SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA STEELHEAD RECOVERY PLAN

Southwest Regional Office
National Marine Fisheries Service
Long Beach, CA

January 2012

DISCLAIMER

Recovery Plans identify recovery actions, based upon the best scientific and commercial data available, necessary for the protection and recovery of listed species. Recovery Plans published by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) are guidance documents, not regulatory documents; identification of an action to be implemented by any public or private party does not create a legal obligation beyond existing legal requirements. Recovery Plans do not necessarily represent the views, official positions or approval of any individuals or agencies involved in the plan formulation, other than NMFS. They represent the official position of NMFS only after they have been signed by the Assistant Administrator. Nothing in this plan should be construed as a commitment or requirement that any general agency obligate or pay funds in any one fiscal year in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year in contravention of the Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C 1341, or any other law or regulation. Approved Recovery Plans are subject to modification as warranted by new findings, changes in a species' status, and the completion of recovery actions.

LITERATURE CITATION:

This document should be cited as: National Marine Fisheries Service. 2012. Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan. Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division, Long Beach, California.

Cover Photograph: Southern California Steelhead, Mission Creek, Santa Barbara, California February 16, 2008. Mark H. Capelli, South-Central/Southern California Steelhead Recovery Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service.

ADDITIONAL COPIES MAY BE OBTAINED FROM:

National Marine Fisheries Service
Protected Resources Division
501 West Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200, Long Beach, CA 90802
562-980-4000

Final recovery plans can be downloaded from the NMFS website:

http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/recovery/plans.htm

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NMFS wishes to thank and acknowledge Dr. David A. Boughton (NMFS's Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Sana Cruz) who chaired NMFS's South-Central/Southern California Steelhead Technical Recovery Team (TRT), and under whose leadership the scientific foundation and framework of the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan was developed.

Thanks also are due to the members of the TRT who contributed their time and expertise to the development of the National Marine Fisheries Service's Southwest Fisheries Science Center's Technical Memoranda that have extended our understanding of the distinctive biology and ecology of southern California steelhead: Dr. Peter B. Adams, Dr. Eric C. Anderson, Dr. Craig A. Fusaro, Dr. Edward A. Keller, Dr. Elise Kelley, Leo D. Lentsch, Dr. Jennifer L. Nielsen, Kathleen Y. Perry, Dr. Helen M. Regan, Dr. Jerry J. Smith, Dr. Camm C. Swift, Dr. Lisa C. Thompson, and Dr. Fred G. R. Watson. Mary L. Larson, Senior Fisheries Biologist with the California Department of Fish and Game, Region 5, also contributed materially to the TRT discussions.

Dr. John Carlos Garza and his colleagues on the Southwest Fisheries Science Center's Molecular Ecology Genetic Analysis Team have provided significant insights into the population structure and distribution of steelhead in southern California. Heidi Fish, Research Fish Biologist, and Associate Fisheries Biologist, Kerrie Pipal, with the Fisheries Ecology Division of the Southwest Fisheries Science Center, were instrumental in the collection of many of the fish samples used in this genetic work.

The Recovery Plan also benefited from the independent scientific reviews of Dr. E. Eric Knudson, Dr. T. Larry Marshall, and Dr. David G. Hankin, and from the co-manager and public comments received on the initial draft of the Recovery Plan. Dr. Scott D. Cooper, Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology, University of California, Santa Barbara, also provided valuable comments at various stages of the recovery planning process. NMFS also would like to acknowledge the staffs of NMFS's Southwest Regional offices for their review of the Recovery Plan, particularly Darren R. Brumback, Richard A. Bush, Penny Ruvelas, Anthony P. Spina, R. Craig Wingert, and Charleen A. Gavette for preparation of the maps and compilation of data on the physical and land-use characteristics of the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area.

The Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan has drawn on the work of Kier Associates - Fisheries and Watershed Professionals, and Hunt & Associates - Biological Consulting Services for the identification of threats and recovery actions. Paul D. Hoobyar and his staff at Watershed Initiatives effectively facilitated the workshops and public meetings on elements of the Recovery Plan.

Finally, NMFS would like to recognize the many public officials, particularly the staff of the California Department of Fish and Game, and private individuals who have worked to preserve and recover southern California steelhead. The Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan builds on the dedication of these individuals and their efforts to preserve a species whose varied life histories uniquely reflect the diverse aquatic and terrestrial habitats of southern California watersheds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, all photographs were taken by Mark H. Capelli, South-Central Southern California Steelhead Recovery Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service, or are from the Mark H. Capelli Southern California Steelhead Watershed Archive, Donald E. Davidson Libarary, University of California, Santa Barabra.

