River, in the lower Carmel Basin BPG, and in the southern watersheds in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG. Coastal watersheds in the center of the ESU (Big Sur Coast and northern San Luis Obispo Terrace BPGs) have very low population densities or are effectively uninhabited (Fig. 1; Table 2).



Figure 1. H abitat conditions and human population density in component watersheds of the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU (histogram color code is same as for indicator ratings in individual BPG summaries; densities are listed in Table 2).

Table 2. Human population density of component watersheds in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU (data from CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003).

Watershed (north to south)	Human Population Density (# / square mile)
Interior Coast Range BPG	
Pajaro River	170
Gabilan Creek	993
Arroyo Seco	3
Salinas River main stem (Salinas Valley)	79
San Antonio River and Nacimiento River combined	6
Carmel River Basin BPG	
Carmel River	70
Big Sur Coast BPG	
San Jose Creek	15
Garrapata Creek	6
Bixby Creek	4
Little Sur River	2
Big Sur River	2
Willow Creek	2
Salmon Creek	< 1
San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG	
San Carpoforo Creek	< 1
Arroyo de la Cruz	< 1
Little Pico Creek	0
Pico Creek	24
San Simeon Creek	19
Santa Rosa Creek	90
Morro, Los Osos, and Chorro creeks combined	324
San Luis Obispo Creek	606
Pismo Creek	160
Arroyo Grande Creek	297

Estuaries are used by steelhead as rearing areas for juveniles and smolt as well as staging areas for smolt acclimating to saline conditions in preparation for entering the ocean and adults acclimating to freshwater in preparation for spawning. Loss and/or degradation of estuarine habitats varied widely across this ESU, averaging about 70% loss in the Interior Coast Range BPG, 33% loss in the Carmel Basin BPG; 15% loss in the Big Sur Coast BPG (almost wholly associated with 98% loss of the San Jose Creek estuary), and; about 43% loss in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG. Losses in the latter BPG were concentrated in the southern watersheds (Table 3).

Table 3. Estuarine habitat loss in component watersheds in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU.

Watershed (north to south)	Remaining Estuarine Habitat as Percentage of Historic Habitat
Interior Coast Range BPG	
Pajaro River	50
Gabilan Creek	9*
Arroyo Seco	9*
Salinas River main stem	9
San Antonio River	9*
Nacimiento River	9*
Carmel River Basin BPG	
Carmel River	67
Big Sur Coast BPG	
San Jose Creek	2
Garrapata Creek	100
Bixby Creek	100
Little Sur River	100
Big Sur River	100
Willow Creek	90
Salmon Creek	100
San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG	
San Carpoforo Creek	80
Arroyo de la Cruz	80
Little Pico Creek	100
Pico Creek	62
San Simeon Creek	50
Santa Rosa Creek	62
Morro Creek	0
Chorro and Los Osos creeks	83
San Luis Obispo Creek	61
Pismo Creek	30
Arroyo Grande Creek	20

* tributary of Salinas River; loss is shared by all contributing sub-watersheds

Summary. In general, the overall "health" of a particular watershed for steelhead is directly related to human population density (Fig. 1). The exception is the large tributaries of the Salinas River. Despite very low population densities and agricultural activity, degraded conditions for steelhead in the Arroyo Seco, San Antonio River, and Nacimiento River watersheds are the result of surface and groundwater management practices designed to serve agricultural development within and outside these watersheds.

Dams and other surface water diversions and excessive groundwater extraction are the most pervasive sources of threats to steelhead in this ESU. The Big Sur Coast BPG (with the exception of its northernmost watershed, San Jose Creek) and the northern watersheds in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG, offer the best existing conditions for steelhead.

Table 4. Severe and Very Severe Sources of Threats to Steelhead in the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU*.

Threat Source	Biogeographic Population Group			
	Interior Coast Range	Carmel Basin	Big Sur Coast	San Luis Obispo Terrace
Dams and Surface Water Diversions	X	X	X	X
Groundwater Extraction	X	X	X	X
Levees and/or Channelization	X	X		X
Urban Development	X	X		X
Roads	X		X	X
Other Passage Barriers		X	X	X
Agricultural Effluent	X		X	X
Agricultural Development	X			X
Recreational Facilities	X			X
Flood Control	X			X
Logging			X	
Urban Wastewater Effluent				X
Non-Native Species	X			

*** These are the "severe" (yellow) and "very severe" (red) threat sources taken from the top five threat sources identified by the CAP Workbook analyses. See individual BPG Threat Summaries for more information.**

The individual threat sources listed in Table 4 are not mutually exclusive threat sources and they can create a number of primary and secondary sources of threats to steelhead. For example, dam construction as a result of urban or agricultural development in a watershed not only creates passage barriers to spawning and rearing habitat and negatively affects the natural hydrograph of the affected drainages, recreational development of reservoirs for fishing and camping can impact steelhead by introducing non-native predators and/or competitors (e.g., largemouth bass, crayfish, western mosquitofish) as well as promoting foot traffic within the active channels of contributing streams that can directly affect redds.

A widespread trend observed in this ESU is severe to very severe degradation of habitat conditions along the main stem of impaired watersheds, while the upper main stem and tributaries retain relatively high habitat values for steelhead. Because the main stem of these drainages is the conduit that connects steelhead spawning and rearing habitat with the ocean, recovery actions in watersheds impaired in this manner should focus on reducing the severity of anthropogenic impacts along the main stem (resulting from encroachment into riparian areas and related flood control activities) in order to promote connectivity between the ocean and estuarine habitats. Additionally, degraded estuarine conditions stemming from filling, artificial sandbar manipulation, and both point and non-point waste discharges should be further evaluated and addressed as part of any recovery strategy for this ESU (see Threats Summaries and Recovery Action Matrices for individual Biogeographic Population Groups for more specific recovery actions).

Threats Assessment for the
Interior Coast Range Biogeographic Population Group

Location and Physical Characteristics. The Interior Coast Range Biogeographic Population Group (BPG) region is the largest of the four BPG regions in the South-Central Coast Steelhead ESU and includes the east-facing (interior) slopes of the Central Coast Range (Santa Lucia Mountains) and the west-facing slopes of the Inner Coast Range (Diablo, Gabilan, Caliente, and Temblor ranges). This region extends 180 miles across the entire length of the South-Central Coast California ESU and includes portions of Santa Clara, San Benito, Monterey, and San Luis Obispo counties. The Interior Coast Range BPG region consists of two major watersheds, the Pajaro River and Salinas River, which empty into the Pacific Ocean at Monterey Bay. The Pajaro River watershed includes the Uvas Creek sub-watershed. The Salinas River watershed is very large, covering over 2.8 million acres (4,426 square miles) and contains two major sub-basins: the Lower Salinas sub-basin, which includes the Gabilan Creek and Arroyo Seco watersheds, and the Upper Salinas sub-basin, which includes the San Antonio River and Nacimiento River watersheds (Fig. 1; Table 1).

Tectonic activity associated with the northwest-trending San Andreas Fault has created a parallel series of northwest to southeast-trending basins and ranges in this part of California. The main stem of the Salinas River runs through the center of most of this BPG and two major tributaries, the San Antonio and Nacimiento rivers are unusual in that they flow southward for most of their length before their confluence with the Salinas River, which flows northwest (Fig. 1).

Average annual precipitation in this region is relatively low (Table 1) and shows high spatial variability. In general, the higher elevations get more moisture, but because of the "rain shadow" effect created by the coastal slope of the Central Coast Range, the eastern half of the Interior Coast Range BPG receives significantly less precipitation than the western half. The upper reaches of the Pajaro River watershed extend into the redwood coniferous forests of the Santa Cruz Mountains and receive significantly more rainfall than do other portions of the Interior Coast Range BPG. Although the highly dissected terrain contributes to a very large total stream length in this region (7,773 miles), the majority of drainages exhibit seasonal surface flow or have extensive seasonal reaches because of highly variable patterns of precipitation.

Land Use. Table 1 summarizes land use and population density in this region. Although human population density is relatively low for the region as a whole, about 100 persons per square mile, population centers, such as Atascadero, Paso Robles, and Salinas, are growing rapidly and are surrounded by large tracts of semi-developed rural land. Most of the land in the Pajaro River watershed, along the main stem of the Salinas River (Salinas Valley), and throughout the eastern half of the region, is privately owned. Public ownership of land is concentrated in the Los Padres National Forest lands and military reservations, such as Fort Hunter-Liggett and Camp Roberts, situated in the western portions of the Interior Coast Range BPG. Additionally, several rivers have been evaluated for consideration as Federally-designated Wild and Scenic Rivers: Arroyo

Seco and Tassajara Creek, tributaries to the Salinas River within the Los Padres National Forest.

Agriculture (row crop and orchard cultivation and livestock ranching), are important land uses that directly or indirectly affects watershed processes throughout this region. A major consequence of agricultural activity in this region is reservoir development and operation. There are at least 37 dams on watersheds in this region that are large enough to be regulated by the California Department of Water Resources and/or Department of Defense (Fig. 1 shows nine of the more significant dams). These dams are owned and operated by federal, state, public utility, local government, or private interests for irrigation, flood control and storm water management, recreation, municipal water supply, hydroelectric power generation, fire protection, farm ponds, or a combination of these purposes. The largest reservoirs in this region, San Antonio Lake (San Antonio River), Lake Nacimiento (Nacimiento River), and Santa Margarita Lake (Upper Salinas River main stem), receive extensive recreational use.

Table 1. Physical and Land Use Characteristics of Watersheds in the Interior Coast Range BPG.

Physical Characteristics				Land Use				
Watershed	**Area (acres/miles[2])[1]**	**Stream Length[2] (miles)**	**Average Annual Rainfall[3] (in.)**	**Human Population[4]**	**Public Ownership***	**Urban Area[5]**	Agriculture/ **Barren[5]**	**Open Space[5]**
Pajaro River	838,776/1,311	1,843	16.9	222,235	7%	4%	14%	83%
Gabilan Creek	(99,929)/(156)	(247)	(18.9)	(154,907)	(0%)	---	---	---
Arroyo Seco	(196,430)/(307)	(477)	(18.5)	(920)	(58%)	---	---	---
Lower Salinas Basin	1,255,902/1,962	2,598	16.5	266,449	14%	3%	19%	78%
Upper Salinas Basin	1,576,869/2,464	3,332	16.4	82,805	24%	1%	4%	94%
San Antonio River and Nacimiento River combined	(456,758)/(714)	(1,030)	(17.4)	(4,598)	(55%)	---	---	---
Total/Average	**3,671,547/5,737****	**7,773****	**17.4**	**571,489****	**15%****	**3%**	**12%**	**85%**

Sources: 1. CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999 (www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/features/calwater/)
2. CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003 (www.calfish.org/)
3. USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1 km grid cells)
4. CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003
5. CDFFP Multi-source land cover data (v02_2), 2002 (100 m grid cells) (http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgisdata/select.asp)

* National Forest Lands and Military Reservations; does not include State and County Parks (http://old.casil.ucdavis.edu/casil/gis.ca.gov/teale/govtowna/)
** Total or average for Pajaro River watershed (including Uvas Creek sub-watershed), Lower Salinas Basin (including Gabilan Creek and Arroyo Seco sub-watersheds), and Upper Salinas Basin (including San Antonio River and Nacimiento River sub-watersheds)



Figure 1. The Interior Coast Range Biogeographic Population Group region. Seven steelhead populations/watersheds were analyzed in this region: two in the Pajaro River watershed; three in the Lower Salinas Basin, and two in the Upper Salinas Basin.

Current Watershed Conditions. The relative ratings of current habitat and land use conditions used to assess the suitability of watersheds to support steelhead in the Interior Coast Range BPG are presented in Figure 2. Because of the amount of relevant information available at the time of this analysis, the number of indicators varied widely between watersheds, from five for the San Antonio River watershed to 35 indicators each for the Pajaro and Salinas river main stems.



Fig. 2. Relative frequency of indicator ratings for watersheds in the Interior Coast Range BPG. Indicators are rated as "Very Good", "Good", etc., based on the current condition of landscape, habitat, or population variables. Although the amount of available information (the number of indicators) varies between watersheds, the relative ranking of indicators provides a general picture of existing habitat and land use conditions across the BPG (see individual CAP Workbooks for details).

The CAP Workbook analyses rated overall habitat conditions for steelhead as "Fair" in the Uvas Creek, Gabilan Creek, Arroyo Seco, and Nacimiento River watersheds, and "Poor" in the Pajaro River, Salinas River, and San Antonio River watersheds. Each of the watersheds included in this BPG are subject to one or more instream, riparian, or upland land use conditions that pose significant threats to steelhead. In general, habitat quality for steelhead declines in a downstream direction through each of these watersheds. The upper watersheds are in relatively good condition; the main stems are in fair to very poor condition. The major concern in this BPG is that the main stems of the two primary drainages in this region, the Pajaro and Salinas rivers, are severely impaired for steelhead by multiple, intensive anthropogenic activities related to agriculture, recreation, and residential development (see Threats discussion below). The main stems of these rivers provide the conduits that connect the ocean, estuary, and upper watershed habitats needed by steelhead to complete their life cycle. In other instances, major tributary watersheds, such as Arroyo Seco and the upper reaches of the San Antonio and Nacimiento rivers, provide generally good to excellent habitat for salmonids, but receive low ratings because they are highly constrained by passage barriers along their lower reaches (dams) or by passage barriers along the main stem of the Salinas River (seasonally dry stream reaches).

