

STREAM INVENTORY REPORT

Duffy Gulch

WATERSHED OVERVIEW

Duffy Gulch is a tributary to the Noyo River (Figure 1). Elevations range from 300 feet at the mouth of the creek to 1400 feet in the headwater areas. Duffy Gulch's legal description at the confluence with the Noyo River is T18N R16W Sec12. Its location is 39°26'5"N. latitude and 123°35'20"W. longitude according to the USGS Northspur 7.5 minute quadrangle.

HABITAT INVENTORY RESULTS

The habitat inventory of July 25, 1996 through July 30, 1996, was conducted by Diana Hines and Dave Wright. The total length of surveyed stream in Duffy Gulch was 9,815 feet (1.9 miles, 3.0 KM) (Table 1). There were no side channels in this creek.

Duffy Gulch consists of one reach: an F3 for the entire 9,815 feet.

Table 1 summarizes the Level II riffle, flatwater and pool habitat types. By percent occurrence riffles comprised 15%, flatwater 38% and pools 47% of the habitat types (Graph 1). By percent total length, riffles comprised 11%, flatwater 68% and pools 21% (Graph 2).

Sixteen Level IV habitat types were identified and are summarized in Table 2. The most frequently occurring habitat types were step runs, 31% and low gradient riffles and lateral scour rootwad pools, both at 13% (Graph 3). The most prevalent habitat types by percent total length were step runs at 63%, low gradient riffles at 10% and lateral scour rootwad pools at 5% (Table 2).

Table 3 summarizes main, scour and backwater pools which are Level III pool habitat types. Scour pools were most often encountered at 71% occurrence and comprised 64% of the total length of pools.

Table 4 is a summary of maximum pool depths by Level IV pool habitat types. In third order streams, pools with depths of three feet (0.91 m) or greater are considered optimal for fish habitat. In Duffy Gulch, eight of the 70 pools (11%) had a depth of three feet or greater (Graph 4).

The depth of cobble embeddedness was estimated at pool tail-outs. Of the pool tail-outs measured, 0% had a value of 1, 10% had a value of 2, 69% had a value of 3 and 21% had a value of 4 (Graph 5).

Of the Level II habitat types, pools had the highest mean shelter rating at 30 (Table 1). Of the Level III pool habitat types, scour pools had the highest mean shelter rating at 34 (Table 3).

Duffy Gulch

Of the 70 pools, 39% were formed by large woody debris (LWD): 11% by logs and 27% by root wads (calculated from Table 4).

Table 6 summarizes dominant substrate by Level IV habitat types. Of the low gradient riffles fully measured, 25% had gravel and 75% had small cobble as the dominant substrate (Graph 6).

Mean percent closed canopy was 79%: 63% coniferous trees and 16% deciduous trees. Mean percent open canopy was 21% (Graph 7, calculated from Table 7).

Table 7 summarizes the mean percent substrate/vegetation types found along the banks of the stream. Mean percent right bank vegetated was 29% while mean percent left bank vegetated was 25%. Grass was the dominant bank vegetation type in 38% of the units fully measured. The dominant substrate composing the structure of the stream banks was cobble/gravel, found in 39% of the units fully measured.

DISCUSSION

The information gathered in the process of habitat typing will provide Georgia-Pacific with baseline data on the current condition of this creek and the available habitat for salmonids. These data can be used to identify components of the habitat which are in need of enhancement so appropriate conditions for Duffy Gulch can be obtained over time.

Level II habitat types by percent occurrence and length

Flatwater habitat types comprised a high percentage of the units by both percent occurrence and length at 38% and 68% respectively (Table 1 and Graph 1). These unit types usually do not provide optimal spawning or rearing habitat for salmonids. Riffle habitat units comprised a low percentage of the stream by both percent occurrence and length at 15% and 11% respectively. Pools, however, comprised a higher percentage by both percent occurrence and length at 47% and 21% respectively. Riffles usually provide good spawning habitat while pools provide important rearing habitat. In addition, Mundie (1969) reported that invertebrate food production is maximized in riffles while pools provide an optimum feeding environment for coho. In fact, the most productive streams are those consisting of a pool to riffle ratio of approximately one to one (Ruggles 1966).

