STREAM INVENTORY REPORT

Groshong Gulch

INTRODUCTION

A stream inventory was conducted August 5, 2003 on Groshong Gulch. The survey began at the confluence with the unnamed tributary to Groshong Gulch and extended upstream 0.21 miles.

The objective of the habitat inventory was to document the habitat available to anadromous salmonids in Groshong Gulch.

The objective of this report is to document the current habitat conditions and recommend options for the potential enhancement of habitat for coho salmon and steelhead trout. Recommendations for habitat improvement activities are based upon target habitat values suitable for salmonids in California's north coast streams.

WATERSHED OVERVIEW

Groshong Gulch is a tributary to the South Fork Gualala River, a tributary to the Gualala River, which drains to the Pacific Ocean. It is located in Sonoma County, California (Map 1). Groshong Gulch's legal description at the confluence with the South Fork Gualala River is T11N R15W S24. Its location is 38°46′45″ north latitude and 123°29′25″ west longitude. Groshong Gulch is an intermittent stream according to the USGS McGuire Ridge 7.5 minute quadrangle. Groshong Gulch drains a watershed of approximately 0.36 square miles. Elevations range from about 70 feet at the mouth of the creek to 1,380 feet in the headwater areas. Mixed conifer forest dominates the watershed. The watershed is entirely privately owned and is managed for timber production. Vehicle access exists east of Gualala on Gualala Redwood, Inc. (GRI) logging roads. The unnamed South Fork Gualala tributary is accessed approximately 0.25 miles from the junction of River Road, North Fork Road, Little Red Rock Road, Mountain Road and GRI's main haul road. Foot access is available to the mouth of Groshong Gulch from the bridge over the unnamed right bank stream.

METHODS

The habitat inventory conducted in Groshong Gulch follows the methodology presented in the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual* (Flosi et al., 1998). The Watershed Stewards Project/AmeriCorps (WSP/AmeriCorps) Members that conducted the inventory were trained in standardized habitat inventory methods by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). This inventory was conducted by a two-person team.

SAMPLING STRATEGY

The inventory uses a method that samples approximately 10% of the habitat units within the survey reach. All habitat units included in the survey are classified according to habitat type and their lengths are measured. All pool units are measured for maximum depth, depth of pool tail crest (measured in the thalweg), dominant substrate composing the pool tail crest, and embeddedness. Habitat unit types encountered for the first time are measured for all the parameters and characteristics on the field form. Additionally, from the ten habitat units on each field form page, one is randomly selected for complete measurement.

HABITAT INVENTORY COMPONENTS

A standardized habitat inventory form has been developed for use in California stream surveys and can be found in the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*. This form was used in Groshong Gulch to record measurements and observations. There are nine components to the inventory form.

1. Flow:

Flow is measured in cubic feet per second (cfs) at the bottom of the stream survey reach using a Marsh-McBirney Model 2000 flow meter.

2. Channel Type:

Channel typing is conducted according to the classification system developed and revised by David Rosgen (1985 rev. 1994). This methodology is described in the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*. Channel typing is conducted simultaneously with habitat typing and follows a standard form to record measurements and observations. There are five measured parameters used to determine channel type: 1) water slope gradient, 2) entrenchment, 3) width/depth ratio, 4) substrate composition, and 5) sinuosity. Channel characteristics are measured using a clinometer, hand level, hip chain, tape measure, and a stadia rod.

3. Temperatures:

Both water and air temperatures are measured and recorded at every tenth habitat unit. The time of the measurement is also recorded. Both temperatures are taken in degrees Fahrenheit at the middle of the habitat unit and within one foot of the water surface.

4. Habitat Type:

Habitat typing uses the 24 habitat classification types defined by McCain and others (1988). Habitat units are numbered sequentially and assigned a type identification number selected from a standard list of 24 habitat types. Dewatered units are labeled "dry". Groshong Gulch habitat typing used standard basin level measurement criteria. These parameters require that the minimum length of a described habitat unit must be equal to or greater than the stream's mean

wetted width. All measurements are in feet to the nearest tenth. Habitat characteristics are measured using a clinometer, hip chain, and stadia rod.