Threats and Sources of Threats. A variable number of threats were used in the CAP Workbooks to determine threat status for the Interior Coast Range BPG watersheds, ranging from seven in the Nacimiento River and San Antonio River watersheds to 16 in the Salinas River main stem (Fig. 3). The level of threat severity is generally very high in all watersheds in this BPG, but especially in Uvas Creek and along the main stems of the Pajaro River and Lower Salinas River (Fig. 3).



Fig. 3. Relative frequency of threat ratings in watersheds in the Interior Coast Range BPG, as identified by the CAP Workbook analyses. The sources, number, and severity of threats varies between watersheds, but watersheds in the Pajaro River and lower Salinas River watersheds are subject to more severe threats than those in the upper Salinas River watershed.

Ten anthropogenic activities ranked as the top five sources of stress to steelhead viability in this BPG (Table 2). These sources are not mutually exclusive and can be collapsed into the following general threat categories:

- barriers to upstream and downstream movement (roads, dams, groundwater extraction, sand and gravel mining);
- agricultural conversion of floodplain habitats, and;
- recreational facilities.

A pervasive threat to steelhead throughout the Interior Coast Range BPG watersheds is barriers to upstream and downstream passage either in the form of dams and surface water diversions or excessive groundwater extraction that creates and maintains dry stream reaches. As noted previously, there are at least 37 regulated dams on drainages in this watershed. Although there is only one dam on the main stem of the Salinas River, located more than 125 miles from its mouth, the intervening main stem is a major barrier to steelhead passage because extensive reaches routinely go dry in the summer and fall. Dams have isolated native rainbow trout populations in the upper San Antonio and Nacimiento River watersheds that otherwise would be anadromous. The reservoirs created by dams create suitable habitat conditions for several species of non-native fishes and bullfrogs that may affect one or more life history stages of steelhead directly (predation) or indirectly (competition for food). Non-native crayfish, snails, fishes, bullfrogs, and even fishes native to California, but not native to the Interior Coast Range BPG, such as Sacramento pikeminnow (= Sacramento squawfish), are problems in particular watersheds. Water management activities are closely related to agricultural conversion of watershed lands. This type of land conversion can increase sedimentation, embeddedness, and turbidity, degrade instream substrates, increase nutrient loading, change riparian canopy cover, and alter the natural hydrograph of the drainages.

Anthropogenic activities can produce manifold threats to steelhead. For example, dam construction and groundwater extraction for irrigation and municipal use is directly related to the magnitude of agricultural and urban conversion of floodplain habitats in the Pajaro River and Salinas River watersheds. A consequence of reservoir construction in this BPG is recreation, which generates its own series of impacts, ranging from the purposeful or unintentional introduction of non-native steelhead predators/competitors that have become a severe threat in the Arroyo Seco, San Antonio River, and Nacimiento River watersheds, to ORV damage to instream and riparian habitats that occurs in the lower portions of Arroyo Seco and the main stem of the Salinas River. Another consequence of agricultural and/or urban encroachment onto the floodplains of the Uvas Creek, Pajaro River main stem, Gabilan Creek, and Salinas River main stem is the need to construct levees or otherwise channelize to protect floodplain development. These structures, in turn, require maintenance by flood control agencies which disturbs riparian canopy cover, creates conditions suitable for invasive, non-native plants, and damages instream habitats.

Table 2. The top five sources of stress, ranked in order of frequency of occurrence and severity, in the component watersheds of the Interior Coast Range BPG. The Gabilan Creek and Arroyo Seco watersheds also are severely affected by other passage barriers, such as in-channel mining and culverts/road crossings (see CAP Workbooks for individual watersheds for further information).

Sources of Threats	**Component Watersheds (north to south)**						
	Uvas Creek	Pajaro River main stem	Salinas River main stem	Gabilan Creek	Arroyo Seco	San Antonio River	Naci-miento River
Dams and Surface Water Diversions	(red)	(red)	(red)		(red)	(red)	(red)
Groundwater Extraction	(red)	(red)	(red)	(red)	(red)	(green)	(green)
Agricultural Development	(red)	(red)		(red)	(red)	(green)	(green)
Recreational Facilities			(red)		(red)	(yellow)	(yellow)
Levees and Channelization		(red)	(red)	(red)			
Non-Native Species					(red)	(yellow)	(yellow)
Urban Development	(red)	(red)					
Flood Control			(red)	(red)			
Agricultural Effluent	(red)						
Roads				(yellow)			

Other Passage Barriers							

Key: Threat cell colors represent threat severity, as determined by the CAP Workbook analyses:
Red = Very High threat Yellow = High threat
Light green = Medium threat Dark green = Low threat

Estuarine habitat loss is a pervasive threat to steelhead populations in the Interior Coast Range BPG because, despite its enormous geographic size, the watersheds in this BPG share a single estuarine complex. Today, the mouths of the Pajaro River and the Salinas River at the Pacific Ocean are less than a mile from each other and form separate estuaries, but historically, the lower reaches of these drainages meandered across a broad coastal plain to create a single estuary complex that extended from Watsonville in the north to Marina in the south (Howard, 1979) (Fig. 1). Less than 50% of the Pajaro River estuary remains extant and the Salinas River estuary has been reduced in size by over 91%. Consequently, steelhead populations in far-flung tributaries of the Salinas River, such as Arroyo Seco and the San Antonio and Nacimiento rivers, are subject to equally severe impacts from loss of these estuarine habitats.

Fire frequency in the Interior Coast Range BPG is relatively low compared to other BPGs, such as the Santa Monica Mountains BPG, because the western half of the Interior Coast Range BPG, which is the most fire-prone area, is mostly in public ownership and has low population and road density. Wildland fires are not a significant threat source to steelhead in the Pajaro River, Gabilan Creek, and lower Salinas River watersheds, but pose moderate to severe threats in the Arroyo Seco and upper Salinas Basin watersheds, where 15% and 27% of the watershed has burned within the past 25 years, respectively. Here, increased road density allowing increased access to many parts of the watershed, and increased population density in fire-prone areas has increased fire frequency.

Improvements to one or a few conditions that are degrading steelhead habitat quality, such as the ineffective Thorne Road Fish Ladder and non-native fish control in the lower reaches of Arroyo Seco, or removing road crossing barriers in portions of the Uvas Creek watershed, could measurably improve conditions for steelhead in relatively localized areas. However, improving conditions for steelhead passage, spawning, and/or rearing over most of the BPG region, i.e., the main stem of the Pajaro River and especially the Salinas River, requires multiple, long-term, measures related to water management, recreation, and fish passage past large dams.

The threat sources discussed in this section should be the focus of a variety of recovery actions to address specific stresses on steelhead viability associated with these threats. Spatial and temporal data acquired on specific indicators associated with sources of threats or stresses, such as water temperature, pH, nutrients, etc., are generally inadequate to be the target of specific recovery actions. This type of data acquisition should be the subject of site-specific investigations in order to refine the primary recovery actions or to target additional recovery actions. Impediments to fish passage stemming from the construction and operation of dams and groundwater extractions, modification of channel morphology and adjacent riparian habitats through flood control activities, instream activities such as sand and gravel mining, loss of estuarine functions as a result of filling, and point and non-point waste discharges from agricultural and other anthropogenic activities should be further evaluated and addressed as part of any recovery strategy for the Interior Coast Range BPG (see the Recovery Action Matrices for more specific recovery actions).

ATTACHMENT. SUMMARY TABLES FOR STRESSES AND THREATS, STRESS MATRIX, AND OVERALL VIABILITY SUMMARY FOR THE INTERIOR COAST RANGE BPG

Threats Assessment for the
Carmel River Basin Biogeographic Population Group

Location and Physical Characteristics. The Carmel River Basin Biogeographic Population Group (BPG) region is one of the smallest of the four BPG regions; the main axis of the watershed is just 28 miles long. In contrast, the main axis of the neighboring Interior Coast Range BPG region is over 180 miles long. The Carmel River Basin BPG region drains the eastern slopes of the northern portions of the Santa Lucia Range and the western slopes of the Sierra de Salinas in northwestern Monterey County. It empties into the Pacific Ocean at Carmel Bay, just south of the Monterey Peninsula. This BPG region shares some physical characteristics with the Interior Coast Range BPG region, such as general northwest-southeast watershed orientation, landform evolution largely controlled by tectonic activity associated with the San Andreas Fault, and a highly dissected watershed. There are seven major perennial tributaries to the Carmel River, all perennial, (Fig. 1).

Average annual precipitation in this region is relatively low (Table 1) and shows high spatial variability. In general, the coastal regions and higher elevations receive higher amounts of precipitation. The Carmel River watershed is relatively steep and most of the tributaries are naturally perennial.

Land Use. Table 1 summarizes land use and population density in this region. Human population density is moderately high and concentrated in the lower and middle portions of the Carmel Valley, and includes the towns of Carmel and Carmel Valley. Population density averages 70 persons per square mile of watershed. Although less than 4% of the watershed is classified as urban, well over 50% of the watershed is privately-owned and the Carmel Valley, through which the main stem flows, is surrounded by extensive areas of ranches and rural land use. Less than 1% of the watershed is under cultivation. There are three dams in the Carmel River watershed: the Black Rock Creek on the Black Rock Creek tributary was constructed in 1925 and is used for recreational purposes, the San Clemente Dam, located at stream mile 18.5 at the confluence of San Clemente Creek and the main stem, was constructed in 1921, and the Los Padres Dam, located at stream mile 24.8, was constructed in 1949. The San Clemente and Los Padres dams are used for municipal and agricultural water supply. These dams are privately-owned and are regulated by the California Department of Water Resources. Los Padres National Forest lands cover about 31% of the watershed. Additionally, a portion of the lower watershed is owned and managed by the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District.



Figure 1. The Carmel Basin Biogeographic Population Group region. This BPG consists of a single watershed, the Carmel River.

Table 1. Physical and Land Use Characteristics of Watersheds in the Carmel River Basin BPG.

Physical Characteristics				Land Use				
Watershed	Area (acres/miles²)[1]	Stream Length[2] (miles)	Average Annual Rainfall[3] (in.)	Human Population[4]	Public Ownership*	Urban Area[5]	Agriculture/ Barren[5]	Open Space[5]
Carmel River	162,286/254	248	19.8	17,692	31%	4%	0.6%	95%

Sources: 1. CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999
6. CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003
7. USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1 km grid cells)
8. CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003
9. CDFFP Multi-source land cover data (v02_2), 2002 (100 m grid cells)
* National Forest Lands and Military Reservations; does not include State and County Parks.

Current Watershed Conditions. The current condition of habitat and land use indicators used to assess the health of the Carmel River watershed for steelhead is depicted in Figure 2. Information was available to rate 30 indicators.



Fig. 2. Relative frequency of indicator ratings for the Carmel River Basin BPG. Indicators are rated as “Very Good”, “Good”, etc., based on the current condition of landscape, habitat, or population variables. The relative ranking of indicators provides a general picture of existing habitat and land use conditions across the watershed (see Carmel River CAP Workbook for details).

The CAP Workbook analyses rated overall habitat conditions for steelhead in the Carmel River watershed as “Fair. Approximately 33% of the indicators were impaired (fair condition) or severely impaired (poor condition) and these indicators repeatedly focused on lack of surface flows in the main stem caused by water management activities (dams and surface water diversions) and excessive pumping of groundwater. The main stem contains suitable spawning habitat and functions as the conduit connecting the ocean and estuary to even more extensive spawning habitat in the upper watershed. The San Clemente and the Los Padres dams impede steelhead access to spawning and rearing habitat in at least 50% of the watershed. Native rainbow trout populations persist in the main stem and most of the tributaries above these structures.

Another feature of the Carmel River watershed that received low ratings was the estuary. While the existing estuary has undergone substantial restoration and still contains valuable rearing habitat for steelhead, at least 33% of the original estuary has been eliminated due to encroachment from residential development, transportation corridors (Highway 1), and recreational development (Carmel Beach State Park).

Threats and Sources of Threats. Although information was gathered on 30 habitat and land use indicators (Fig. 2), the underlying threat sources that determined the poor to very poor condition of approximately one-third of those indicators repeatedly pointed to a limited number of anthropogenic causes (Fig. 3):

- passage barriers caused by excessive surface and groundwater diversions;
- passage barriers caused by dams;
- loss or degradation of spawning substrates below San Clemente Dam due to water management practices;
- urban development and associated levee construction that has significantly reduced estuarine habitats and constricted the lower floodplain of the river, and;
- artificial breaching of the estuary sandbar to alleviate flooding of adjacent residential development.