Pool Depth

According to Flosi and Reynolds (1994), a stream with at least 50% of its total habitat comprised of primary pools is generally desirable. Primary pools are at least two feet deep in first and second order streams and at least three feet deep in third order streams. The information from Graph 4 on maximum depth in pools was used to determine percent of primary pools. Duffy Gulch, a third order stream, is comprised mainly of shallow pools with 11% of the pools having a maximum depth of three feet or greater.

Duffy Gulch

Instream Shelter

Instream shelter ratings are derived from two measurements: instream shelter complexity and instream shelter percent cover. The first is a value rating which provides a relative measure of the quality and composition of the shelter, and the second is a measure of the area of a habitat unit covered by shelter. The various types of instream shelter include LWD, small woody debris, boulders, rootwads, terrestrial vegetation, aquatic vegetation, bedrock ledges and undercut banks.

Of the Level II habitat types, pools had the highest shelter rating at 30. Of the Level III habitat types, scour pools had the highest shelter rating at 34. These values are low as shelter values of 80 or higher are considered optimal for good rearing habitat (Flosi and Reynolds 1994).

Large Woody Debris

The presence of large woody debris in streams is a significant component of fish habitat. Woody debris creates areas of low flow, providing a refuge for fish during periods of high flow (Robison and Beschta, 1990). Woody debris also provides cover for fish, lowering the risk of predation. The percent of pools formed by LWD in Duffy Gulch was 39%. Whether these numbers are high or low, relative to the needs of salmonids is difficult to ascertain since the optimum amount of woody debris in streams has not been specified (Robison and Beschta 1990). However, based on data from Georgia-Pacific's 1995 Aquatic Vertebrate Study, the only coho found in the Ten Mile River Basin were in stream reaches where approximately 50% of pools were formed by large woody debris. Those reaches that did not support coho had a significantly lower percentage of pools formed by large woody debris (Ambrose et al, 1996). This suggests that a low percentage of LWD formed pools could adversely affect juvenile coho populations (C.S. Shirvel 1990).

The above LWD analysis pertains only to pools formed by logs or root wads as described in Flosi and Reynolds (1994): lateral scour pool-log enhanced, lateral scour pool-rootwad enhanced, backwater pool-log formed and backwater pool-rootwad formed. Other pools containing LWD as a component were not included in the calculation. For example, plunge pools may be formed by boulders, bedrock or LWD, but are not described as such by habitat unit types. Therefore, the LWD formed pool calculation is limited to four pool types and does not quantify the amount of LWD in Duffy Gulch.

Canopy

There are two important benefits of canopy cover in coastal streams. Canopy keeps stream temperatures cool as well as providing nutrients in the form of leaf litter and organic material (Bilby 1988). This leaf litter, organic material, and their associated nutrients are utilized as a food source by benthic macroinvertebrates (aquatic insects). The macroinvertebrates, in turn, are major food sources for most fish species in forested areas (Gregory et al., 1987). Mean percent canopy cover for the Duffy Gulch was 79%. This is relatively high since a canopy cover of 80% or higher is considered optimum, Flosi and Reynolds (1994).

Coniferous trees occupied a larger portion of the canopy than did deciduous trees. Coniferous trees comprised 63% and deciduous trees 16% of the canopy. The significance of this is that

Duffy Gulch

wood from coniferous trees deteriorates less rapidly than wood from alders and most other deciduous species (Sedell, *et al.* 1988). Therefore, more LWD would be available in the future for fish cover and LWD formed pools in this creek and others dominated by coniferous species.

Embeddedness

High embeddedness values (silt levels), such as those found in Duffy Gulch, have been associated with many negative impacts to salmonids. These negative impacts can be observed in important environmental components of salmonid habitat, such as pool habitats, dissolved oxygen levels and water temperatures.

The impact high silt levels have on pool habitat is that they fill in and eventually eliminate pools. As already mentioned, pools provide important habitat for rearing salmonids.

High silt levels also impact oxygen levels in the water. They do so by reducing water circulation within the substrate, thus lowering the oxygen levels needed by salmonid eggs (Sandercock, 1991). This can hinder the survival of the eggs deposited in redds, as well as the survival of juvenile salmonids.

Water temperature is impacted by high silt levels in several ways. Hagans et al (1986) reported the following impacts to water temperatures: 1) the loss of a reflective bottom; 2) darker sediment (as opposed to clean gravels) storing heat from direct solar radiation which is then transferred to the water column; and 3) a reduction in the flow of water through the substrate interstitial spaces thereby exposing more of the water column to direct solar radiation.