5. Embeddedness:

The depth of embeddedness of the cobbles in pool tail-out areas is measured by the percent of the cobble that is surrounded or buried by fine sediment. In Groshong Gulch, embeddedness was ocularly estimated. The values were recorded using the following ranges: 0 - 25% (value 1), 26 - 50% (value 2), 51 - 75% (value 3) and 76 - 100% (value 4). Additionally, a value of 5 was assigned to tail-outs deemed not suitable for spawning due to inappropriate substrate particle size, bedrock, or other considerations.

6. Shelter Rating:

Instream shelter is composed of those elements within a stream channel that provide salmonids protection from predation, reduce water velocities so fish can rest and conserve energy, and allow separation of territorial units to reduce density related competition. The shelter rating is calculated for each fully-described habitat unit by multiplying shelter value and percent cover. Using an overhead view, a quantitative estimate of the percentage of the habitat unit covered is made. All cover is then classified according to a list of nine cover types. In Groshong Gulch, a standard qualitative shelter value of 0 (none), 1 (low), 2 (medium), or 3 (high) was assigned according to the complexity of the cover. Thus, shelter ratings can range from 0-300 and are expressed as mean values by habitat types within a stream.

7. Substrate Composition:

Substrate composition ranges from silt/clay sized particles to boulders and bedrock elements. In all fully-described habitat units, dominant and sub-dominant substrate elements were ocularly estimated using a list of seven size classes and recorded as a one and two, respectively. In addition, the dominant substrate composing the pool tail-outs is recorded for each pool.

8. Canopy:

Stream canopy density was estimated using modified handheld spherical densiometers as described in the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*. Canopy density relates to the amount of stream shaded from the sun. In Groshong Gulch, an estimate of the percentage of the habitat unit covered by canopy was made from the center of approximately every third unit in addition to every fully-described unit, giving an approximate 30% sub-sample. In addition, the area of canopy was estimated ocularly into percentages of evergreen or deciduous trees.

9. Bank Composition and Vegetation:

Bank composition elements range from bedrock to bare soil. However, the stream banks are usually covered with grass, brush, or trees. These factors influence the ability of stream banks to withstand winter flows. In Groshong Gulch, the dominant composition type and the dominant

vegetation type of both the right and left banks for each fully-described unit were selected from the habitat inventory form. Additionally, the percent of each bank covered by vegetation (including downed trees, logs, and rootwads) was estimated and recorded.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data from the habitat inventory form are entered into Stream Habitat 1.0.37, a Visual Basic data entry program developed by Karen Wilson, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission in conjunction with the California Department of Fish and Game. This program processes and summarizes the data, and produces the following ten tables:

- Summary of riffle, flatwater, and pool habitat types
- Summary of habitat types and measured parameters
- Summary of pool types
- Summary of maximum pool depths by pool habitat types
- Summary of shelter by habitat types
- Summary of dominant substrates by habitat types
- Summary of fish habitat elements by stream reach

Graphics are produced from the tables using Microsoft Excel. Graphics developed for Groshong Gulch include:

- Level II habitat types by % occurrence
- Level II habitat types by % total length
- Level IV habitat types by % occurrence
- Level I pool habitat types by % occurrence
- Maximum depth in pools
- Percent embeddedness estimated in pool tail-outs
- Mean percent cover types in pools
- Substrate composition in pool tail-outs
- Mean percent canopy
- Dominant bank composition in survey reach
- Dominant bank vegetation in survey reach

HABITAT INVENTORY RESULTS

\ast ALL TABLES AND GRAPHS ARE LOCATED AT THE END OF THE REPORT \ast

The habitat inventory of August 5, 2003, was conducted by J. Breton and K. Lucey (WSP/Americorp). The total length of the stream surveyed was 1,083 feet.

Stream flow was not measured on Groshong Gulch.

Groshong Gulch is an A3 channel type for the entire 1,083 feet of the stream surveyed. A3 channels are steep, narrow, cascading, step-pool, high energy debris transporting channels associated with depositional soils, and cobble-dominant substrates.

Water temperatures taken during the survey period ranged from 58 to 59 degrees Fahrenheit. Air temperatures ranged from 66 to 68 degrees Fahrenheit.