Fig. 3. Relative frequency of threats to steelhead habitat in the Carmel River Basin BPG.

A pervasive threat to steelhead throughout the Carmel River are impediments to upstream and downstream fish passage either in the form of dams and surface water diversions or excessive groundwater extraction that creates and maintains dry stream reaches (Table 2). Several miles of the main stem of the river below San Clemente Dam, which would otherwise have perennial surface flows, frequently dry up or are reduced to isolated pools by late spring and early summer due to the combination of reduced runoff and surface and subsurface water withdrawals. Spawning habitat in the main stem below San Clemente Dam has been damaged by water releases from the dam, contributing to increasing sedimentation, bank erosion, and increased substrate embeddedness and turbidity. A sandbar forms during the summer and fall each year at the river mouth; however, the pattern of sandbar formation and breaching has been artificially modified by both surface and groundwater extractions that delay natural breaching, or artificial breaching for flood control, which causes premature draining of the estuary.

Table 2. The top sources of threats in the Carmel River Basin BPG (See CAP Workbook for details).

Threat Sources	Rating
Dams and Surface Water Diversions	
Groundwater Extraction	
Urban development	
Levees and Channelization	
Other Passage Barriers	
Recreational Facilities (*)	

(*) Artificial breaching of the sandbar at the mouth of the lagoon and associated recreational activities rank as the sixth most serious threat source to steelhead in this watershed and is included here because implementing specific recovery action recommendations can substantially reduce the magnitude of this threat.

Key: Threat cell colors correspond to the threat rating from CAP Workbook:
Red = Very High threat
Yellow = High threat

Urban and agricultural development within the watershed, as indicated by the relative rating of several instream and riparian habitat indicators, suggest relatively low sources of direct threats from these land uses compared to activities such as water diversions and extractions. For example, urban development (with the notable exception of residential development that encroaches on the estuary), road density, population density, and fire frequency are relatively low, agricultural conversion of watershed lands is low, and water quality and riparian canopy cover is generally good. The suitable condition of these important land use and habitat indicators could facilitate restoration if the serious threats associated with water management, fish passage, adequate instream flows, and estuarine management can be reduced. Because the main stem of the Carmel River is the conduit that connects upstream steelhead spawning and rearing habitat with the ocean, recovery actions in this watershed should focus on reducing the severity of anthropogenic impacts along the main stem in order to promote connectivity between the ocean and estuarine habitats, as well as main stem spawning and rearing habitat. Additionally, degraded estuarine conditions stemming from filling, artificial sandbar manipulation, and both point and non-point waste discharges should be further evaluated and addressed as part of any recovery strategy for the Carmel River BPG (see Recovery Action Matrices for more specific recovery actions).

ATTACHMENT. SUMMARY TABLES FOR STRESSES AND THREATS, STRESS MATRIX, AND OVERALL VIABILITY SUMMARY FOR THE CARMEL RIVER BASIN BPG

Threats Assessment for the Big Sur Coast Biogeographic Population Group

Location and Physical Characteristics. The Big Sur Coast BPG consists of seven small watersheds that drain the steep coastal slopes of the northern Santa Lucia Range. This region extends approximately 60 miles along a sparsely populated section of coastal Monterey County from the Monterey Peninsula southward almost to the San Luis Obispo County line. From north to south, these watersheds are: San Jose Creek, Garrapata Creek, Bixby Creek, Little Sur River, Big Sur River, Willow Creek, and Salmon Creek (Fig. 1). The Big Sur Coast BPG resembles the Conception Coast BPG in Santa Barbara County and the Santa Monica Mountains BPG in Ventura and Los Angeles counties in that its component watersheds are, with one or two exceptions, small, steep, and have small total stream lengths. Although average annual precipitation shows little spatial variation across the component watersheds (Table 1), total seasonal rainfall in this region is highly variable from year to year, depending on the intensity and duration of Pacific storms. In general, the higher elevations receive greater amounts of precipitation, and persistent spring and summer fog is characteristic of this region. All of the watercourses in this BPG are perennial.

Land Use. The Big Sur Coast BPG region supports, by far, the lowest total human population of any of the nine regions and is highly buffered from urban areas by extensive undeveloped open space and rural lands. Average human population density averages about 4 persons per square mile of watershed land (Table 1). The closest population centers are the small towns of Carmel near the north end and Cambria near the south end of the region. There are no major cities or towns within this BPG. There is a strong gradient of increasing public ownership of watershed lands, from less than 1% in the San Jose Creek watershed in the north to over 98% in the Salmon Creek watershed in the south. Most of the federal lands are in the Los Padres National Forest. Small acreages of National Recreation Area lands occur along the immediate coast. The Los Padres National Forest encompasses several federally designated wilderness areas, such as Ventana and Silver Peak Wilderness Areas. Additionally, the Big Sur River, including the North and South Forks, is a federally designated Wild River. There are several State and County parks along the coast in this region, but some of the larger state parks, such as Andrew Molera and Pfeiffer-Big Sur in the Big Sur River watershed, extend well into some of the component watersheds. Urban and agricultural conversion of land in these watersheds lands is correspondingly low, with the overwhelming majority of watershed lands being open space (Table 1). There are no major dams on watersheds in this region, though there are seasonal dams on some of the drainages that can affect steelhead, particularly the instream movement of juveniles.



Figure 1. The Big Sur Coast Biogeographic Population Group region. Seven steelhead populations/watersheds were analyzed in this region.

Table 1. Physical and Land Use Characteristics of Watersheds in the Big Sur Coast BPG.

Physical Characteristics				Land Use				
Watershed	Area (acres/miles^2)[1]	Stream Length[2] (miles)	Average Annual Rainfall[3] (in.)	Human Population[4]	Public Ownership*	Urban Area[5]	Agriculture/ Barren[5]	Open Space[5]
San Jose Creek	8,826/14	23	20.3	213	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	> 99%
Garrapata Creek	6,925/11	16	20.5	63	12%**	0%	0%	100%
Bixby Creek	7,218/11	15	20.8	44	27%	0%	0%	100%
Little Sur River	26,541/41	64	20.8	70	63%	0.2%	< 0.1%	> 99%
Big Sur River	37,374/58	92	20.8	142	86%	0.7%	< 0.1%	> 99%
Willow Creek	10,412/16	26	18.5	35	95%	0%	0%	100%
Salmon Creek	5,406/8	12	19.5	6	98%	0%	0%	100%
Total/Average	**102,702/159**	**248**	**20.2**	**573**	**54%**	**< 0.2%**	**< 0.1%**	**> 99%**

Sources: 1. CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999
10. CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003
11. USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1-km grid cells)
12. CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003
13. CDFFP Multi-source land cover data (v02_2), 2002 (100 m grid cells)
* National Forest Lands and State Recreation Areas; does not include State and County Parks.
** 68% of the watershed is owned by the State, Land Trust, or has conservation easement restrictions on land use.

Current Watershed Conditions. The relative ratings of current habitat and land use conditions used to assess the viability of watersheds to support steelhead in the Big Sur Coast BPG are presented in Figure 2. The number of indicators varied from 30 for the San Jose Creek watershed to 42 indicators for the Garrapata Creek watershed.



Fig. 2. Relative frequency of indicator ratings for watersheds in the Big Sur Coast BPG. Indicators are rated according to the current condition of landscape, habitat, or population variables. The relative ranking of indicators within and across watersheds provides a general picture of existing

habitat and land use conditions within the BPG region (see CAP Workbooks for individual watersheds for details).

Instream, riparian, and upland habitat conditions in the watersheds in this region are, collectively, rated the highest of any of the BPG regions by the CAP Workbook analyses. The CAP Workbooks rated overall habitat conditions for steelhead in the San Jose Creek watershed as “Fair”, “Good” in the Garrapata Creek, Big Sur River, and Salmon Creek watersheds, and “Very Good” in the Bixby Creek, Little Sur River, and Willow Creek watersheds. Land use activities that affect these conditions are most pronounced in watersheds that are mostly under private ownership: the San Jose Creek, Garrapata Creek, and Bixby Creek watersheds are degraded by groundwater and surface water diversions, elevated sedimentation from old logging roads, and road crossings, respectively. Big Sur River and Salmon Creek have natural barriers that block steelhead passage to the middle and upper portions of the watershed. Increased fire frequency in the Big Sur Creek and Salmon Creek watersheds was rated as a severe threat to steelhead because of potential sedimentation and other impacts to instream and riparian habitats. In general, however, the six watersheds south of the San Jose Creek watershed provide excellent spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead.

Threats and Sources of Threats. The number of threats affecting various watersheds in this region is very low compared to other BPG regions, ranging from three in the Bixby Creek watershed to eleven in the San Jose Creek watershed (Fig. 3). The low number of threats reflects low human population density and land use impacts in this region. Aside from the San Jose Creek watershed, the most pervasive threats to watersheds here come from roads as a source of sedimentation and natural barriers to steelhead passage in the form of landslides, waterfalls, and log jams, and fire. On-going restoration and revegetation of eroded slopes and disused logging roads and removal of log jams in the Garrapata Creek watershed will, in time, reduce or eliminate these threat sources and significantly improve habitat conditions for steelhead. Land use activities in the mostly privately-owned San Jose Creek watershed pose a number of problems for steelhead. Surface water diversions and groundwater extraction in the main stem of San Jose Creek produce severe to very severe impairments of instream habitat quality and quantity related to passage barriers (dry stream reaches), degraded water quality caused by sediment inputs and other non-point pollution arising from high road density, and depleted food resources for steelhead.



Fig. 3. Relative frequency of threat ratings in watersheds of the Big Sur Coast BPG, as determined by the CAP Workbook analyses. The sources, number, and severity of threats varies between watersheds, but in general, steelhead populations in most of the watersheds in this BPG region are subject to only a few, relatively minor threats.

The only significant threat to steelhead persistence in the Salmon Creek watershed is the large waterfall that forms the natural limit of anadromy only two miles above the mouth of the creek. The main stem of Salmon Creek between the ocean and the Highway 1 culvert provides excellent spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead (though the culvert is an impediment to upstream fish passage under low-flow conditions).

Ten anthropogenic activities ranked as the top five sources of stress to steelhead viability in the Big Sur Coast BPG, however, CAP Workbook Analysis of the Bixby Creek watershed produced only three threats (Table 2). The severity of these threats compared to similar threat levels in other BPGs in the South-Central Coast Steelhead ESU is generally low. These ten threat sources can be grouped into the following categories:

- passage barriers caused by culverts and road crossings and natural barriers, such as waterfalls, landslides, and log jams;
- passage barriers caused by excessive groundwater extraction and surface water diversions (San Jose Creek watershed only), and;
- sedimentation and non-point pollution caused by moderate road density, including active and abandoned logging roads.

Table 2. The top five sources of threats in the component watersheds of the Big Sur Coast BPG (see CAP Workbooks for individual watersheds for details). Only three medium-severity threat sources were identified for the relatively undeveloped Bixby Creek watershed.

Threat Sources	Component Watershed (north to south)						
	San Jose Creek	Garrapata Creek	Bixby Creek	Little Sur River	Big Sur River	Willow Creek	Salmon Creek
Other Passage Barriers	Yellow	Red	Light green	Dark green	Dark green	Dark green	Light green
Roads		Red	Light green	Dark green	Dark green	Light green	Light green
Non-Point Pollution	Red	Red	Light green	Dark green		Dark green	Dark green
Natural Barriers		Yellow		Dark green	Light green		Yellow
Groundwater Extraction	Red			Dark green		Dark green	
Recreational Facilities					Light green	Light green	
Wildfires					Dark green		Light green
Dams and Surface Water Diversions	Red						
Logging	Yellow						
Non-Native Species		Light green					

Key: Threat cell colors represent threat rating from CAP Workbook:
Red = Very High threat
Yellow = High threat
Light green = Medium threat
Dark green = Low threat

With the exception of the San Jose Creek watershed, the majority of these threats were rated as low severity in most of the watersheds. Overall, threats to most of these watersheds are relatively minor.

In the past 25 years, fires have burned 43% of the Big Sur River watershed, 56% of the Willow Creek watershed, and 97% of the Salmon Creek watershed. Fire has consumed no more than 12% of the Bixby Creek and Little Sur River watersheds, and the San Jose Creek and Garrapata Creek watersheds have not burned during this time. Fires do not appear to have severely impacted instream and riparian habitat conditions for steelhead in this BPG.