List of Tables

Appendices

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of this Recovery Plan is *to prevent the extinction of southern California steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) in the wild and to ensure the long-term persistence of viable, self-sustaining, populations of steelhead distributed across the Southern California Distinct Population Segment (DPS). It is also the goal of this Recovery Plan to re-establish a sustainable southern California steelhead sport fishery.*

Recovery of the DPS will require the protection, restoration, and maintenance of a range of habitats throughout the DPS in order to allow the natural diversity of *O. mykiss* to be fully expressed (*e.g.*, anadromous and resident forms, timing and frequency of runs, and dispersal between watersheds).

Status of Southern California Coast Steelhead

Steelhead are the anadromous, or ocean going form of the species *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, with adults spawning in freshwater, and juveniles rearing in freshwater before migrating to the ocean to grow and sexually mature before returning as adults to reproduce in freshwater. Steelhead populations along the West Coast of North America have experienced substantial declines as a result of human activities such as water development, flood control programs, forestry practices, agricultural activities, mining, and urbanization that have degraded, simplified, and fragmented aquatic habitats. In southern California, at the southern limit of the range for anadromous *O. mykiss* in North America, it is estimated that annual runs have declined dramatically from 32,000-46,000 returning adults historically, to currently less than 500 returning adults (Williams *et al.* 2011, Good *et al.* 2005, Helmbrecht and Boughton 2005, Boughton and Fish 2003).

Steelhead in southern California comprise a "distinct population segment" (DPS) of the species *O. mykiss* that is ecologically discrete from the other populations of *O. mykiss* along the West Coast of North America. Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), this DPS qualifies for protection as a separate species. In 1997, the Southern California Steelhead DPS was first listed as an "endangered" species - a species that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.



Southern California Steelhead Angling Heritage - Santa Ynez River 1937

Recovery Planning

The ESA mandates that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) develop and implement Recovery Plans for the conservation (recovery) of listed species. The development and implementation of a Recovery Plan for the Southern California Steelhead DPS is considered vital to the continued persistence and recovery of anadromous *O. mykiss* in southern California.

The Southern California Steelhead DPS encompasses *O. mykiss* populations in watersheds from the Santa Maria River (north of Point Sal) south to the Tijuana River at the U.S.-Mexico border. For recovery planning purposes, the Southern California Steelhead (SCS) Recovery Planning Area includes those portions of coastal watersheds that are seasonally accessible to anadromous *O. mykiss* entering from the ocean, including the upper portions of watersheds above anthropogenic fish passage

barriers that historically contributed to the maintenance of anadromous populations.

Recovery plans developed under the ESA are guidance documents, not mandatory regulatory documents. However, the ESA envisions Recovery plans as the central organizing tool for guiding the recovery of listed species. Recovery plans also guide federal agencies in fulfilling their obligations under Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA, which calls on all federal agencies to "utilize their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of this Act by carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species." In addition to outlining proactive measures to achieve species recovery, Recovery plans provide a context and framework for other provisions of the ESA with respect to federally listed species, including but not limited to consultations on federal agency activities under Section 7(a)(2) and the development of Habitat Conservation Plans in accordance with Section 10(a)(1)(B).

This Recovery Plan serves as a guideline for achieving recovery goals by describing the criteria by which NMFS would measure species recovery, the strategy to achieve recovery, and the recommended recovery actions necessary to achieve viable populations of steelhead within the SCS Recovery Planning Area.

Environmental Setting

The SCS Recovery Planning Area is dominated by a series of steep mountain range and coastal valleys and terraces. Watersheds within the region fall into two basic types: those characterized by short coastal streams draining mountain ranges immediately adjacent to the coast (*e.g.*, Santa Ynez, Santa Monica, Santa Ana Mountains), and those watersheds containing larger river systems that extend inland through gaps in the coastal ranges (*e.g.*, Santa Maria, Santa Ynez, Ventura, Santa Clara, San Gabriel, Santa Ana, Santa Margarita, San Luis Rey, and San Diego Rivers).

The SCS Recovery Planning Area has a Mediterranean climate, with long dry summers and brief winters with short, sometimes intense cyclonic winter storms. Rainfall is restricted almost exclusively to the winter months (December through March), though the extreme southern portion of the SCS Recovery Planning Area is subject to occasional summer storms originating from the Gulf of California. Additionally, there is a wide disparity between winter rainfall from north to south, as well as between coastal plains and inland mountainous areas. Snow accumulation is generally small and of short duration, and does not typically contribute significantly to peak run-off in southern California watersheds. The SCS Recovery Planning Area is also subject to an El Niño/La Niña weather cycle that can significantly affect winter precipitation, causing highly variable rainfall and significant changes in oceanic conditions.

Base flows (average dry-season flows) in southern California watersheds are strongly influenced by groundwater which is transported to the surface through faults and fractured rock formations. Many rivers and streams in this region naturally exhibit interrupted base flow patterns (*i.e.,* alternating reaches with perennial and seasonal surface flow) controlled by geologic formations, and the strongly seasonal precipitation pattern characteristic of a Mediterranean climate. Water temperatures are generally highest during summer months, but can be locally cooled by springs, seeps, and rising groundwater, creating refugia where conditions remain suitable for rearing salmonids, even during the summer.