Table 1 summarizes the Level II riffle, flatwater, and pool habitat types. Based on frequency of occurrence there were 48% riffle units, 35% flatwater units, and 13% pool units (Graph 1). Based on total length of Level II habitat types there were 58% riffle units, 22% flatwater units, and 3% pool units (Graph 2).

Seven Level IV habitat types were identified (Table 2). The most frequent habitat types by percent occurrence were low gradient riffle units, 44%; run units, 26%; step run units, 9%; and mid-channel pool units, 9% (Graph 3). Based on percent total length, low gradient riffle units made up 48%, run units 13%, and cascade units 10%.

A total of three pools were identified (Table 3). Mid-channel pools were the most frequently encountered, at 67%, and comprised 72% of the total length of all pools (Graph 4).

Table 4 is a summary of maximum pool depths by pool habitat types. Pool quality for salmonids increases with depth. One of the three measured pools (33%) had a depth of two feet or greater (Graph 5).

The depth of cobble embeddedness was estimated at pool tail-outs. Of the three pool tail-outs measured, 0 had a value of 1 (0%); 2 had a value of 2 (67%); 0 had a value of 3 (0%); 0 had a value of 4 (0%); and 1 had a value of 5 (33%) (Graph 6). On this scale, a value of 1 indicates the best spawning conditions and a value of 4 the worst. Additionally, a value of 5 was assigned to tail-outs deemed not suitable for spawning due to inappropriate substrate such as bedrock, log sills, boulders, or other considerations.

Riffle habitat types had a mean shelter rating of 14, flatwater habitat types had a mean shelter rating of 82, and pool habitats had a mean shelter rating of 13 (Table 1). Of the pool types, the main channel pools had the highest mean shelter rating at 15. Scour pools had a mean shelter rating of 10 (Table 3).

Table 5 summarizes mean percent cover by habitat type. Small woody debris is the dominant cover type in Groshong Gulch. Graph 7 describes the pool cover in Groshong Gulch. Small woody debris is the dominant pool cover type followed by undercut banks.

Table 6 summarizes the dominant substrate by habitat type. Graph 8 depicts the dominant substrate observed in pool tail-outs. Gravel was the dominant substrate observed in 67% of the pool tail-outs. Sand was the next most frequently observed dominant substrate type and occurred in 33% of the pool tail-outs.

The mean percent canopy density for the surveyed length of Groshong Gulch was 89%. Of the canopy present, the mean percentages of evergreen and deciduous trees were 49% and 40%, respectively. Graph 9 describes the mean percent canopy in Groshong Gulch.

For the stream reach surveyed, the mean percent right bank vegetated was 78%. The mean percent left bank vegetated was 76%. The dominant elements composing the structure of the stream banks consisted of 59% cobble/gravel, and 41% sand/silt/clay (Graph 10). Coniferous trees were the dominant vegetation type observed in 68% of the units surveyed. Additionally, 32% of the units surveyed had deciduous trees as the dominant vegetation type (Graph 11).

DISCUSSION

Groshong Gulch is an A3 channel type for the entire 1,083 feet of stream surveyed. The suitability of A3 channel types for fish habitat improvement structures is as follows: A3 channel types are good for bank-placed boulders and fair for plunge weirs, opposing wing-deflectors and log cover.

The water temperatures recorded during the survey ranged from 58 to 59 degrees Fahrenheit. Air temperatures ranged from 66 to 68 degrees Fahrenheit. These water temperatures were within the suitable range for salmonids. To make any further conclusions, temperatures would need to be monitored throughout the warm summer months, and more extensive biological sampling would need to be conducted.

Riffle habitat types comprised 58% of the total length of this survey, flatwater 22%, and pools 3%. One of the 3 (33%) measured pools hae a maximum depth greater than 2 feet. In general, pool enhancement projects are considered when primary pools comprise less than 40% of the length of total stream habitat. In first and second order streams, a primary pool is defined to have a maximum depth of at least two feet, occupy at least half the width of the low flow channel, and be as long as the low flow channel width. Installing structures that will increase or deepen pool habitat is recommended for locations where their installation will not be threatened by high stream energy, or where their installation will not conflict with the modification of the numerous log debris accumulations (LDA's) in the stream.