While none of the watersheds in the Big Sur Coast BPG are pristine, the Bixby Creek, Big Sur River, Willow Creek, and Salmon Creek watersheds are as close to natural steelhead streams as can be found in any of the four BPG regions in the South-Central Coast Steelhead ESU. Although threats to these streams are generally low, conditions can change because some of these watersheds are mostly under private ownership, are all traversed by Highway 1, and all support low to moderate intensity livestock ranching operations. Improving one or a few moderate threats that are negatively affecting steelhead habitat quality in the Bixby Creek, Big Sur River, Willow Creek, and Salmon

Creek watersheds, such as road crossings and erosion control, could reverse current conditions. Severe to very severe sedimentation impacts from existing and abandoned roads and fish passage impediments in the Garrapata Creek watershed are the focus of on-going restoration activities. The large waterfall that forms the upstream limit of anadromy on the lower reach of Salmon Creek is natural. Improving passage, spawning, and rearing habitat conditions for steelhead in the San Jose Creek watershed will require multiple, long-term, measures related to water management and upper watershed land use practices, including agricultural and residential development and related road development. Additionally, the estuary has been largely eliminated as a result of the construction of Highway 1.

The threat sources discussed in this section should be the focus of a variety of recovery actions to address specific stresses on steelhead viability associated with these threats. Spatial and temporal data acquired on specific indicators associated with sources of threats or stresses, such as water temperature, pH, nutrients, etc., are generally inadequate to be the target of specific recovery actions. This type of data acquisition should be the subject of site-specific investigations in order to refine the primary recovery actions or to target additional recovery actions (see Recovery Action Matrices for more specific recovery actions).

ATTACHMENT. SUMMARY TABLES FOR STRESSES AND THREATS, STRESS MATRIX, AND OVERALL VIABILITY SUMMARY FOR THE BIG SUR COAST BPG

Threats Assessment for the
San Luis Obispo Terrace Biogeographic Population Group

Location and Physical Characteristics. The San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG region extends about 75 miles to include the extreme SW corner of Monterey County and almost the entire length of coastal San Luis Obispo County. It consists of eleven small to moderate-size watersheds that drain the steep coastal slopes of the southern half of the Santa Lucia Range. The San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG is almost conterminous with the Big Sur Coast BPG and the upper watersheds resemble the latter physiographically but, because the spine of the Santa Lucia Range veers inland in this region, the lower portions of the watersheds in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG are relatively flat and cut across coastal terraces before entering the Pacific Ocean. From north to south, 12 watersheds are included in this BPG: San Carpoforo Creek, Arroyo de la Cruz, Little Pico Creek, Big Pico Creek, San Simeon Creek, Santa Rosa Creek, Morro Creek, Chorro Creek (Morro Bay), Los Osos Creek (Morro Bay), San Luis Obispo Creek, Pismo Creek, and Arroyo Grande Creek. (Fig. 1). The Morro Bay steelhead population region (Fig. 1) includes the separate watersheds of Morro Creek, which empties into the Pacific Ocean north of Morro Bay, and Chorro and Los Osos creeks, which, along with several smaller drainages, empty into Morro Bay, forming an extensive estuarine wetland (Fig. 1). Separate CAP Workbooks were prepared for Morro, Chorro, and Los Osos creeks.

Watersheds in the San Luis Obispo BPG vary in size by over an order of magnitude, from less than 5,300 acres in the Little Pico Creek watershed to almost 100,000 acres in the Arroyo Grande Creek watershed. Average annual precipitation shows some spatial variation across the component watersheds and total seasonal rainfall in this region is highly variable from year to year, depending on the intensity and duration of Pacific storms. In general, the higher elevations receive greater amounts of precipitation, and persistent spring and summer coastal fog is characteristic of this region. All of the watercourses in this BPG are perennial (though some reaches may be seasonally reduced to isolated pools, particularly during low rainfall years).

Table 1. Physical and Land Use Characteristics of Watersheds in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG.

Physical Characteristics				Land Use				
Watershed (North to South)	Area (acres/miles^2)[1]	Stream Length[2] (miles)	Average Annual Rainfall[3] (in.)	Human Population[4]	Public Ownership**	Urban Area[5]	Agriculture/ Barren[5]	Open Space[5]
San Carpoforo Creek	29,316/46	64	19.7	38	30%	0.1%	0.1%	> 99%
Arroyo de la Cruz	27,774/43	65	19.4	5	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	> 99%
Little Pico Creek	5,229/8	13	18.1	0	0%	0%	0.2%	> 99%
Big Pico Creek	9,687/15	29	18.1	367	0.3%	1%	< 0.1%	99%
San Simeon Creek	22,247/35	57	17.8	681	0.1%	1%	1%	98%
Santa Rosa Creek	31,484/49	81	17.2	4,403	1%	5%	3%	92%
Morro Bay (*)	65,993/103	127	18.8	33,389	17%	10%	6%	84%
San Luis	55,554/87	98	18.9	52,731	2%	16%	6%	78%

Obispo Creek								
Pismo Creek	25,355/40	49	18.4	6,385	0.1%	6%	9%	85%
Arroyo Grande Creek	97,873/153	175	18.0	45,378	20%	7%	9%	84%
Total/Average	**370,512/579**	**758**	**18.4**	**143,377**	**7%**	**5%**	**3%**	**92%**

Sources: 1. CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999
14. CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003
15. USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1 km grid cells)
16. CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003
17. CDFFP Multi-source land cover data (v02_2), 2002 (100 m grid cells)
* "Morro Bay" include statistics for the Morro Creek, Chorro Creek, and the Los Osos Creek watersheds, combined (see Fig. 1).
** National Forest and BLM lands, Wilderness Areas, Military Reservations, State and County Parks.

Land Use. Despite a relatively low total human population density, the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG has over 2.5 times the population density of any BPG in the South-Central Steelhead DPS, averaging about 248 persons per square mile of watershed. Population density increases dramatically south of the San Simeon Creek watershed such that over 99% of the total population in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG is concentrated in the seven southern watersheds: Santa Rosa Creek, Morro Creek, Chorro Creek (Morro Bay), Los Osos Creek (Morro Bay), San Luis Obispo Creek, Pismo Creek, and Arroyo Grande Creek. The San Carpoforo Creek, Arroyo de la Cruz, Little Pico Creek, Big Pico Creek, and San Simeon Creek watersheds are practically undeveloped (though there are ranching and agricultural activities in the Big Pico Creek watershed), or have very low population densities and, in this respect, they most resemble the central and southern Big Sur Coast BPG watersheds. The Los Padres National Forest encompasses a federally designated wilderness area: the Santa Lucia Wilderness Area within the San Luis Obispo Creek and Arroyo Grande Creek watersheds (Table 1).

The strong increasing gradient in population density towards the southern portions of this BPG is reflected in land use changes, such as increasing agricultural conversion of watershed lands and urbanized areas, including small cities, such as Morro Bay, San Luis Obispo, Grover Beach, Pismo Beach, Shell Beach, and Arroyo Grande, increasing private ownership of land, and correspondingly lower amounts of open space (Table 1). The coastal terraces of the southern watersheds receive high recreational and urban use. There are four major reservoirs in this region: a privately-owned dam on a tributary of San Luis Obispo Creek, Lopez Dam on the main stem and Terminal Dam on a tributary of Arroyo Grande Creek, and Chorro Dam on Chorro Creek. The reservoirs created by these structures are used as municipal water supplies, agricultural irrigation, and recreation.



Figure 1. The San Luis Obispo Terrace Biogeographic Population Group region. Twelve steelhead populations/watersheds were analyzed in this region, including three in the Morro Bay watershed.

Current Watershed Conditions. The relative ratings of current habitat and land use conditions used to assess the suitability of watersheds to support steelhead in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG are presented in Figure 2. The number of indicators varied widely between watersheds from 16 for the Pismo Creek watershed to 45 indicators for the Arroyo de la Cruz watershed.

There is a dramatic shift in the steelhead habitat quality in watersheds south of the Pico Creek watershed, reflecting increasing land use changes associated with higher human population densities. Although mostly or entirely privately owned, the northernmost watersheds in this BPG, the San Carpoforo, Arroyo de la Cruz, Little Pico, and Pico creeks, are relatively pristine and resemble the southernmost of the Big Sur Coast watersheds (Little Sur, Big Sur, Willow, and Salmon creeks) in this respect. The CAP Workbook analyses rated overall habitat conditions for steelhead as “Very Good” or “Good” in the four northernmost watersheds, and “Fair” in the seven watersheds in the central and southern portions of this BPG.

Threats and Sources of Threats. Various numbers of threats were used in the CAP Workbooks to determine threat status in individual watersheds in this region, ranging from 7 in the Pico Creek watershed to 16 in the San Carpoforo Creek, San Luis Obispo Creek, and Arroyo Grande Creek watersheds (Fig. 3). However, all or most of the “threats” identified in the four northern watersheds (San Carpoforo, Arroyo de la Cruz, Little Pico, and Pico) are rated as low severity. In fact, near-natural conditions identified here reflect the prevailing very low-intensity land use in these watersheds. Pico Creek has a single threat rated as “high”: extensive reaches of the main stem and North Fork frequently go dry in summer and pose fish passage impediments to juveniles and smolt. This condition is natural, but can be exacerbated by groundwater extraction and surface water diversions.

Although the San Simeon Creek watershed has a relatively low human population density (about 19 persons/square mile) and less than 1.4% of the watershed has been converted to row crop agriculture, most of the agricultural conversion has occurred within the narrow floodplain of San Simeon Creek, thereby exacerbating land use impacts. The stream and riparian corridor are subject to a number of severe to very severe threats related to land use: groundwater extraction, severe stream incision caused by confinement of the active channel due to floodplain encroachment from agriculture, ranch houses, and the main road through the watershed. Wastewater treatment facilities near the San Simeon Creek estuary and a proposed desalination plant have the potential to adversely affect the lower stream reaches and estuary through direct or indirect effluent discharges. Development of recreational facilities (San Simeon State Park) at the mouth of the creek and the placement of the Highway 1 bridge abutments has eliminated 50% of the estuary.



Figure 2. Relative frequency of indicator ratings for watersheds in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG. Indicators are rated as "Very Good", "Good", etc., based on the current condition of landscape, habitat, or population variables. Although the amount of available information (the number of indicators) varies between watersheds, the relative ranking of indicators provides a general picture of existing habitat and land use conditions across the BPG (see individual CAP Workbooks for details).



Figure 3. Relative frequency of threat ratings to steelhead habitat in watersheds in the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG, as determined by CAP Workbook analyses. The sources, number, and severity of threats vary between watersheds and there is a dramatic increase in overall severity of threats to steelhead in watersheds south of the Pico Creek watershed.

Fourteen anthropogenic activities ranked as the top five sources of threats to steelhead viability in this BPG (Table 2). These sources are not mutually exclusive and can be grouped into a few general threat categories related to the land use. Although open space is by far the dominant land use within all of the watersheds in this BPG region, with less than 10% of any watershed converted to agricultural production, watersheds south of the San Simeon Creek watershed share a common pattern of urban and agricultural development that largely determines the pervasive lower quality of steelhead habitat in their drainages. These watersheds are primarily under private ownership, with land use activities concentrated along the narrow, coastal terrace floodplains, which magnify impacts to instream and riparian habitats. Recurring sources of threats to instream and riparian habitats here include: agricultural conversion of floodplain lands, increased density of roads and placement of roads in or near the riparian corridor, and the development of towns and cities on the floodplains, frequently at or near the estuaries of these watersheds. Increased sedimentation and substrate embeddedness, excessive groundwater extraction, culverts and road crossings as passage barriers, recreational facilities, non-point pollution from runoff from roads as well as nutrient and coliform bacteria loading from agricultural and wastewater treatment effluents, and channelization are important sources of threats to steelhead.

Dams and surface water diversions on Morro Creek, Chorro Creek, San Luis Obispo Creek, Pismo Creek, and Arroyo Grande Creek serve agricultural, urban, and recreational purposes and have significantly altered natural sediment and hydrological processes in these watersheds. Dams also have isolated native rainbow trout in the upper watersheds of these drainages that otherwise would be anadromous. The reservoirs behind these dams create suitable habitat conditions for several species of non-native fishes and bullfrogs that may affect one or more life history stages of steelhead directly (predation) or indirectly (competition for food). Non-native crayfish, fishes, and bullfrogs are particular problems in these watersheds.

The Pico Creek, San Simeon Creek, Santa Rosa Creek, Morro Creek, San Luis Obispo Creek, Pismo Creek, and Arroyo Grande Creek estuaries have lost between 50% and 80% of their former size as a result of development of recreational facilities (State and County parks), Highway 1 bridge construction, and/or agricultural or urban development.

Fires are a minor source of disturbance in the northern watersheds of this BPG where less than 4% of watershed lands have burned in the past 25 years, but between 18% and 44% of the Morro Creek, Chorro Creek, Los Osos Creek, San Luis Obispo Creek, Pismo Creek, and Arroyo Grande Creek watersheds have burned in this same time. Sedimentation and increased substrate embeddedness as a result of elevated slope erosion stemming from overgrazing and agricultural developments are significant habitat stressors in these watersheds. Increased road density and human population density in these fire-prone watersheds has increased fire frequency.