Significant portions of the upper watersheds within the SCS Recovery Planning Area are contained within four U.S. National Forests (Los Padres, Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland National Forests). These forests are managed primarily for water production and recreation (with limited grazing and oil, gas, and mineral production).

Urban development is concentrated in coastal areas and inland valleys, with the most extensive and densest urban development located within the Los Angeles Basin. The SCS Recovery Planning Area is home to more than 21 million people, over half the population of the State of California. Some coastal valleys and foothills are extensively developed with agriculture - principally row-crops, orchards, and vineyards (*e.g.,* Santa Ynez and Santa Clara River, San Luis Rey River Valleys).

Recovery Goals and Viability Criteria

The overarching goal of this Recovery Plan is recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS and its removal from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (50 C.F.R. 17.11). To achieve this goal, the ESA requires that Recovery plans, to the maximum extent practical, incorporate objective, measurable criteria that, when met, would result in a determination in accordance with the provisions of the ESA that the species be delisted (50 CFR 17.11 and 17.12).

Recovery criteria are built upon viability criteria developed by NMFS's Technical Recovery Team (TRT) for the individual anadromous *O. mykiss* populations and the DPS as a whole. A ***viable population*** is defined as a population having a negligible risk (< 5%) of extinction due to threats from demographic variation, natural environmental variation, and genetic diversity changes over a 100-year time frame. A ***viable DPS*** is comprised of a sufficient number of viable populations spatially dispersed, but proximate enough to maintain long-term (1,000-year) persistence and evolutionary potential (McElhany *et al*. 2000). The viability criteria are intended to describe characteristics of the species, within its natural environment, necessary for both individual populations and the DPS as a whole to be viable, *i.e.,* persist over a specific period of time, regardless of other ongoing effects caused by human actions.

Recovery of the endangered Southern California Steelhead DPS will require recovery of a minimum number of viable populations within each of five Biogeographic Population Groups (BPGs) within the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Recovery of these individual populations is necessary to conserve the natural diversity (genetic, phenotypic, and behavioral), spatial distribution, and abundance of the species, and thus the long-term viability of the DPS. Each population must exhibit a set of biological characteristics (*e.g.,* minimum mean annual run size, persistence over variable oceanic conditions, spawner density, anadromous fraction, *etc*.) in order to be considered viable. (Boughton *et al.* 2007b).

Recovery Strategy

Recovery of southern California steelhead will require effective implementation, as well as a scientifically based biological, recovery strategy. The framework for a durable implementation strategy involves two key principles: 1) solutions that focus on fundamental causes for watershed and river degradation, rather than short-term remedies; and 2) solutions that emphasize resilience in the face of projected climate change to ensure a sustainable future for both human communities and steelhead (Beechie *et al*. 2010; Boughton 2020a, Naiman 2005, Lubchenco 1998). Such a strategy:

- Looks for opportunities for sustainable water and land-use practices;
- Restores river and estuary processes that naturally sustain steelhead habitats;
- Provides diverse opportunities for steelhead within the natural range of ecological adaptability;
- Sustains ecosystem services for humans by reinforcing natural capital and the self-maintenance of watersheds and river systems; and
- Builds natural and societal adaptive capacity to deal with climate change.

A comprehensive strategic framework is necessary to serve as a guide to integrate the

actions contributing to the goal of recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS. This strategic framework incorporates the concepts of viability at both the population and DPS levels, and the identification of threats and recovery actions for each of the five BPGs.

NMFS has identified core populations intended to serve as the foundation for the recovery of the species in the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Threats assessments for the species indicate that recovery actions related to the modification of existing fish passage barriers and changes in water storage and management regimes within certain rivers of the SCS Recovery Planning Area are essential to the recovery of the species. Extensive, high quality habitat exists above a large number of passage barriers in these river systems. These areas are currently not included within the DPS as defined in the listing rule (71 FR 834). However, because these habitat areas comprise a majority of the prime steelhead spawning and rearing habitat within the species' natural range, they are a major focus of recovery actions.

Uncertainties remain regarding the level of recovery necessary to achieve population and DPS viability, therefore, additional research and monitoring of *O. mykiss* populations within the SCS Recovery Planning Area is an essential component of this Recovery Plan. As the Recovery Plan is implemented, additional information will become available to: (1) refine the viability criteria; (2) update and refine the threats assessment and related recovery actions; (3) determine whether individual threats have been abated or new threats have arisen; and (4) evaluate the overall viability of anadromous *O. mykiss* in the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Additionally, there will be a review of the recovery actions implemented and population and habitat responses to these actions during the 5-year status reviews of the DPS.