Two of the three pool tail-outs measured had embeddedness ratings of 1 or 2. None of the pool tail-outs had embeddedness ratings of 3 or 4. One of the pool tail-outs had a rating of 5, which is considered not suitable for spawning. Cobble embeddedness measured to be 25% or less, a rating of 1, is considered to indicate good quality spawning substrate for salmon and steelhead. Sediment sources in Groshong Gulch should be mapped and rated according to their potential sediment yields, and control measures should be taken.

Two of the three pool tail-outs measured had gravel or small cobble as the dominant substrate. This is generally considered good for spawning salmonids.

The mean shelter for flatwater was 82. The mean shelter rating for pools was 13. A pool shelter rating of approximately 100 is desirable. The amount of cover that now exists is being provided

primarily by small woody debris in all habitat types. Additionally, large woody debris contributes a small amount. Log and root wad cover structures in the pool and flatwater habitats would enhance both summer and winter salmonid habitat. Log cover structure provides rearing fry with protection from predation, rest from water velocity, and also divides territorial units to reduce density related competition.

The mean percent canopy density for the stream was 89%.

The percentage of right and left bank covered with vegetation was moderate at 78% and 76%, respectively. In areas of stream bank erosion or where bank vegetation is not at acceptable levels, planting endemic trees species, in conjunction with bank stabilization, is recommended.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Groshong Gulch should be managed as an anadromous, natural production stream.
- 2) The limited water temperature data available suggest that maximum temperatures are within the acceptable range for juvenile salmonids. To establish more complete and meaningful temperature regime information, 24-hour monitoring during the July and August temperature extreme period should be performed for 3 to 5 years.
- 3) Where feasible, design and engineer pool enhancement structures to increase the number of pools. This must be done where the banks are stable or in conjunction with stream bank armor to prevent erosion.
- 4) Increase woody cover in the pools and flatwater habitat units. Most of the existing cover in the pools is from small woody debris. Adding high quality complexity with woody cover in the pools is desirable.
- 5) Inventory and map sources of stream bank erosion and prioritize them according to present and potential sediment yield. Identified sites should then be treated to reduce the amount of fine sediments entering the stream.
- 6) Active and potential sediment sources related to the road system need to be identified, mapped, and treated according to their potential for sediment yield to the stream and its tributaries.
- 7) There are several log debris accumulations present on Groshong Gulch that are retaining large quantities of fine sediment. The modification of these debris accumulations is desirable, but must be done carefully, over time, to avoid excessive sediment loading in downstream reaches.

COMMENTS AND LANDMARKS

The following landmarks and possible problem sites were noted. All distances are approximate and taken from the beginning of the survey.

Position (ft.):	Habitat Unit #:	Comments:
0	0001.00	Start of survey at the confluence with the unnamed tributary to Groshong Gulch.
66	0002.00	Begin fully sampling Groshong Gulch upstream of influence of South Fork Gualala River. There is a log debris accumulation (LDA) which includes 3' diameter x 20' long log which is laying parallel to the flow and clogging channel.
658	0014.00	LDA measures 7' high x 35' long x 15' wide and is retaining sediment creating a 4' high plunge.
853	0020.00	LDA measures 20' high x 40' wide x 25' long and is creating a 4' plunge.
930	0021.00	There is a gradient which is greater than 10%.
972	0023.00	Erosion site on right bank measures 12' high x 40' long x 3' wide. Erosion site on left bank measures 20' high x 40' long x 10' wide.
1083	0023.00	End of survey due to high gradient. There is an 11' high plunge after series of 6' cascades.

REFERENCES

Flosi, G., Downie, S., Hopelain, J., Bird, M., Coey, R., and Collins, B. 1998. *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*, 3rd edition. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.