Table 2. The top five sources of threats in component watersheds of the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG. Threat sources are ranked in order of frequency of occurrence and severity (see CAP Workbook for details).

Threat Sources	**Component Watersheds (north to south)**											
	San Carpoforo Creek (*)	Arroyo de la Cruz (*)	Little Pico Creek (*)	Pico Creek	San Simeon Creek	Santa Rosa Creek	Morro Creek	Chorro Creek	Los Osos Creek	SLO Creek	Pismo Creek	Arroyo Grande Creek
Agricultural Development			Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Groundwater Extraction	Green	Green	Green		Red	Red	Red	Red	Red		Red	Red
Dams and Surface Water Diversions						Red	Red	Red		Red	Red	Red
Levees and Channelization					Red	Red				Red		Red
Other Passage Barriers	Green	Green	Green	Green			Yellow					
Urban Development				Green		Red	Yellow				Red	
Roads	Green	Green			Red				Yellow			Red
Recreational Facilities		Green			Red						Red	
Channel and/or Estuary Maintenance	Green									Red		
Non-Point Pollution	Green								Yellow	Red		
Natural Barriers			Green	Yellow								
Urban Effluents								Red				
Agricultural Effluents								Red	Yellow			
Livestock Farming and Ranching		Green	Green	Green								

Key: Threat cell colors represent threat rating from CAP Workbook:
Red = Very High threat Light green = Medium threat
Yellow = High threat Dark green = Low threat

The watersheds in this BPG are not pristine, but the San Carpoforo Creek, Arroyo de la Cruz, Little Pico Creek, and Pico Creek watersheds are as close to unaltered steelhead streams as can be found in any of the four BPG regions within the South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU. Although threats to these streams are currently low, conditions can change because they are largely under private ownership, are all traversed by Highway 1, and support low to moderate intensity livestock ranching operations. Improving conditions for steelhead passage, spawning, and/or rearing in the watersheds south of these watersheds will require multiple, long-term, measures related to water management, recreation, agriculture, and fish passage past large dams.

The threat sources discussed in this section should be the focus of a variety of recovery actions to address specific stresses on steelhead viability associated with these threats. Spatial and temporal data acquired on specific indicators associated with sources of threats or stresses, such as water temperature, pH, nutrients, etc., are generally inadequate to be the target of specific recovery actions. This type of data acquisition should be the subject of site-specific investigations in order to refine the primary recovery actions or to target additional recovery actions. As a result of the substantial increase in human population density and related development pressures in the southern portion of the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG, recovery actions should be focused in the drainages south of the community of San Simeon. Recovery actions in these watersheds should concentrate on reducing the severity of anthropogenic impacts from water diversions and groundwater extractions, which adversely affect steelhead rearing habitat; minimize erosion and sedimentation caused by upslope developments (including roads, overgrazing, and agricultural development); remove impediments to fish passage along the main stems of affected drainages in order to facilitate connectivity between the ocean and estuaries and the upstream steelhead spawning and rearing habitats; and restore channel morphology and riparian habitats affected by floodplain encroachment and related flood control activities. Additionally, degraded estuarine conditions stemming from filling, artificial sandbar manipulation, and both point and non-point waste discharges should be further evaluated and addresses as part of any recovery strategy for the San Luis Obispo Terrace BPG (see Recovery Action Matrices for more specific recovery actions).

ATTACHMENT. SUMMARY TABLES FOR STRESSES AND THREATS, STRESS MATRIX, AND OVERALL VIABILITY SUMMARY FOR THE SAN LUIS OBISPO TERRACE BPG

Bibliography for Threats Assessment and Recovery Action Analyses for the South-Central California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area

Ainsworth, J. and T. Doss. 1995. Natural history of fire and flood cycles. Prep. for the Calif. Coastal Commission. http://www.coastal.ca.gov/fire/ucsbfire.html.

Alderdice, D., W. Wickett, and J. Brett. 1958. Some effects of temporary exposure to low dissolved oxygen levels on Pacific salmon eggs. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada, 15: 229-250.

Allen, M. 1986. Population dynamics of juvenile steelhead trout in relation to density and habitat characteristics. MS Thesis, Humboldt State Univ., Arcata, CA.

Alley, D.W. & Associates. 1997. Monitoring results for San Simeon and Santa Rosa creeks in 1995 and 1996: Water quality conditions in lagoons, streamflow measurements, fish sampling in lagoons, and steelhead censusing in the upper watersheds, San Luis Obispo County, California. Prep. for Cambria Community Serv. District, Cambria, CA.

Alley, D.W. & Associates. 2001. Monitoring results for lower San Simeon and Santa Rosa creeks in 1997-1999: Water quality in lagoons, lagoon in-flow, and fishery resources in lagoons immediately upstream and in Van Gordon Creek.

Alley, D.W. & Associates. 2004. Monitoring results for lower San Simeon and Santa Rosa creeks in 2002-2003: Water quality in lagoons, lagoon in-flow and fishery resources in lagoons immediately upstream, San Luis Obispo County, California. Prep. for Cambria Community Serv. District, Cambria, CA.

Alley, D.W. & Associates. 2006a. Monitoring results for lower San Simeon and Santa Rosa creeks, 2004-2005: Lagoon water quality, fishery resources and inflow near Cambria, San Luis Obispo County, California. Prep. for Cambria Community Serv. District, Cambria, CA. 214 pp, plus maps.

Alley, D.W. & Associates. 2006b. Trends in juvenile steelhead production in 1994-2005 for Santa Rosa Creek, San Luis Obispo County, California, with habitat analysis and an index of adult returns. Prep. for the Cambria Community Serv. District, Cambria, CA.144 pp, plus appendices.

Ambrosius, J. 2008a. NOAA-NMFS biologist, electronic communication to Mark Capelli (NOAA-NMFS) regarding steelhead barriers on San Jose Creek, Monterey County. 27 May.

Ambrosius, J. 2008b. NOAA-NMFS biologist, electronic communication to Mark Capelli (NOAA-NMFS) regarding groundwater extraction impacts to steelhead on San Jose Creek, Monterey County. 13 May.

Anderson, H., M. Hoover, and K. Reinhart. 1976. Forests and water: Effects of forest management on floods, sedimentation, and water supply. U.S. Dept. Agriculture Forest Serv., Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experim. Sta. Genl. Tech. Report PSW-GTR-18. Berkeley, CA. 115 pp.

Armentrout, S. et al. 1998. Watershed analysis for Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks. USDA-Forest Service, Lassen Natl. Forest, Almanor Ranger District, Chester, CA. 299 pp.

Aspen Institute. 2002. Dam removal: A new option for a new century. Aspen Institute Program on Energy, the Environment, and the Economy. Aspen, CO.

Bailey, R. 1973. An estimate of the standing crop of steelhead trout (*Salmo gairdneri* Richardson), Santa Rosa Creek, San Luis Obispo County, California.. Unpub. Masters Thesis, Nat. Resources Mgmt. Dept., Calif. Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA.

Baltz, D. and P. Moyle. 1984. Segregation by species and size classes of rainbow trout, *Salmo gairdneri*, and Sacramento sucker, *Catostomus occidentalis*, in three California streams. Envir. Biol. Fish. 10: 101-110.

Barbour, M., J. Gerritsen, B. Snyder, and J. Stribling. 1999. Rapid bioassessment protocols for use in streams and wadeable rivers: periphyton, benthic macroinvertebrates and fish. 2nd ed., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C., EPA 841-B-99-002.

Barclay, L.A. 1975. Fishery survey of six coastal streams and the Salinas River drainage, San Luis Obispo County. Dept. Biol. Sci., CA Polytech. State Univ., San Luis Obispo, CA. Prep. for the CA Dept. of Fish and Game, 31 pp, plus appendix.

Barnhart, R. 1986. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) - Steelhead. U.S. Fish and Wildl. Service Biol. Rept. No. 82. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Tech. Rept. EL-82-421.

Bates, K., B. Barnard, B. Heiner, P. Klavas, and P. Powers. 1999. Fish passage design at road culverts: A design manual for fish passage at road crossings. Wash. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA. 44 pp.

Berg, N., A. Carlson, and D. Azuma. 1998. Function and dynamics of woody debris in stream reaches in the central Sierra Nevada, California. Canad. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci., 55: 1807-1820.

Biskner, A. and T. Gallagher. 1995. An overview of the upper Salinas River Coordinated Resource Management and Planning Process: Accomplishments and resource summary, 1992-1995. San Luis Obispo County Parks and Open Space, San Luis Obispo, CA.

Blakley, E. and K. Barnette. 1985. Historical overview of Los Padres National Forest. USDA Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest Headquarters, Goleta, CA.

Boughton, D. and H. Fish. 2003. New data on steelhead distribution in southern and south-central California. National Marine Fisheries Service, SW Fisheries Science Center, Fisheries Ecology Div., Santa Cruz, CA.

Boughton, D., et al. 2005. Contraction of the southern range limit for anadromous *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. Unpub. report., US Dept. Commerce, Natl. Oceanic Atmosph. Admin., SW Fisheries Science Center, Fisheries Ecol. Div., Santa Cruz, CA.

Boughton, D. and M. Goslin. 2006. Potential steelhead over-summering habiat in the South-central/Southern California Coast Recovery Domain: Maps based on the envelope method. NOAA-Natl. Marine Fish. Service, SW Fish. Sci. Ctr. Tech. Memo No. 391, Santa Cruz, CA. 36 pp.

Boughton, D., P. Adams, E. Anderson, C. Fusaro, E. Keller, E. Kelley, L. Lentsch, J. Neilsen, K. Perry, H. Regan, J. Smith, C. Swift, L. Thompson, and F. Watson. 2006. Steelhead of the South-Central/Southern California Coast: Population characterization for recovery planning. NOAA-Natl. Marine Fisheries Service, SW Fisheries Sci. Ctr. Tech. Memo. No. 394, Santa Cruz, CA. 116 pp.

Boughton, D., M. Gibson, R. Yedor, and E. Kelly. 2007. Stream temperature and the potential growth and survival of juvenile *Oncorhynchus mykiss* in a southern California creek. Freshw. Biol. 52: 1353-1364.

Boughton, D., P. Adams, E. Anderson, C. Fusaro, E. Keller, E. Kelley, L. Lentsch, J. Neilsen, K. Perry, H. Regan, J. Smith, C. Swift, L. Thompson, and F. Watson. 2007. Draft viability criteria for steelhead populations and ESUs of the southern and south-central California coast. NOAA-Natl. Marine Fisheries Service, SW Fisheries Sci. Ctr. Tech. Memo. No. 14, Santa Cruz, CA. 27 pp., plus appendices.

Brown, L.R. and A.M. Brasher. 1995. Effect of predation by Sacramento squawfish (*Ptychocheilus grandis*) on habitat choice of California roach (*Lavinia symmetricus*) and rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in artificial streams. Canad. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci., 52: 1639-1646.

Brown, L.R. and P.B. Moyle. 1991. Changes in habitat and microhabitat partitioning within an assemblage of stream fishes in response to predation by Sacramento squawfish (*Ptychocheilus grandis*). Canad. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci., 48: 848-856.

Bryant, G. and S. Flanagan. 2007. Establishing references for aquatic indicators and upland threats and sources by drawing from collaborating agencies and the scientific literature, for use in NMFS' SONCC Coho ESU and CAP Database. NOAA Fisheries, Arcata Field Office. Arcata, CA. 26 pp.

Burgy, R. 1968. Hydrologic studies and watershed management on brushlands. Ann. Rept. No. 8, 1966-1967. Dept. Water Science and Engineering, Univ. Calif. Davis, Davis, CA. 50 pp.

California Conservation Corps. 2005. San Luis Obispo County stream crossing inventory and fish passage evaluation. Prep. for Greenspace the Cambria Land Trust, Cambria, CA. 50 pp, plus appendix. March.

California Department of Fish and Game. (n.d.). California salmonid stream habitat restoration manual. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Fish and Game. 1960. Santa Rosa Creek stream survey, San Luis Obispo County, California. January 18. Report by Max R. Schreiber.

California Department of Fish and Game. 1970. Memo regarding Santa Rosa Creek lagoon, San Luis Obispo County, California. L. Puckett.

California Department of Fish and Game. 1994. Summary of steelhead population and habitat sampling, Santa Rosa Creek, San Luis Obispo County, California: 1993. Report by J. Nelson.

California State University Monterey Bay Class (ESSP 660). 2007. Carmel River Lagoon water quality and steelhead soundings: Fall 2007. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2007-04. 24 pp.

Carmel River Watershed Conservancy, Inc. 2004. Watershed assessment and action plan of the Carmel River Watershed, California. Prep. for the Calif. State Water Resources Control Board, Monterey, CA. 40 pp, 31 March.

Casagrande, J. 2001. How does land use effect sediment loads on Gabilan Creek? Senior Thesis, Dept. Earth Systems Science and Policy, CA State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. 49 pp., plus appendices.