Recovery Actions

Many complex and inter-related biological, economic, social, and technological issues must be addressed in order to recover anadromous *O. mykiss* in the Southern California Steelhead DPS. Policy changes at the federal, state and local levels will likely be necessary to implement many of the recovery actions identified in this Recovery Plan. For example, without substantial strides in water conservation, efficiency, and re-use throughout southern California, flow conditions for anadromous salmonids will limit recovery. Similarly, recovery is unlikely without programs to restore properly functioning historic habitats such as estuaries, and access to upstream spawning and rearing habitat.

Many of the recovery actions identified in this Recovery Plan also address watershed-wide processes (*e.g.,* wild-fire cycle, erosion and sedimentation, runoff and waste discharges) which will benefit a wide variety of native species (including other state and federally listed species, or species of special concern) by restoring natural ecosystem functions. Some of the listed species which co-occupy coastal watersheds with southern California steelhead include: Tidewater goby, Santa Ana sucker, Unarmored threespine stickleback, California least tern, California red-legged frog, Southwestern pond turtle, Arroyo toad, Least Bell's Vireo, and Southwestern willow flycatcher. Additionally, Pacific lamprey, the only other anadromous species occupying southern California watersheds and whose numbers have declined significantly can be expected to benefit from many of the recovery actions identified in this Recovery Plan.

Restoration of steelhead habitats in coastal watersheds will also provide substantial benefits for human communities. These include, but are not limited to, improving and protecting the water quality of important surface and groundwater supplies, reducing damage from periodic flooding resulting from floodplain development, and controlling invasive exotic animal and plant species which can threaten water supplies and increase flooding risks. Restoring and maintaining ecologically functional watersheds also enhances important

human uses of aquatic habitats occupied by steelhead; these include activities such as outdoor recreation, environmental education (at primary and secondary levels), field-based research of both physical and biological processes of coastal watersheds, aesthetic benefits, and the preservation of tribal and cultural heritage values.

The final category of benefits accruing to recovered salmon and steelhead populations involve the ongoing costs associated with maintaining populations that are at risk of extinction. Significant resources are spent annually by federal, state, local, and private entities to comply with the regulatory obligations that accompany species that are listed under the ESA. Important activities, such as water management for agriculture and urban uses, can be constrained to protect ESA listed species. As a result of these ESA related obligations, such as compliance with Section 7 requirements, the take prohibitions of Section 9, and the development of Section 10 Habitat Conservation Plans, a degree of uncertainty is often experienced by regulated entities. Recovering listed salmonid species will reduce the regulatory obligations imposed by the ESA, and allow land and water managers greater flexibility to optimize their activities, and reduce costs related to ESA protections.

Although the recovery of southern California steelhead is expected to be a long process, the TRT recommended certain actions that should be implemented as soon as possible to help facilitate the recovery process for the Southern California Steelhead DPS. These include identifying a set of core populations on which to focus recovery efforts, protecting extant parts of inland populations, identifying refugia habitats, protecting and restoring estuaries, and collecting population data (Boughton *et al.* 2007b). Recovery actions for individual watersheds are identified in separate chapters covering the five BPGs within the SCS Recovery Planning Area (see Chapters 9-13).

Implementation and Recovery Action Cost Estimates

Implementation of this Recovery Plan will require a shift in societal attitudes, understanding, priorities, and practices. Many of the current land and water use practices that are detrimental to steelhead (particularly water supply and flood control programs) are not sustainable. Modification of these practices is necessary to both continue to meet the needs of the human communities of southern California and restore the habitats upon which viable steelhead populations depend.

Since the listing of southern California steelhead in 1997, efforts have accelerated to change many unsustainable water and land-use practices; however a great deal more needs to be done before steelhead are recovered and ultimately removed from the list of federally endangered species.

Investment in the recovery of southern California steelhead will provide economic and societal as well as environmental benefits. Monetary investments in watershed restoration projects can benefit the economy in multiple ways. These include stimulating the economy directly through the employment of workers, contractors and consultants, and the expenditure of wages and restoration dollars for the purchase of goods and services. Habitat restoration projects have been found to stimulate job creation at a level comparable to traditional infrastructure investments such as mass transit, roads, or water projects (Sunderstrom *et al.* 2011, Nielsen-Pincus and Moseley 2010, Meyer Resources Inc., 1988). In addition, viable salmonid populations provide ongoing direct and indirect economic benefits as a natural resource base for angling, outdoor recreation, and tourist related activities. Dollars spent on steelhead recovery have the potential to generate significant new dollars for local, state, federal and tribal economies.

Perhaps the largest direct economic returns resulting from recovered anadromous

salmonids are associated with angling. On average 1.6 million anglers fish the Pacific region annually (Oregon, Washington and California) and 6 million fishing trips were taken annually between 2004 and 2006 (National Marine Fisheries Service 2010b). Most of these trips were taken in California and most of the anglers live in California. Projections of the economic and jobs impacts of restored salmon and steelhead fisheries for California have been estimated from $118 million to $5 billion dollars, and supporting thousands of jobs (Michael 2010, Southwick Associates 2009; see also, Meyer Resources, Inc. 1988).