LEVEL III and LEVEL IV HABITAT TYPES

RIFFLE			
Low Gradient Riffle	(LGR)	[1.1]	{ 1 }
High Gradient Riffle	(HGR)	[1.2]	{ 2 }
CASCADE			
Cascade	(CAS)	[2.1]	{ 3 }
Bedrock Sheet	(BRS)	[2.2]	{24}
FLATWATER		50.43	(21)
Pocket Water	(POW)	[3.1]	{21}
Glide	(GLD)	[3.2]	{14}
Run	(RUN)	[3.3]	{15}
Step Run	(SRN)	[3.4]	{16}
Edgewater	(EDW)	[3.5]	{18}
MAIN CHANNEL POOLS		F / 11	(0)
Trench Pool	(TRP)	[4.1]	$\{8\}$
Mid-Channel Pool	(MCP)	[4.2]	{17}
Channel Confluence Pool	(CCP)	[4.3]	{19}
Step Pool	(STP)	[4.4]	{23}
SCOUP POOLS			
SCOUR POOLS		[5 1]	(22)
Corner Pool	(CRP)	[5.1]	{22} (10)
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced	(LSL)	[5.2]	{10}
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced	(LSL) (LSR)	[5.2] [5.3]	{10} {11}
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4]	<pre>{10} {11} {11} {12}</pre>
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5]	<pre>{10} {11} {12} {20}</pre>
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4]	<pre>{10} {11} {11} {12}</pre>
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5]	<pre>{10} {11} {12} {20}</pre>
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6]	<pre>{10} {11} {11} {12} {20} {9}</pre>
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6]	<pre>{10} {11} {11} {12} {20} {9}</pre>
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6] [6.1] [6.2]	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \end{cases} $
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed Backwater Pool - Root Wad Formed	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB) (BPR)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6] [6.1] [6.2] [6.3]	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \\ \{6\} \\ \} $
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed Backwater Pool - Root Wad Formed Backwater Pool - Log Formed	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB) (BPR) (BPL)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6] [6.1] [6.2] [6.3] [6.4]	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \\ \{6\} \\ \{7\} \\ \end{cases} $
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed Backwater Pool - Root Wad Formed	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB) (BPR)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6] [6.1] [6.2] [6.3]	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \\ \{6\} \\ \} $
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed Backwater Pool - Root Wad Formed Backwater Pool - Log Formed Dammed Pool	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB) (BPR) (BPL)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6] [6.1] [6.2] [6.3] [6.4]	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \\ \{6\} \\ \{7\} \\ \end{cases} $
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed Backwater Pool - Root Wad Formed Backwater Pool - Log Formed Dammed Pool	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB) (BPR) (BPL) (DPL)	[5.2] $[5.3]$ $[5.4]$ $[5.5]$ $[5.6]$ $[6.1]$ $[6.2]$ $[6.3]$ $[6.4]$ $[6.5]$	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \\ \{6\} \\ \{7\} \\ \end{cases} $
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed Backwater Pool - Root Wad Formed Backwater Pool - Log Formed Dammed Pool	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB) (BPR) (BPR) (BPL) (DPL)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6] [6.1] [6.2] [6.3] [6.3] [6.4] [6.5]	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \\ \{6\} \\ \{7\} \\ \end{cases} $
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed Backwater Pool - Root Wad Formed Backwater Pool - Log Formed Dammed Pool ADDITIONAL UNIT DESIGNATIONS Dry Culvert	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB) (BPR) (BPL) (DPL) (DRY) (CUL)	$ \begin{bmatrix} 5.2\\ 5.3\\ 5.4\\ 5.5\\ 5.6\\ \end{bmatrix} $ $ \begin{bmatrix} 6.1\\ 6.2\\ [6.3]\\ [6.4]\\ [6.5]\\ \end{bmatrix} $ $ \begin{bmatrix} 7.0\\ [8.0]\\ \end{bmatrix} $	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \\ \{6\} \\ \{7\} \\ \end{cases} $
Corner Pool Lateral Scour Pool - Log Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Root Wad Enhanced Lateral Scour Pool - Bedrock Formed Lateral Scour Pool - Boulder Formed Plunge Pool BACKWATER POOLS Secondary Channel Pool Backwater Pool - Boulder Formed Backwater Pool - Root Wad Formed Backwater Pool - Log Formed Dammed Pool	(LSL) (LSR) (LSBk) (LSBo) (PLP) (SCP) (BPB) (BPR) (BPR) (BPL) (DPL)	[5.2] [5.3] [5.4] [5.5] [5.6] [6.1] [6.2] [6.3] [6.3] [6.4] [6.5]	$ \{10\} \\ \{11\} \\ \{12\} \\ \{20\} \\ \{9\} \\ \{4\} \\ \{5\} \\ \{6\} \\ \{7\} \\ \end{cases} $