Casagrande, J. 2006. Wetland habitat types of the Carmel River Lagoon. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2006-05. 19 pp.

Casagrande, J., F. Watson, T. Anderson, and W. Newman. 2002. Hydrology and water quality of the Carmel and Salinas lagoons, Monterey Bay, California: 2001/2002.

The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2002-04.

Casagrande, J. and F. Watson. 2003. Hydrology and water quality of the Carmel and Salinas lagoons, Monterey Bay, California: 2002/2003. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2003-14.

Casagrande, J., J. Hager, F. Watson, M. Angelo. 2003. Fish species distribution and habitat quality for selected streams of the Salinas Watershed: Summer/Fall 2002. The Watershed Institute, CA State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Report No. WI-2003-02. 28 May.

Casagrande, J. and F. Watson. 2005a. Reclamation Ditch watershed assessment and management plan: Part A - Watershed assessment. Rept. to Board of Directors, Monterey Co. Water Res. Agency. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-01A - Draft. 311 pp.

Casagrande, J. and F. Watson. 2005b. Reclamation Ditch watershed assessment and management plan: Part B - Management plan. Rept. to Board of Directors, Monterey Co. Water Res. Agency. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-01B - Draft. 78 pp.

Casagrande, J. and D. Smith. 2005. Garrapata Creek watershed steelhead barrier assessment. Prep. for Calif. Dept. Fish and Game and Garrapata Creek Watershed Council. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-02. 76 pp.

Casagrande, J. and D. Smith. 2006. Garrapata Creek lagoon, Central Coast, California: A preliminary assessment, 2005-2006. Prep. for Calif. Dept. Fish and Game and Garrapata Creek Watershed Council. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2006-01. 62 pp.

Central Coast Salmon Enhancement. 2005. Arroyo Grande Creek watershed management plan. Prep. for Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA. March. 107 pp, plus appendices.

Central Coast Salmon Enhancement, Inc. 2008. Nacimiento River and San Antonio River watersheds management plan: Watershed resources analysis summary report. Prep. for the Monterey County Water Res. Agency, Monterey, CA.

Chappell, P., J. Lidberg, and M. Johnson. 1976. Report to the State Water Resource Control Board summarizing the position of the California Department of Fish and Game on Water Application 24120. Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Region 3.

Cleveland, P. 1995. San Luis Obispo Creek steelhead trout habitat inventory and investigation. Prep. for Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County and the

Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region. 22 pp, plus appendices.

Close, B. and S. Smith. 2004. Stream inventory report: Arroyo Grande Creek, Summer 2004. Prep. for Central Coast Salmon Enhancement, Arroyo Grande, CA. 37 pp., plus appendices.

Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District. 2001a. Morro Bay Watershed steelhead restoration planning project: Existing data summary. Prep. for Tech. Advisory Comm., SLRCD, Morro Bay, CA. 17 pp, plus maps and appendices.

Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District. 2001b. Morro Bay Watershed steelhead restoration planning project: Stream inventory report: Chorro Creek, 2001. Morro Bay, CA. 13 pp, plus appendices.

Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District. 2001c. Morro Bay Watershed steelhead restoration planning project: Stream inventory report: Chorro Creek, 2001. Morro Bay, CA. 13 pp, plus appendices. (http://www.coastalrcd.org/MBSteelheadPlan.html)

Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District. 2002. Chorro Flats enhancement project: Final report to the Calif. State Coastal Conservancy, Oakland, CA. http://www.coastalrcd.org.

Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District. 2003. Morro Bay Watershed steelhead restoration planning project: Morro Bay watershed stream crossing inventory and fish passage evaluation, 2003. Morro Bay, CA. 13 pp, plus appendices. http://www.coastalrcd.org/MBSteelheadPlan.html.

Cordone, A. and D. Kelley. 1961. The influence of inorganic sediment on the aquatic life of streams. Calif. Dept Fish and Game, 47(2): 189-228.

Cooper, S., T. Dudley, and N. Hemphill. undated. The biology of chaparral streams in southern California, pp. 139-151, In: J. Devries (ed.). Proceedings of the chaparral ecosystems research conference, California Water Res. Center Rept. No. 62.

Cross, P. 1975. Early life history of steelhead trout in a small coastal stream. M.S. Thesis, Humboldt State Univ., Arcata, CA.

DeBano, L. 1991. The effect of fire on soil properties, In: Proceedings, management, and productivity of western-montane forest soils. Genl. Tech. Rept. INT-280. USDA Forest Service Intermountain Res. Station, Fort Collins, CO.

Dettman, D. 1973. Distribution, abundance, and microhabitat segregation of rainbow trout and Sacramento squawfish in Deer Creek, California. M.S. Thesis, Univ. Calif., Davis, CA.

Dowd, B., M. Los Huertos, and D. Press. 2008 (in press). Policy tools, monitoring, and funding to reduce nutrient pollutants: A case study of nitrate in the Pajaro River, California. Subm. to Agriculture, Ecosystems, and Environment.

Dvorsky, J. 2002. Steelhead restoration planning project for the Morro Bay watershed. Prep. for Swanson Hydrology and Geomorphology, Santa Cruz, CA. 34 pp.

Elliott, H. 1995. Relation of pool depth and groundwater elevation of Santa Rosa Creek in Santa Rosa Natural Preserve, San Simeon State Park, San Luis Obispo County: 1992-1994. Prep. for the Calif. Dept. Parks and Recreation, San Simeon Distr., San Simeon, CA.

Entrix, Inc. 2003. An assessment of steelhead access and rearing habitat conditions in upper San Jose Creek, Potrero Creek, Robinson Canyon Creek, and upper San Clemente Creek on the Santa Lucia Preserve, Monterey County, California, Late Fall 2002.

FishXing. 1999. FishXing software: Version 3.0. USDA Forest Service, Six Rivers Natl. Forest, Eureka, CA. www.stream.fs.fed.us/fishxing.

Flosi, G., S. Downie, J. Hopelian, M. Bird, R. Coey, and B. Collins. 1998. California salmonid stream restoration manual, 3rd ed.. State of Calif., The Resources Agency, Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Div., Rancho Cordova, CA. Amended 2005.

Ford, A. 2004. Upland groundwater pumping and stream flow, San Jose Creek, Monterey County. Abstract of paper delivered at the 1st Annual Calif. Water Symposium, Univ. California-Berkeley, Berkeley, CA. 24 April.

Franklin, H. 1999. Steelhead and salmon migrations in the Salinas River. Unpub. report cited in: Casagrande, J., J. Hager, F. Watson, M. Angelo. 2003. Fish species distribution and habitat quality for selected streams of the Salinas Watershed: Summer/Fall 2002. The Watershed Institute, CA State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Report No. WI-2003-02. 28 May. 67 pp.

Fukushima, T. and P. Lesh. 1998. Adult and juvenile anadromous salmonid migration timing in California streams. Calif. Fish and Game 84: 133-145.

Funk, D.. and A. Morales. 2002. A study of the Upper Salinas River and tributaries: Watershed fisheries report and early actions. Prep. for the Upper Salinas-Los Tablas Resource Conservation District, Paso Robles, CA.

Funk, D., A. Morales, M. Johnson, E. Perryess, M. Seyedan, and R. Pineda. 2004. Upper Salinas River Watershed action plan (Rio Santa Delfina): Final report to State

Water Resources Control Board. Prep. by Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Resource Conservation District, Templeton, CA. 30 June.

Gaffney, T. 2004. Letter to Mr. M. Streatars, Chief, Compliance and Enforcement Unit, State Water Resources Control Board, Sacramento, CA, regarding complaints against E. Righetti and Sons, Inc. for violations of water permits on West Corral de Piedra Creek, San Luis Obispo County, CA. 18 pp.

Gamradt, S. and L. Kats. 1996. Effect of introduced crayfish and mosquitofish on California newts. Conserv. Biol., 10(1): 1155-1162.

Gamradt, S., L. Kats, and C. Anzalone. 1997. Aggression by non-native crayfish deters breeding in California newts. Conserv. Biol., 11(3): 793-199.

Garrapata Creek Watershed Council. 2006. Garrapata Creek watershed assessment and restoration plan. Prep. for Garrapata Creek Watershed Council and the Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game. 77 pp, plus appendices.

Hagar, J. 1996. Salinas River steelhead status and migration flow requirements. Prep. for the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Monterey, CA. 41 pp.

Garcia and Associates. 2006. Biological assessment: San Simeon Creek Road bridges replacement project. Prep. for San Luis Obispo County, Dept. of Public Works, San Luis Obispo, CA. May. 74 pp, plus appendices.

Garrapata Creek Watershed Council. 2006. Garrapata Creek watershed assessment and restoration plan. Prep. for GCWC and Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game. 77 pp, plus appendices.

Girman, D. and J. Garza. 2006. Population structure and ancestry of *O. mykiss* populations in South-Central California based on genetic analysis of microsatellite data. Final report for Calif. Dept. Fish and Game Proj. No. P0350021 and Pacific States Marine Fish. Contr. No. AWIP-S-1. 29 pp., plus appendices. September.

Goodridge, J. 1997. Historic rainstorms in California. Dept. Water Res., Sacramento, CA. August. 118 pp. http://water.usgs.gov/data.html.

Grant, G. 2005. The geomorphic response of rivers to dam removal. Pacific Northwest Science Findings, 71(3): 1-5.

Habitat Restoration Group, Philip Williams and Associates, and Wetlands Research Associates. 1992. Salinas River Lagoon management and enhancement plan. Prep. for the Salinas River Lagoon Task Force, Salinas, CA.

Hagar, J. 1995. Report on steelhead spawning in the Salinas River tributaries during the 1994-95 season and implications for basin management. Prep. for the Monterey Co. Water Resources Agency, Monterey, CA. 10 pp.

Hagar, J. 1996. Salinas River steelhead status and migration flow requirements. Prep. for the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Monterey, CA. 41 pp.

Hager, J. and F. Watson. 2003. Watsonville Sloughs pathogen and sediment TMDL: Quality assurance project plan and field sampling plan. Rept. to the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2002-13. 122 pp.

Hager, J. and F. Watson. 2005. Watsonville sloughs sediment problems and sources. Rept. to Central Coast Regjional Water Quality Control Board. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-04. 206 pp.

Hager, J. et al. 2003. Salinas River fish habitat and population map. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2003-01.

Hager, J., F. Watson, and B. Olson. 2004. Watsonville Sloughs pathogen problems and sources. Rept. to the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2004-06. 116 pp.

Hager, J., J. Casagrande, W. Newman, and F. Watson. 2003. Map of aquatic life and habitat in the Arroyo Seco watershed, Version 3.0. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2003-09.

Harris, K., K. Brown, S. Earnshaw, E. Hanson, B. Largay, L. Harris, K., J. Larson, and F. Watson. 2005. Agricultural best management practices and treatment wetlands in the Gabilan watershed: Monitoring plan. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-11. 39 pp.

Harris, K., J. Larson, and F. Watson. 2006. Agricultural best management practices and treatment wetlands in the Gabilan watershed: Quality assurance project plan. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2006-03. 113 pp.

Harris, K., K. Brown, S. Earnshaw, E. Hanson, B. Largay, L. Lienk, F. Watson, R. Williams, and A. Wiskind. 2006. Agricultural best management practices and treatment wetlands in the Gabilan watershed: Project assessment and evaluation plan. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2006-04. 33 pp.

Harvey & Stanley Associates, Inc. 1983. Pajaro River Habitat Management Study: Detailed field study report. Prep. for Assoc. Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Monterey, CA. January.

Howard, A.D. 1979. Geologic history of Middle California. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, CA. 113 pp.

Hallock, B. et al. 1994. Nutrient objectives and best management practices for San Luis Obispo Creek. Coastal Resources Institute, Calif. Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA.

Hankin, D. and G. Reeves. 1988. Estimating total fish abundance and total habitat area in small streams based on visual estimation methods. Canadian J. Fish. and Aq. Sci., 45:834-844.

Harrelson, C., C. Rawlins, and J. Potyondy. 1994. Stream channel reference sites: An illustrated guide to field techniques. Genl. Rept. RM-245, USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, CO.

Hart, D., T. Johnson, K. Bushaw-Newton, R. Horwitz, A. Bednarek, D. Charles, D. Kreeger, and D. Velinsky. 2002. Dam removal: Challenges and opportunities for ecological research and river restoration. Bioscience 52(8): 669-681.

Heise, G. 2002. Culvert criteria for fish passage. Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA. 15 pp.

Huber, A. 2001a. Stream inventory report for Chorro Creek: Morro Bay watershed steelhead restoration planning process. Prep. for the Coastal San Luis Resource Conserv. Dist., San Luis Obispo, CA.

Huber, A. 2001b. Stream inventory report for Dairy Creek: Morro Bay watershed steelhead restoration planning process. Prep. for the Coastal San Luis Resource Conserv. Dist., San Luis Obispo, CA.

Huber, A. 2001c. Stream inventory report for Pennington Creek: Morro Bay watershed steelhead restoration planning process. Prep. for the Coastal San Luis Resource Conserv. Dist., San Luis Obispo, CA.