Estimating total cost to recovery in the SCS Recovery Planning Area is challenging for a variety of reasons. These include the need to 1) refine recovery criteria; 2) complete investigations such as barrier inventories and assessments, and habitat typing surveys in the core populations; 3) identify flow regimes for individual watersheds; and 4) develop site-specific designs and plans to carry out individual recovery actions. Additionally, the biological response of steelhead to many of the recovery actions is uncertain and will require extensive monitoring. The recovery action tables (Tables 9-4 through 13-13) for each BPG within the SCS Recovery Planning Area include a preliminary estimate of the costs of individual recovery actions, based on the general recovery action descriptions contained in Chapter 8, Summary of DPS-Wide Recovery Actions, Table 8.2 (Recovery Actions Glossary).

Cost estimates have been provided wherever possible, but in some cases where the uncertainties regarding the exact nature of the recovery actions is unknown (*e.g.*, complete barrier removal versus modification), these costs estimates can only be provided after site-specific investigations are completed. Estimating the total cost to recovery is further complicated because achieving recovery will be a long-term effort, involving multiple decades. Based upon the costs of individual recovery actions identified it estimated that the cost of implementing recovery actions throughout the SCS Recovery Planning Area will range, from 1.7 to 2.1 billion dollars over the next 80 to 100 years. Appendix E (Estimated Costs of Recovery Actions) of the Recovery Plan contains estimates for categories of typical watershed restoration activities.

Many of the recovery actions identified in the recovery action tables are intended to restore basic ecosystem processes and functions. As a result, many of these recovery actions will be, or already have been, initiated by local, state and federal agencies, as well as non-governmental organizations and other private entities as a part of their local or regional environmental protection efforts. Recovery actions may be eligible for funding from multiple funding sources at the federal, state, and local levels. Many of these grant programs also offer technical assistance, including project planning, design, permitting, and monitoring. Regional personnel with NMFS, California Department of Fish and Game, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service can also provide assistance and current information on the status of individual grant programs. Appendix E provides a list of federal, state, and local funding sources. In weighing the costs and benefits of recovery, the multiple long-term benefits derived from short-term costs must be considered in any assessment. Southern California steelhead recovery should therefore be viewed as an opportunity to diversify and strengthen the regional economy while enhancing the quality of life for present and future generations.

Recovery Partners

Recovery of southern California steelhead depends most fundamentally on a shared vision of the future. Such a vision would include a set of rehabilitated watersheds, rivers, and estuaries which support steelhead and other native species over the long-term, efficiently sustain ecological services for people, and allow river systems to respond to climate change.

A shared vision for the future can align interests and encourage cooperation that, in turn, has the

potential to improve rather than undermine the adaptive capacity of public resources such as functioning watersheds and river systems.

The construction of a shared vision for southern California steelhead will require a number of basic institutional arrangements: 1) a deliberative forum (or set of forums) where interested stakeholders, including non-governmental organizations, can share experiences and ideas; 2) information networks that allow stakeholders to disseminate information with a broad array of interested and effected parties; and 3) the development and maintenance of trust and reciprocity that allows meaningful deliberation on inherently complex and contentious issues.

Stream Team - San Luis Rey River 2011

Achieving recovery of southern California steelhead will also require a number of coordinated activities, including implementation of strategic and threat-specific recovery actions, monitoring of the existing population's response to recovery actions, and further research into the diverse life history patterns and adaptations of *O. mykiss* to a semi-arid and highly dynamic environment (including the ecological relationship between anadromous and non-anadromous life history patterns).

Effective implementation of recovery actions will entail: 1) development of cooperative relationships with private land owners, non-governmental organizations, special districts, and local governments with direct control and responsibilities over non-federal land-use practices to maximize recovery opportunities; 2) participation in the land use and water planning and regulatory processes of local, regional, state, and federal agencies to integrate recovery efforts into the full range of land and water use planning; 3) close cooperation with state resource agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Game, California Coastal Commission, CalTrans, California Department of Parks and Recreation, State Water Resources Control Board, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards to ensure consistency of recovery efforts; and 4) partnering with federal resource agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Defense, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

NMFS intends to promote the Recovery Plan and provide needed technical information and assistance to entities responsible for activities that may impact the species' recovery, including implementation of high priority recovery actions. Additionally it will be important to work with cities and counties to incorporate protective measures consistent with recovery objectives in their General Plans and Local Coastal Plans. NMFS also intends to work with state and federal regional entities on regional planning efforts such U.S. Forest Service Land Resource Management Plans, State Park General Plans, Regional Water Control Board Basin Plans, and Local Coastal Plans.