Table 1 - Summary of Riffle, Flatwater, and Pool Habitat Types

TABLES AND GRAPHS

rream Na Jrvey Da	Stream Name: Groshong Gulch Survey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/2 Confinance Location: Outad: 1	Stream Name: Groshong Gulch Survey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/2003 Conditionce Location: Ottact: MCC	Stream Name: Groshong Guich Survey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/2003 Constituence Location: Orlaid: MCGUIRE RIDGE	Legal	Legal Description: 711NR15/VS24 Latitude: 38:46:45.0N	TIINRI	SWS24	Latitude:	38:46:45.0		Longitude: 123:29:25.0W	9:25.0W			
Habitat	Units Fully Measured	Habitat Type	Habitat Occurrence (%)	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	Total Length (ft.)	Percent Total Length	Mean Width (ft.)	Mean Depth (ft.)	Mean Max Depth (ft.)	Mean Area (sq.ft.)	Estimated Total Area (sq.ft.)	Mean Volume (cu.ft.)	Estimated Total Volume (cu.ft.)	Mean Residual Pool Vol (cu.ft.)	Mean Shelter Rating
-	0	DRY	4.3	193	193	17.8									
00	e	FLATWATER	₹ 34.8	29	233	21.5	4.7	0.3	0.9	169	1349	60	483		82
en en	e	POOL	13.0	10	29	2.7	8.0	0.8	1.3	6/	236	11	230	69	13
5	4	RIFFLE	E 47.8	57	628	58.0	2.5	0.2	0.6	11	852	30	216		14
Total Units	Total Units Fully Measured	ts Fully ured	Ì	Tota	Total Length (ft.)			ļ			Total Area (sq.ft.) 2437.008		Total Volume (cu.ft.) 929.1425		12

10

Parameters
Measured
at Types and
of Habitat
- Summary
Table 2

Drainage: Gualala River Stream Name: Groshong Gulch

Survey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/2003

91 82 81 97 97 Mean Canopy (%) Mean Shelter Rating 8 30 63 120 15 15 Mean Residual Pool Vol (cu.ft.) Estimated Total Volume (cu.ft.) 191 235 196 34 197 Legal Description: T111NR15WS24 Latitude: 38:46:45.0N Longitude: 123:29:25.0W Mean Volume (cu.ft.) 32 118 98 34 20 Estimated Total Area (sq.ft.) 636 588 180 56 774 106 294 90 56 F Mean Area (sq.ft.) 0.6 1.4 2.1 0.9 Max Depth (ft.) 0.9 Mean Depth (ft.) 0.3 0.4 0.9 0.5 0.2 Mean Width (ft.) 4 ~ 8 ~ 3 10.2 13.2 8.3 1.9 47.7 Total Length (%) Total Length (ft.) 517 111 143 90 21 8 8 193 Mean Length (ft.) 52 1111 24 45 10 8 8 193 Confluence Location: Quad: MCGUIRE RIDGE Habitat Occurrence (%) 43.5 4.3 26.1 8.7 8.7 4.3 4.3 Habitat Type LGR CAS RUN SRN MCP PLP DRY Habitat Units Fully Units Measured 400 - 0 1 2 2 4 - - -

89 28

0.7

- 0

Total Area Total Volume (sq.ft.) (cu.ft.) 2234.25 852.275	
Total Length (ft.) 1083	
Total Units Fully Measured 10	
Total Units	2