Hunt, L.E. 1992. Biological resources (vertebrates) technical report for the Salinas Reservoir Expansion Project, San Luis Obispo County, California. Prep. for Woodward-Clyde Consultants and the City of San Luis Obispo Planning Dept., Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo, CA. 85 pp.

Jones and Stokes Associates. 1993. Phase I project description and background hydrology report for the Hearst Corporation water rights applications 27126 and 27212. Prep. for Hearst Corporation, San Simeon, CA. 16 pp.

Jones and Stokes. 1997. Steelhead trout habitat assessment on San Luis Obispo Creek, San Luis Obispo County, California. Prep. for the Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County, San Luis Obispo, CA.

Keller, E. and F. Swanson. 1979. Effects of large organic material on channel form and fluvial processes. Earth Surfaces and Processes, 4: 361-380.

Kelley, D.W. & Associates, Inc. 1983. The effect of water development on the Carmel River steelhead resource.

Kier Associates and Natl. Marine Fisheries Service. 2008. Guide to the reference values used in the South-Central/Southern California Coastal Steelhead Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Workbooks. Arcata, Santa Barbara, and Long Beach, CA. 41 pp, plus appendices.

Knable, A. 1978. Characteristics of steelhead rainbow trout streams, San Luis Obispo County, California, 1978. Masters Thesis, Nat. Resources Mgmt. Dept., Calif. Polytechnic Univ., San Luis Obispo, CA. 55 pp.

Koslowski, D., F. Watson, M. Angelo, and J. Larson. 2004a. Monitoring chlorpyrifos and diazinon in impaired waters of the lower Salinas Region. Rept. to Calif. Dept. Pesticide Regulation. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2004-03. 170 pp.

Kozlowski, D., F. Watson, M. Angelo, and S. Gilmore. 2004b. Legacy pesticide sampling in impaired surface waters of the lower Salinas Region. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2004-04. 46 pp.

Larson, J. and F. Watson. 2005. Storm water quality in the Pacheco, Uvas, and Watsonville watersheds: 2003-2004. Rept. to the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-05. 91 pp.

Larson, J., F. Watson, J. Masek, and M. Watts. 2005. Carmel River Lagoon enhancement project: Water quality and aquatic wildlife monitoring: 2004-2005. Rept. to Calif. Dept. Parks and Recreation. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-12. 130 pp.

Larson, J., F. Watson, J. Casagrande, and B. Pierce. 2006. Carmel River Lagoon enhancement project: Water quality and aquatic wildlife monitoring, 2005-2006. Rept. to Calif. Dept. Parks and Recreation. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2006-06. 102 pp.

Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County. 1996. San Luis Obispo Creek watershed hydrologic study. Prep. for the Calif. Coastal Conservancy, San Francisco, CA.

Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County. 2002. San Luis Obispo Creek watershed enhancement plan. Prep. for the Calif. Coastal Conservancy, San Francisco, CA. 93 pp.

Levine-Fricke-Recon, Inc.. 1998. Steelhead trout habitat investigation, lower San Luis Obispo Creek. Prep. for the Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County, San Luis Obispo, CA.

Los Huertos, M, S. Rollins, K. Morris, C. Phillips, L. Gentry, and C. Shennan. In prep. Phosphorus loads and water quality criteria ambiguities along the central coast of California. Subm. to Agricultural Water Mgmt. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA.

Love, M. and R. Taylor. 2003. California salmonid stream habitat restoration manual, Part 9: Fish passage evaluation at stream crossings. Prep. for the CA Dept. Fish and Game. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/Resources/HabitatManual.asp.

Matthews, K. and N. Bern. 1997. Rainbow trout responses to water temperature and dissolved oxygen stress in two southern California stream pools. J. Fish Biology, 50:60-67.

McEwan, D. and T. Jackson. 1996. Steelhead restoration and management plan for California. The Resources Agency, Dept. of Fish and Game, Inland Fish. Div., Sacramento, CA. 234 pp.

McEwan, D. 2001. Central Valley steelhead. In: Brown, R.L. (ed.). Contributions to the biology of Central Valley salmonids. Calif. Dept of Fish and Game Fish Bull. No. 179, Vol. 1: 1-43.

Minnich, R. 1989. Climate, fire, and landslides in southern California, pp. 91-100, In: Sadler, P. and D. Morton (eds.). Landslides in a semi-arid environment, with an emphasis on the inland valleys of Southern California. Public. Inland Geol., Vol. 2.

Mount, J. 1995. California rivers and streams. Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley, CA. 313 pp.

Moyle, P. 1976. Inland fishes of California. Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley, CA. 405 pp.

Moyle, P.B. 2002. Inland fishes of California, 2nd ed. Univ. Calif Press, Berkeley, CA. 279 pp.

Moyle, P. and T. Light. 1996. Fish invasions in California: Do abiotic factors determine success? Ecology, 77(6): 1666-1670.

Moyle, P., R. Yoshiyama, J. Williams, and E. Wikramanayake. 1995. Fish species of special concern in California, 2nd ed., The Resources Agency, Dept. of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Div., Rancho Cordova, CA. 272 pp.

Murray, C. and J. McPhail. 1988. Effect of temperature on the development of five species of Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus*) embryos and alevins. Can. J. Zool., 66: 266-273.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1996. Status review of West Coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-27., NMFS Seattle, WA and NMFS Long Beach, CA. August. 261 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1997. Aquatic properly functioning condition matrix (species habitat needs matrix). NMFS, Southwest Region, Northern Calif. Area Office, Santa Rosa, CA. 20 March. 22 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2001. Guidelines for salmonid passage at stream crossings. NMFS, Southwest Region, Santa Rosa, CA. 14 pp.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2002. Proposed Lower Pajaro River flood control project. NMFS, Southwest Region, Santa Rosa, CA.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2005. Endangered and threatened species: Designation of critical habitat for seven evolutionarily significant units of Pacific salmon and steelhead in California--Final Rule. Federal Register 70(170): 52488-52627.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007a. 2007 Federal Recovery Outline for the distinct population segment of Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. NMFS SW Regional Office., Long Beach, CA. 52 pp. http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/recovery/FINAL.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007b. 2007 Federal Recovery Outline for the distinct population segment of South-Central California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. NMFS SW Regional Office., Long Beach, CA. 52 pp. http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/recovery/FINAL.

National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Recovery plan for the Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Natl. Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/EPA. 1991a. Susceptibility and status of West Coast estuaries to nutrient discharges: San Diego Bay to Puget Sound. October.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/EPA. 1991b. Distribution and abundance of fishes and invertebrates in the West Coast estuaries. Vol. II: Species life history summaries. U.S. Dept. Commerce NOAA. August.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 2005. Endangered and threatened species: Designation of critical habitat for seven Evolutionarily Significant Units of Pacific salmon and steelhead in California: Final Rule. Federal Register, 50CFR, Part 226.

Nedeff, N. 2004. Garrapata Creek watershed assessment and restoration plan: Riparian element. Prep. for the Garrapata Creek Watershed Council.

Nedeff, N. 2005. Garrapata Creek watershed assessment. Phase II: Upper watershed. Prep. for the Garrapata Creek Watershed Council.

Nelson, J. 1995. Steelhead populations and habitat assessment on Santa Rosa Creek, San Luis Obispo County, Calif. Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Region 3.

Nelson, J. 2005. Garrapata Creek steelhead population assessment. Prep. for the Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Central Coast Region.

Nelson, J. et al. 2006. Stream inventory report: Seneca Creek, San Jose Creek watershed, Monterey County. Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Monterey, CA.

Newcombe, C. 2003. Impact assessment model for clear water fishes exposed to excessively cloudy water. J. Amer. Water Res. Assoc., 35: 529-544.

Newcombe, C. and J. Jensen. 1996. Channel suspended sediment and fisheries: Synthesis for quantitative assessment of risk and impact. North Amer. J. Fish. Mgmt., Vol. 16(4): 1-34.

Newman, W. and F. Watson. 2005. Land use/land cover of the Central Coast Region of California - 2005. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-08.

Newman, W., D. Smith, and F. Watson. 2004. The Carmel River Watershed map set. Rept. to Carmel River Watershed Conservancy. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2004-04. 6 maps.

Newman, W., F. Watson, M. Angelo, J. Casagrande, and B. Feikert. 2003. Land use history and mapping in California's Central Coast Region. Prep. for the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2003-14. 87 pp.

Nielsen, J., C. Gan, and W. Thomas. 1994. Differences in genetic diversity of mtDNA between hatchery and wild population of *Oncorhynchus*. Canad. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci., 51 (Suppl. 1).

Nielsen, J., C. Gan, J. Wright, D. Morris, and W. Thomas. 1994. Biogeographic distribution of mitochondrial and nuclear markers for southern steelhead. Molec. Marine Biol. and Biotech., 3(5): 281-293.

Nielsen, J. et al. 1996. Mitochondrial DNA and nuclear microsatellite diversity in hatchery and wild *Oncorhynchus mykiss* from freshwater habitats in southern California. Prep. for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR.

Nielsen, J., C. Carpanzano, M. Fountain, and C. Gan. 1997. Mitochondrial DNA and nuclear microsatellite diversity in hatchery and wild *Oncorhynchus mykiss* from freshwater habitats in southern California. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc., 126: 397-417.

Nielsen, J., T. Lisle, and V. Ozaki. 1994. Thermally stratified pools and their use by steelhead in northern California streams. Trans. Amer. Fisheries Soc., 123: 613-626.

Otte, F. and M. McEwen. 2001. Existing data summary: Morro Bay Watershed. Morro Bay Watershed steelhead restoration planning process. Prep. for the Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District, Morro Bay, CA.

Pacific Watershed Associates. 1990. A working plan for emergency erosion control and erosion prevention for roads on the Little Horse Ranch, Monterey County, California. Unpub. tech. report.

Pacific Watershed Associates. 2003. 2001 California Coastal Salmon Recovery program, Watershed Assessment and Erosion Prevention Planning Project for the Garrapata Creek Watershed, Monterey County, California. Prep. for Calif. Dept. Fish and Game., Monterey, CA. 23 pp.

Payne, T. & Associates. 2000. Habitat suitability index (HSI) assessment of Coon Creek and San Luis Obispo Creek. Prep. for the City of San Luis Obispo Planning Dept.

Payne, T. & Associates. 2001a. The distribution and abundance of steelhead in tributaries to Morro Bay, California. Prep. for Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District, Morro Bay, CA. 14 pp, plus appendices.

Payne, T. & Associates. 2001b. Supplemental habitat surveys of Coon Creek, San Luis Obispo County, California. Prep. for the City of San Luis Obispo Planning Dept.

Payne, T. & Associates. 2004. Distribution and abundance of steelhead in the San Luis Obispo Creek watershed, California. Prep. for the Planning Dept., City of San Luis Obispo, CA.

Pearse, D. and J. Garza. 2007. Historical baseline for genetic monitoring of coastal California steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. Grant No. P0510530, Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Fish. Restor. Grant Progr., Sacramento, CA. 31 pp.

Perry, W., F. Watson, J. Casagrande, and C. Hanley. 2007. Carmel River Lagoon enhancement project: Water quality and aquatic wildlife monitoring, 2006-2007. Rept. to Calif. Dept. Parks and Recreation. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2007-02. 100 pp.

Perryess, E., W. Bremer, V. Holland, and J. Strampe. 1997. Morro Bay watershed wetlands evaluation program. Prep. for the Coastal San Luis Resource Conserv. District, Morro Bay, CA. Proj. No. 5-077-130-0.

Peterson, N. and T. Quinn. 1996. Spatial and temporal variation in dissolved oxygen in natural egg pockets of chum salmon, *Oncorhynchus keta* (Walbaum), in Kennedy Creek, Washington. J. Fish. Biol., 48: 131-143.

Peterson, N., A. Hendry, and T. Quinn. 1992. Assessment of cumulative effects on salmonid habitat: some suggested parameters and target conditions. Prep. for the Washington Dept. Nat. Resources and the Coop. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee, Timber/Fish/Wildlife Agreement. Univ. Washington, Seattle, WA.

Questa Engineering Corp. and The Morro Group, Inc. 2001. Phase II Waterways Management Plan, San Luis Obispo Creek Watershed. Prep. for the San Luis Obispo County Zone 9 Flood Control and Water Conservation Advisory Committee, San Luis Obispo, CA.

Quinn, T. 2005. The behavior and ecology of Pacific salmon and trout. Amer. Fisheries Soc., Bethesda, MD and Univ. Washington Press, Seattle. 378 pp.

Raleigh, R., T. Hickman, R. Solomon, and P. Nelson. 1984. Habitat suitability information: rainbow trout. U.S. Fish and Wildl. Serv. FWS/OBS-82/10.60. 64 pp.