Estimated Time to Recovery and Delisting

Given the scope and complexity of the threats and recovery actions identified within the SCS Recovery Planning, the time to full recovery can be provisionally estimated to vary from 80 to 100 years. Delays in the completion of recovery actions, time for habitats to respond to recovery actions, or the species' response to recovery actions would lengthen the time to recovery. A

modification of the provisional population or DPS viability criteria resulting in smaller run-sizes, or the number or distribution of recovered populations, could shorten the time to recovery.

1. Introduction

"There is a charm in fishing for trout in the small stream, and this is multiplied a hundred times, with the attendant excitement, for the angler who seeks the great fresh-run steelhead in the little rivers of the Southern California Coast. . . And so little rivers, granted sufficient rainfall to give them life, possess one thing in common. These sturdy migrants forge swiftly and surely over the tidal bars and up the current perhaps a dozen or two-score miles to the spawning bars at the headwaters far back in a deep dark canyon of the Coast Range."

Claude M. Kreider. Steelhead. G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1948

1.1 Southern California Steelhead at Risk

Steelhead are the anadromous, or ocean-going, form of the species *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. Historically, these fish were the only abundant salmonid species that occurred naturally within the coast ranges of southern California (Jordan and Evermann 1896, 1923, Jordan and Gilbert 1881). Steelhead entered the rivers and streams draining the Coast Ranges from Point Sal to the U.S. Mexican Border during the winter and spring, when storms produced sufficient runoff to breach the sandbars at the rivers' mouths and provided fish passage to upstream spawning and rearing habitats. These fish and their progeny were sought out by recreational anglers during the winter, spring and summer fishing seasons (Alagona *et al*. 2011, Swift *et al.* 1993, Nehlsen, *et al.,* 1991, Capelli 1974, Boydstun 1973, Fry 1973, Combs 1972, Fry 1938, 1973, Kreider 1948, Hubbs 1946, Shapovalov 1945, 1944). The ethnographic and archaeological evidence regarding the role of *O. mykiss* in Native American culture is currently limited and subject to varying interpretation by investigators (Hosale 2010, Glassow *et al*. 2007, Jones and Klar 2007, Armstrong 2006, Gobalet *et al.*, 2004, Hildebrandt 2004, McRae 1999, Woodman *et al.* 1991, Hudson and Blackburn 1982, Horne 1981, Swezey and Heizer 1977, Spanne 1975, Tainter 1975).



Steelhead Anglers, Ventura River Estuary 1918

Following the dramatic rise in southern California's human population after World War II and the associated land and water development within coastal drainages (particularly major dams and water diversions), steelhead abundance rapidly declined, leading to the extirpation of populations in many watersheds and leaving only sporadic and remnant populations in the remainder (Boughton *et al.* 2005, Good *et al.* 2005,

Helmbrecht and Boughton 2005, Busby *et al.* 1996). While the steelhead populations declined sharply, most coastal watersheds retained populations of the non-anadromous life history form of the species (commonly known as resident or rainbow trout), often in the upper reaches of watersheds within national forest lands that were more protected from the impacts of human development. In response to the dwindling native populations of anadromous and related non-anadromous resident *O. mykiss*, and in an effort to meet the burgeoning demand for recreational fishing opportunities, the California Department of Fish and Game expanded an extensive put-and-take stocking program (Dill *et al*. 1997, Leitritz 1970, Butler and Borgeson 1965). This program was aimed principally at recreational anglers, and not intended or expected to address the underlying causes of the decline of the anadromous runs in southern California. As conditions in southern California coastal rivers and stream continued to deteriorate, put-and-take trout stocking became more focused on suitable manmade reservoirs.

Since the listing of southern California steelhead as endangered in 1997, the California Department of Fish and Game has ceased stocking hatchery reared fish in the anadromous waters of southern California (California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2010). However, a substantial portion of the upper watersheds, which contain the majority of historical spawning and rearing habitats for anadromous *O. mykiss*, remain intact (though inaccessible to anadromous fish) and protected from intensive development as a result of their inclusion in the four large U.S. National Forests in southern California: the Los Padres, Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland National Forests. Additionally, a significant amount of land within southern California coastal watersheds is protected by inclusion within regional parks and various military installations such as Vandenberg Air Force Base and Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base.

Ventura River Steelhead 1947

The National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) responsibility and goal is to prevent the extinction of steelhead in the wild and ensure the long-term persistence of self-sustaining, and ultimately harvestable, wild populations of steelhead across the Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of southern California steelhead by addressing those factors limiting the species' ability to survive and reproduce in the wild. The species can be removed from the list of federally-protected threatened and endangered species only after this goal has been reached.

Recovery of steelhead will require reducing threats to the long-term persistence of wild populations, maintaining multiple interconnected populations of steelhead across the diverse habitats of their native range, and preserving the diversity of steelhead life history strategies that allow the species to withstand natural environmental variability—both intra-annually and over the long-term.