Groshong Gulch

Stream Name: Grosnong Guion	nong Gulch		Drainag	Drainage: Gualala River	a River							
Survey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/2003 Confluence Location: Quad: MCC	003 to 8/5/2003 Quad: MCG	3 to 8/5/2003 Quad: MCGUIRE RIDGE	Legai Di	Legai Description:		WS24	T11NR15WS24 Latitude: 38:46:45.0N	:46:45.0N	Longitude:	Longitude: 123:29:25.0W	M	
Habitat Units Fully Units Measured	Type	Habitat Occurrence (%)	Mean Length (ft.)	Total Length (ft.)	Total Length (%)	Mean Width (ft.)	Mean Residual Depth (ft.)	Mean Area (sq.ft.)	Estimated Total Area (sq.ft.)	Mean Residual Pool Vol (cu.ft.)	Estimated Total Resid.Vol. (cu.ft.)	Mean Shetter Rating
2 2	MAIN	29	=	21	72	8.5	6.0	06	180	8	178	15
-	scour	8	۵	α	Q	2	3	3	3			
Total Total Units Fully	s Fully			Total Length (ft.)					Total Area (sq.ft.)		Total Volume (cu.ft.)	
	Lea			00					236		206	

			>= 4 Feet >= 4 Feet Maximum Percent Residual Occurrence Depth
		Longitude: 123:29:25.0W	3 < 4 Feet Percent Occurrence
		Longitude:	3 < 4 Feet Maximum Residual Depth
			2 < 3 Feet Percent Occurrence
		Latitude:	2 < 3 Feet Maximum Residual Depth
River		Legal Description: T11NR15WS24 Latitude: 38:46:45.0N	1 < 2 Feet Percent Occurrence
Drainage: Gualala River		escription:	1 < 2 Feet Maximum Residual Depth
Drainag			< 1 Foot Percent Docurrence
	603	Quad: MCGUIRE RIDGE	< 1 Foot Maximum Residual Depth
hong Gulch	Survey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/200		Habitat Occurrence (%)
Stream Name: Groshong	ites: 8/5/2	Confluence Location:	Habitat Type
Stream Na	Survey Da	Confluenc	Habitat Units

5
φ
D.
>
⊆.
10
Habita
77
-
-
Q.
0
۵.
1
>
8
07
2
*
•
e
0
_
-
¥
0
ρ.
_
-
-
2
10
d)
~
μ.
-
-
-
-
=
-
2
10
2
-
5
•
>
F
50
5
-
E
=
5
A
01
-
2
101
-

Total < Total	Total >= 4 Foot % Occurrence	-1. PO
 Total Total Total Total Total Total Foot 1<2 Foot 1<2 Foot 2<3 Foot 3<4 Foot	Total >= 4 Foot Max Resid. Depth	0
 Total Total Total Total Total Total Foot 1<2 Foot 1<2 Foot 2<3 Foot 3<4 Foot unrence Max Resid % Occurrence Max Resid % Occurrence Max Resid Depth Depth 0 	Totat 3< 4 Foot % Occurrence	0
 Total Total Total Total Foot 1<2.Foot 1<2.5 foot 2<3.5 foot Sect 3 Sect 3<		0
 Total Total Total Foot 1<2 Foot 2<3 Foot Stoot 3<5 foot Stoot 4<2 Foot Stoot Stoot	Total 2< 3 Foot % Occurrence	33
 Total Total Foot 1<2 Foot 1<2 Foot Surrence Max Resid % Occurrence Depth 0 0 	Total 2< 3 Foot Max Resid Depth	-
 Total Foot 1<2 Foot 5 Foot 57 0 	Total 1< 2 Foot % Occurrence	0.1
Foot Surrence 67	Total 1<2 Foot Max Resid. Depth	0
Total < 1 Foot Max Resid. Depth	Foot	. 67
	Total < 1 Foot Max Resid. Depth	7
	Total Units	e

Maan Mavimum Pacidual Davi Danth 18 1. 1 2

Groshong Gulch

0 0

0 0

0 0

0 0

0 20

- 0

0 0

0 0

<u>8</u>

- -

67

МСР

- 10

Table 5 - Summary of Mean Percent Cover By Habitat Type

Mean % Bedrock Ledges 0 0 Longitude: 123:29:25.0W Mean % Boulders \$ Mean % White Water T11NR15WS24 Latitude: 38:46:45.0N Mean % Aquatic Vegetation Mean % Terr, Vegetation a Mean % Root Mass Drainage: Gualala River Legal Description: Mean % LWD Dry Units: 1 Mean % SWD ß Quad: MCGUIRE RIDGE Mean % Undercut Banks ŝ TOTAL RIFFLE TOTAL POOL Survey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/2003 TOTAL FLAT Habitat Type Stream Name: Groshong Gulch MCP RUN PLP LGR CAS SRN Confluence Location: Units Fully Measured e --Habitat Units -Ξ N -