Another means by which water temperatures are increased is through the widening of stream channels: over time, high silt levels increase the substrate surface level of the creek, resulting in a wider, shallower stream channel (Flosi and Reynolds, 1994). In shallow streams, more surface area is exposed to the sun relative to the volume of water, leading to an increase in solar heating which in turn leads to higher water temperatures.

Substrates embedded with silt in varying degrees were given corresponding values as follows: 0-25%= value 1, 26 - 50% = value 2, 51 - 75% = value 3 and 76 - 100% = value 4. According to Flosi and Reynolds (1994), creeks with embeddedness values of two or higher are considered to have poor quality fish habitat. In Duffy Gulch, 100% of the pool tail-outs measured had embeddedness values of two or more.

It is important to consider, however, that the above embeddedness values were obtained in the summer during low flow conditions. In winter and spring, flows are usually higher due to the rainy season and the lowered evapotranspiration of the trees. This higher flow can carry away some of the previously deposited silt to sites further downstream. Therefore, embeddedness values may fluctuate throughout the year along different sections of the stream.

Duffy Gulch

Substrate

In Duffy Gulch, 25% of the Low Gradient Riffles had gravel and 75% had small cobble as the dominant substrate. The relatively high concentration of gravel and small cobble in riffles indicates that there is a sufficient amount of substrate available as potential spawning habitat in this creek. While this creek had sufficient substrate for spawning in the riffles surveyed, the overall percentage of riffles in the surveyed portions of the creek was very low at only 15% (Table 1). Subsequently, there may be a lack of sufficient spawning habitat in this creek. Another point to consider is that regardless of the amount of substrate or spawning habitat available, this habitat may not be suitable for salmonids if it is highly embedded.

Overall, Duffy Gulch appears to have a relatively high percentage of LWD formed pools and sufficient canopy. However, this stream also appears to have low shelter values, a low percentage of primary pools, and high embeddedness values. In addition, while there was sufficient substrate for spawning, habitat for spawning appeared to be limited.

Georgia-Pacific recognizes that there are areas of Duffy Gulch in need of enhancement, and where feasible will attempt to restore those areas over time as part of its long term management plan. The company will also attempt to facilitate a healthy environment for salmonids in this creek through sound management practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Duffy Gulch should be managed as an anadromous, natural production watershed.
- 2) Where feasible, design and engineer pool enhancement structures to increase the depth of pools. This must be done where the banks are stable or in conjunction with stream bank armor to prevent erosion.
- 3) Shelter values throughout Duffy Gulch could be increased by addition of large logs and root wads, boulder clusters, log and boulder weirs and log and boulder deflectors. These need to be placed carefully to prevent washing out in high flows. The Stream Habitat Restoration Manual, by Flosi and Reynolds, 1994, provides detailed descriptions for restoration efforts.
- 4) Log debris accumulations retaining large quantities of fine sediment should be modified if necessary, over time, to avoid excessive sediment loading in downstream reaches.
- 5) Sources of stream bank erosion should be mapped and prioritized according to present and potential sediment yield. Identified sites should then be treated to reduce the amount of fine sediment entering the stream. In addition, sediment sources related to road systems need to be identified, mapped and treated according to their potential for sediment yield to the watershed.

Duffy Gulch

COMMENTS AND LANDMARKS

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

Position (ft):	Comments:
294'	Concrete and rebar sheet below railroad crossing.
493'	Approximately 12 salmonids observed.
609'	Four salmonids observed.
647'	Approximately 10 salmonids observed. Hobo temperature monitor in pool.
1029'	Three redds, four salmonids observed.
2233'	Steelhead observed (100 mm).
3832'	Approximately 24 steelhead observed.
3864'	Good cover, many rootwads. 12 salmonids observed.
5042'	First side gulch.
5182'	Left bank failure.
7757'	Confluence with West Branch Duffy Gulch.
9067'	Approximately 15 to 20% slope over 44 feet. Possible barrier to salmonids.
9135'	Approximately 10 to 15% gradient over a 68 foot long run; possible barrier to salmonids.
9251'	Approximately 20-25% gradient over 104 feet.
9315'	No salmonids observed. Good pools, but the gradient is 10-15%.
9815'	End of survey. Salmonid habitat has diminished (too little flow), and the gradient is too steep (20-25%). No fish observed for at least 10 units.

Duffy Gulch