An effective steelhead recovery program will require the implementation of a series of coordinated recovery actions that:

- Prevent steelhead extinction by protecting existing populations and their habitats.
- Maintain current distribution of steelhead and restore distribution to previously occupied areas that are essential for recovery.
- Increase abundance of steelhead to viable population levels, including the expression of all life history forms and strategies.
- Conserve existing genetic diversity and provide opportunities for interchange of genetic material between and within metapopulations.
- Maintain and restore suitable habitat conditions and characteristics for all life history stages so that viable populations can be sustained naturally.
- Refine and demonstrate attainment of recovery criteria through research and monitoring.

Preventing the extinction of steelhead has long term implications for all *O. mykiss* populations (Boughton *et al.* 2007b, 2006). Steelhead have evolved an ability to search out and use a wide variety of ever-changing habitats over millennia. The loss of steelhead would initiate a process of irreversible cumulative extinctions of other native *O. mykiss* trout populations in the region because the evolutionary innovations that are the product of anadromy could no longer be naturally transmitted among the remaining resident *O. mykiss* populations. Because of the naturally dynamic and unstable environment of southern California, the remaining resident *O. mykiss* populations would likely continue on the path of gradual differentiation and perhaps even speciation (Hoelzer *et al*. 2008), but with a vastly reduced ability to innovate and survive in a changing environment., thus increasing their chance of extirpation.

1.2 Southern California Steelhead Listing History

After NMFS completed a comprehensive status review of all West Coast steelhead populations (Busby *et al.* 1996), southern California populations were proposed for listing by NMFS as an endangered Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) on August 9, 1996 (61 FR 56138). An ESU is composed of a group of conspecific populations that are substantially reproductively–isolated from other conspecific populations, and that possess important elements of the evolutionary legacy of the species which are expressed genetically and phenotypically that have adaptive value (56 FR 224, Waples 1998, 1995, 1991a, 1991b). The Southern California Steelhead ESU was formally listed as endangered on August 18, 1997 (62 FR 43937). The original ESU boundaries during the first listing of 1997 were from the Santa Maria River south to Malibu Creek. Following this initial listing, *O. mykiss* were discovered in watersheds south of Malibu Creek (Topanga Creek in Los Angeles County and San Mateo Creek in Orange, Riverside, and San Diego Counties) and genetic testing confirmed that these *O. mykiss* were most closely related to the more northern populations of the Southern California Steelhead ESU. This resulted in the range for the ESU being extended south to the U.S.-Mexico border on May 1, 2002 (67 FR 21586).

During the time between the initial listing and a subsequent re-listing in 2006, NMFS adopted the DPS designation for steelhead to replace the ESU designation to be consistent with the listing policies and practices of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. A DPS designation (61 FR 4722) uses similar but slightly different criteria from the ESU designation for determining when a group of organisms constitutes a DPS under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). A DPS is a population or group of populations that is discrete from other populations of the same taxon, and significant to its taxon. A group of organisms is discrete if it is "markedly separated from other populations of the same taxon as a consequence of physical, physiological, ecological, and behavioral factors.'' While a group of organisms is discrete if it is "markedly separated from other populations of the same taxon" it does not have to exhibit reproductive isolation under the DPS designation.

Following a subsequent status review of West Coast steelhead populations in 2005 (Good *et al.* 2005), a final listing determination for the endangered southern California steelhead as a DPS was issued on January 5, 2006 (71 FR 834).

The final designation for the Southern California Steelhead DPS encompasses all naturally spawned steelhead between the Santa Maria River (inclusive) and the U.S.-Mexico border. Consequently, this DPS includes only those *O. mykiss* whose freshwater habitat occurs below impassible barriers, whether artificial or natural, and which exhibit an anadromous life history. Individuals that have originated in freshwater above impassible barriers and exhibit an anadromous life history are also considered as part of the DPS when they are within waters below the most downstream impassible barriers.

1.3 Designated Critical Habitat

The ESA requires NMFS to designate critical habitat for all listed species. Critical habitat is defined as specific areas where physical or biological features essential to the conservation (recovery) of the species exist and may require special management considerations or protection. For recovery planning and implementation purposes, these physical or biological features can be viewed as the set of habitat characteristics or conditions that are the end goal of many recovery actions.