Groshong Gulch

a

ŝ

TOTAL

Table 6 - Summary of Dominant Substrates By Habitat Type

urvey De	Survey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/2	33 to 8/5/2003	503	Dry Units:	Dry Units: 1				
Confluent	Confluence Location:	Quad:	Quad: MCGUIRE RIDGE	Legal Des	cription: T11NI	Legal Description: T11NR15WS24 Latitude: 38:45:45.0N	e: 38:46:45.0N	222.001	Longitude: 123:29:25.0W
Habitat Units	Units Fully Measured	Habitat Type	% Total Sitt/Clay Dominant	% Total Sand Dominant	% Total Gravel Dominant	% Total Small Cobble Dominant	% Total Large Cobble Dominant	% Total Boulder Dominant	% Total Bedrock Dominant
10	4	l lGR	o	0	75	8 	0	0 	
-	-	CAS	o	0	0	0	0	100	0
9	3	RUN	0	0	100	٥	0	0	0
8	-	SRN	o	0	100	0	0	0	0
3	3	MCP	0	50	20	0	Ø	0	0
-	-	PLP	0	100	0	0	0	0	0

Groshong Gulch

tream Name: Groshong Gulch	Drainage: Guaiala River	
urvey Dates: 8/5/2003 to 8/5/2003	Survey Length (ft.): 1083 Main Channel (ft.):	1083 Side Channel (ft.): 0
onfluence Location: Quad: MCGUIRE RID	GE Legal Description: T11NR15WS24 Latitude: 38	3:46:45.0N Longitude: 123:29:25.0W
Su	mmary of Fish Habitat Elements By Stream Read	sh
STREAM REACH: 1		
Channel Type: A3	Canopy Density (%): 89	Pools by Stream Length (%): 3
Reach Length (ft.): 1083	Coniferous Component (%): 55	Pool Frequency (%): 13
Riffle/Flatwater Mean Width (ft.): 3.4	Deciduous Component (%): 45	Residual Pool Depth (%):
BFW:	Dominant Bank Vegetation: Evergreen Trees	< 2 Feet Deep: 67
Range (ft.): 6 to 10	Vegetative Cover (%): 84	2 to 2.9 Feet Deep: 33
Mean (ft.): 8	Dominant Shelter: Small Woody Debris	3 to 3.9 Feet Deep: 0
Std. Dev.: 2	Dominant Bank Substrate Type: Cobble/Gravel	>= 4 Feet Deep: 0
Base Flow (cfs.): 0.0	Occurrence of LWD (%): 12	Mean Max Residual Pool Depth (ft.): 1.3
Water (F): 58 - 59 Air (F): 66 - 68	LWD per 100 ft.:	Mean Pool Shelter Rating: 13
Dry Channel (ft): 193	Riffles: 6	
	Pools: 10	
	Flat: 6	
Pool Tail Substrate (%): Silt/Clay: 0 Sa	nd: 33 Gravel: 67 Sm Cobble: 0 Lg Cobble: 0	Boulder: 0 Bedrock: 0
Embeddedness Values (%): 1. 0	2. 67 3. 0 4. 0 5. 33	

GROSHONG GULCH HABITAT TYPES BY PERCENT OCCURRENCE



GRAPH 1





GRAPH 2

GROSHONG GULCH HABITAT UNIT TYPES BY PERCENT OCCURRENCE







GRAPH 4



GRAPH 5





GRAPH 6

GROSHONG GULCH MEAN PERCENT COVER TYPES IN POOLS





GRAPH 7





20

GROSHONG GULCH DOMINANT BANK COMPOSITION IN SURVEY REACH



GRAPH 10

GROSHONG GULCH DOMINANT BANK VEGETATION IN SURVEY REACH



GRAPH 11