Rathbun, G., K. Worcester, D. Holland, and J. Martin. 1991. Status of declining aquatic reptiles, amphibians, and fishes in the lower Santa Rosa Creek, Cambria, San Luis Obispo County, California. Prep. for Greenspace Land Trust, Cambria, CA. 21 pp.

Rathbun, G., M. Jennings, T. Murphey, and N. Siepel. 1993. Status and ecology of sensitive aquatic vertebrates in lower San Simeon and Pico creeks, San Luis Obispo County, California. Unpubl. report to Natl. Ecology Research Center, Piedras Blancas Research Station, San Simeon, California, prep. under Cooperative Agreement 14-16-00009-91-1909.

Rathbun, G. and N. Scott. 1998. Status of special-status fish, amphibians, and reptiles in San Simeon Creek, San Luis Obispo County, California. Unpub. report to USGS-National Biological Survey, Piedras Blancas, CA.

Reeves, G., et al. 2003. Aquatic and riparian effectiveness monitoring plan for the Northwest Forest Plan. General Tech. Rept. PNW-GTR-577. USDA-Forest Service. Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR. 70 pp.

Reiser, D.W. and T.C. Bjornn. 1979. Influence of forest and rangeland management on anadromous fish habitat in western North America: Habitat requirements of anadromous salmonids. USDA Forest Service Tech. Report PNW-96. 54 pp.

Rich, A. 1987. Water temperatures which optimize growth and survival of the anadromous fishery resources of the lower American River. Prep. for McDonough, Holland, and Allen, Sacramento, CA.

Roberts, B. and R. White. 1992. Effects of angler wading on survival of trout eggs and pre-emergent fry. North Amer. J. Fisheries Mgmt. 12: 450-459.

Rosgen, D. 1994. A classification of natural rivers. Catena 22(1994): 169-199.

Ruehl, C., A. Fisher, M. Mos Huertos, S. Wankel, C. Wheat, C. Kendall, C. Hatch, and C. Shennan. 2007. Dynamics within the Pajaro River: A nutrient-rich, losing stream. J. North Amer. Benthological Soc., 26: 191-216.

Shapavalov, L. and A. Taft. 1954. The life histories of steelhead rainbow trout and silver salmon. Calif. Dept. Fish and Game. Fish Bulletin No. 98. 375 pp.

Shapavalov, L., A. Cordone, and W. Dill. 1981. A list of the freshwater and anadromous fishes of California. Calif. Fish and Game, 67:4-38.

Smith, D., et al. 2003. Carmel River large woody debris inventory from San Clemente Dam to the lagoon, Fall 2002. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2003-01.

Smith, D., J. Casagrande, and C. Ramsey-Wood. 2006. Garrapata Watershed, California: Water and sediment monitoring in 2004-2005. Prep. for Calif. Dept. Fish and Game and Garrapata Creek Watershed Council. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2006-02. 27 pp.

Smith, D., J. Casagrande, M. Vincent, J. McDermott, A. Price, A. Martin, and Z. Carlson. 2005. Garrapata Watershed assessment: Hydrology and sedimentology, 2001-2004. Rept. to Calif. Dept. Fish and Game and Garrapata Watershed Council. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2005-03. 49 pp.

Smith, D., W. Newman, F. Watson, and J. Hameister. 2004. Physical and hydrologic assessment of the Carmel River watershed, California. Rept. to Carmel River Watershed Conservancy. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2004-05/2. 94 pp.

Smith, J. 1982a. Survey of fish populations on thirty-four rivers and creeks in Santa Cruz County. Prep. for the County of Santa Cruz Planning Dept., Santa Cruz, CA.

Smith. J. 1982b. Fishes of the Pajaro River System, pp. 83-169, In: Moyle, P.B. (ed.). Studies on the distribution and ecology of stream fishes of the Sacramento-San Joaquin drainage system, California. Univ. Calif. Public. Zoology, Vol. 115: 83-170. Berkeley, CA.

Smith, J. 1990. The effects of sandbar formation and inflows on aquatic habitat and fish utilization in Pescadero, San Gregorio, Waddell, and Pomponio Creek estuary/lagoon systems, 1985-1989. Prep. for the Calif. Dept. Parks and Recreation.

Smith, J. 2005. Aquatic ecology and fisheries of San Felipe Lake. Prep. for the Pajaro River Watershed Flood Prevention Authority.

Smith. J.J. 2002 (revised 2006). Steelhead distribution and ecology in the Upper Pajaro River system (with reach descriptions and limiting factor identification for the Llagas Creek watershed). Unpub. report. Dept. Biol. Sci., San Jose State Univ., San Jose, CA. 22 pp.

Smith, J. and H. Li. 1983. Energetic factors influencing foraging tactics of juvenile steelhead trout (*Salmo gairdneri*), pp. 173-180, In: D.L.G. Noakes et al. (eds.), The predators and prey in fishes. Dr. W. Junk Publ, The Hague, Netherlands.

Snider, W.M. 1983. Reconnaissance of the steelhead resource of the Carmel River drainage, Monterey County. State of CA., The Resources Agency, Dept. of Fish and Game, Environ. Serv. Branch, Admin. Report No. 83-3. 41 pp.

Snyder, J.O. 1913. The fishes of the streams tributary to Monterey Bay, California. Bull. U.S. Bureau of Fisheries. 32: 49-72.

Spina, A. 2003. Habitat associations of steelhead trout near the southern extent of their range. Calif. Fish and Game 89(2): 81-95.

Spina, A. 2007. Thermal ecology of juvenile steelhead in a warm-water environment. Environ. Biol. Fishes, 80: 23-34.

Spina, A. and D. Tormey. 2000. Post-fire sediment deposition in geographically restricted steelhead habitat. North Amer. J. Fish. Mgmt. 20: 562-569.

Spina, A., M. McGoogan, and T. Gaffney. 2006. Influence of surface-water withdrawal on juvenile steelhead and their habitat in a south-central California stream. Calif. Dept. Fish and Game Bull. 92(2): 81-90.

Steelhead Recovery Actions Public Workshop. 2007a. Public input from recovery action workshops for the San Luis Obispo Terrace Steelhead Biogeographic Population Group watersheds and the Interior Coast Range Steelhead Biogeographic Population Group held in Arroyo Grande, SLO County, California. 19 April.

Steelhead Recovery Actions Public Workshop. 2007b. Public input from recovery action workshops for the Carmel Basin and Big Sur Coast Biogeographic Population Group watersheds and the Interior Coast Biogeographic Population Group watersheds held in Carmel, Monterey County, California. 4 June.

Sundermeyer, D. 1999. Hatchery influence on Pajaro River steelhead analyzed with microsatellite DNA. Master's Thesis, Dept. Biol. Sci., San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.

Swanson Hydrology and Geomorphology. 2003. Steelhead restoration planning project for the Morro Bay Watershed: Final report. Prep. for Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District, Morro Bay, CA. 42 pp.

Swanson Hydrology and Geomorphology and Habitat Restoration Group. 1993a. Pajaro River Lagoon management plan, with technical appendices. Prep. for the Santa Cruz County Public Works Dept. and the Calif. State Coastal Conservancy, Santa Cruz and Oakland, CA.

Sweet, S. 1992. Initial report on the ecology and status of the arroyo toad (*Bufo microscaphus californicus*) on the Los Padres National Forest of southern California, with management recommendations. Prep. for USDA, Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest, Goleta, CA. 198 pp.

Swift, C. 1975. Survey of the freshwater fishes and their habitats in the coastal drainages of southern California. Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, CA. 364 pp.

Swift, C., T. Haglund, M. Ruiz, and R. Fisher. 1993. The status and distribution of the freshwater fishes of southern California. Bull. So. Calif. Acad. Sci., A92(3): 101-172.

Tait, C., J. Li, G. Lamberti, T. Pearsons, and H. Li. 1994. Relationships between riparian cover and the community structure of high desert streams. J. North Amer. Benthological Soc., 13: 45-56.

Taylor, R.N. 2003. Morro Bay watershed stream crossing inventory and fish passage evaluation. Final report. Prep. for the Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Agreement No. P0130419, 45 pp, plus appendices.

The Nature Conservancy. 2000. The Five-S framework for site conservation: A practitioner's handbook for site conservation planning and measuring conservation success. Vol. 1, 2nd ed., June.

The Nature Conservancy. 2007. Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Basic Practice Workbook: Developing strategies, taking action, and measuring success at any scale. 12 January version. http://www.conserveonline.org/workspaces/cbdgateway/cbdmain/cap/practices.

The Watershed Institute. n.d. Historic map of steelhead geographic range within the Salinas Valley, California. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA.

Titus, R., D. Erman, and W. Snider. 1994. History and status of steelhead in California coastal drainages south of San Francisco Bay. Hilgardia. 193 pp, plus appendices.

Titus, R., D. Erman, and W. Snider. 2000. History and status of steelhead in California coastal drainages south of San Francisco Bay. Draft. Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA. 265 pp.

Tri-County Fish Team. 2006. Recommended barrier and watershed priority ranking methodology for San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura counties, CA. Prep. for Conception Coast Project, Santa Barbara, CA.

United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service. 1989. Erosion and sediment study, Morro Bay watershed, San Luis Obispo County, California.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 1997. Listing of several evolutionary significant units (ESUs) of West Coast steelhead. Federal Register 62(159): 43937-43954.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. Arroyo southwestern toad (*Bufo microscaphus californicus*) recovery plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. 119 pp.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2006. Revised critical habitat for the tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*). Federal Register 71(228): 68913-68995.

United States Forest Service. 2004. Atlas of southern California Planning Maps, National Forests of southern California Land Management Plan revision: Angeles National Forest, Cleveland National Forest, Los Padres National Forest, and San Bernardino National Forest. Pacific Southwest Region, Rept. No. R5-MB-053. April.

United States Forest Service. 2005. Executive summary of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for revised land management plans: Angeles National Forest, Cleveland National Forest, Los Padres National Forest, and San Bernardino National Forest. Pacific Southwest Region Rept. No. R5-MB-085, 20 pp. September.

United States Geological Survey. 2008. website: http://water.usgs.gov/data.html.

Urquhart, K. 2008. NOAA-NMFS biologist, electronic communication to Mark Capelli (NOAA-NMFS) regarding sedimentation and passage barrier impacts to steelhead on San Jose Creek, Monterey County. 27 May.

Waters, T. 1995. Sediment in streams: Sources, biological effects, and control. Amer. Fisheries Soc., Monogr. No. 7. 251 pp.

Watson, F., M. Angelo, T. Anderson, J. Casagrande, D. Kozlowski, W. Newman, J. Hager, D. Smith, R. Curry. 2003. Salinas Valley sediment sources. Prep. for the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, The Watershed Institute, Dept. Sci. and Environ. Policy, Calif. State Univ., Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2003-10. 228 pp.

Watson, F. and J. Casagrande. 2004. Potential effects of groundwater extractions on Carmel River Lagoon. Prep. for California-American Water Co. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2004-09. 93 pp.

Watson, J., J. Casagrande, and F. Watson. 2008. Central Coast Region, South District Basin planning and habitat mapping project. The Watershed Institute, Dept. Sci. and Environ. Policy, Calif. State Univ., Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2008-03. 40 pp.

Wilkinson, M., J. Casagrande, J. Hager, and F. Watson. 2004. Gabilan watershed assessment quality assurance project plan and monitoring plan. Rept. to State Water Resources Control Board. The Watershed Institute, Calif. State Univ. Monterey Bay, Seaside, CA. Publ. No. WI-2004-07. 43 pp.

Williams, D. and J. Mundie. 1978. Substrate size selection by stream invertebrates and the influence of sand. Limnol. Oceanogr. 23(5): 1020-1033.

Williams, P. & Associates. 2005. Chorro Creek Ecological Reserve long-term restoration and management plan: Existing conditions assessment. Prep. for the Morro Bay National Estuary Program, Morro Bay, CA.

Winter, B. 1987. Racial identification of juvenile summer and winter steelhead and resident rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri* Richardson). Admin. Rept. No. 87-1, Calif. Dept. Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Div., Rancho Cordova, CA. 32 pp.

Woodward-Clyde Consultants, Inc. 1998. Biological Technical Report for the Final EIR of the Proposed Salinas Reservoir Expansion Project, Appendix 1. Prep. for City of San Luis Obispo, CA. State Clearinghouse No. 92071018. May.

Xanthippe, A. 2005. Atlas of Pacific salmon: The first map-based status assessment of salmon in the North-Pacific. Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley, CA.

Yates, E.G. 1998. Hydrogeology, water quality, water budgets, and simulated responses to hydrologic changes in Santa Rosa and San Simeon creek ground-water basins, San Luis Obispo County, California. U.S. Geol. Surv. Invest. Rept. 98-4061. Prep. in coop. with San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, San Luis Obispo, CA.

Zimmerman, C. and G. Reeves. 2000. Population structure of sympatric anadromous and nonanadromous *Oncorhynchus mykiss*: Evidence from spawning surveys and otolith microchemistry. Canad. J. Fish. and Aquat. Sci. 57: 2152-2162.