When designating critical habitat, NMFS considers certain habitat features called "Primary Constituent Elements" (PCEs) that are

essential to support one or more life history stage(s) of the listed species (50 CFR 424.12b). PCEs considered essential for the conservation of the Southern California Steelhead DPS are those sites and habitat components that support one or more life stages and contain physical or biological features essential to survival, growth, and reproduction. These PCEs include:

- **Freshwater spawning sites** with sufficient water quantity and quality as well as adequate substrate (*i.e.*, spawning gravels of appropriate sizes) to support spawning, incubation and development.
- **Freshwater rearing sites** with sufficient water quantity and floodplain connectivity to form and maintain physical habitat conditions and allow development and mobility; sufficient water quality to support growth and development; food and nutrient resources such as terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates and forage fish; and natural cover such as shade, submerged and overhanging large wood, log jams, aquatic vegetation, large rocks and boulders, side channels, and undercut banks.
- **Freshwater migration corridors** free of obstruction and excessive risk of predation with adequate water quantity to allow for juvenile and adult mobility; cover, shelter, and holding areas for juveniles and adults; and adequate water quality to allow for survival.
- **Estuarine areas** that provide uncontaminated water and substrates; food and nutrient sources to support growth and development; and connected shallow water areas and wetlands to conceal and shelter juveniles. Estuarine areas include coastal lagoons that are seasonally stable, predominantly freshwater-flooded habitats that remain disconnected from the marine environment except during high streamflow events, and tidally-influenced estuaries that provide a dynamic shallow water environment.
- **Marine areas** with sufficient water quality to support growth, development and mobility; food and nutrient resources such as marine invertebrates and forage fish; and nearshore marine habitats with adequate depth, cover and marine vegetation to provide shelter.

The final critical habitat designation for the Southern California Steelhead DPS was issued on September 2, 2005 (70 FR 52488). A total of 708 miles of stream habitat was designated as critical habitat from the 32 watersheds within the range of this DPS. Critical habitat for the Southern California Steelhead DPS includes most, but not all, occupied habitat from the Santa Maria River in southern San Luis Obispo County to San Mateo Creek in northern San Diego County, but excludes some occupied habitat based on economic considerations and all military lands with occupied habitat. Critical habitat was not designated for most of the watersheds south of Malibu Creek with the exception of San Juan Creek and San Mateo Creek. The stream channels with designated critical habitat are listed in 70 FR 52488. A review of the current critical habitat designations may result in modifications of the current critical habitat designations, including the addition of unoccupied habitat which exhibit PCEs.

1.4 The Recovery Planning Process

The ESA, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), mandates that NMFS develop and implement recovery plans for the conservation of listed species. The Southern California Steelhead DPS was listed as endangered in 1997 under the ESA. The development and implementation of a Recovery Plan for the Southern California Steelhead DPS is considered vital to the continued persistence and recovery of steelhead in this region.

NMFS has established a Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area for the purposes of developing this Recovery Plan and guiding the implementation of actions to recover this species. The Southern California Steelhead (SCS) Recovery Planning Area extends from the Santa Maria River south to the Tijuana River at the U.S.-Mexico border and includes those portions of coastal watersheds that are at least seasonally accessible to steelhead entering from the ocean and the upstream portions of some watersheds that are currently inaccessible to steelhead due to man-made barriers. NMFS' Southwest Region (SWR) Protected Resources Division (PRD) in Long Beach, California is responsible for the development of the recovery plan for the Southern California Steelhead DPS.

The Recovery Plan serves as a guideline for achieving recovery goals by describing the biological criteria that the listed species (and individual populations) must exhibit, and the recovery actions that must be taken to meet these criteria. Although recovery plans provide guidance, they are not regulatory documents. However, the ESA envisions recovery plans as the central organizing tool for guiding the recovery of listed species. Recovery plans also provide guidance to federal agencies fulfilling their obligations under Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA, which calls on all federal agencies to "utilize their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of this Act by carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species . . .". In addition to outlining proactive measures to achieve species recovery, recovery plans provide a context and framework for implementing other provisions of the ESA, including consultations on federal agency activities under Section 7(a)(2) and the development of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) in accordance with Section 10(a)(1)(B).

Recovery plans are also intended to be used to inform local, state, tribal and non-governmental entities and individuals who may wish to participate in the conservation and recovery of the species, or who are engaged in activities that may adversely affect that species. Successful implementation of a recovery plan depends upon the cooperation of stakeholders and planning and regulatory entities.

Pursuant to Section 4(f) of the ESA, a recovery plan must be developed and implemented for species listed as threatened or endangered, unless it is found that such a plan will not promote the conservation of the species. A recovery plan must include the following:

- Objective, measurable criteria, which, when met, will allow delisting of the species (see Chapter 6, Steelhead Recovery Goals, Objectives & Criteria);
- A description of site-specific management actions necessary for recovery (see Chapters 9 through 13, Biogeographic Population Groups); and

- Estimates of the time and cost to carry out the recommended recovery measure (see Chapters 9 through 13, Biogeographic Population Groups, Recovery Action Tables).

Past recovery plans for other listed species have generally focused on the abundance, productivity, habitat, and other life history characteristics of a species. While knowledge of these characteristics is important for making sound conservation management decisions, the long-term sustainability of a threatened or endangered species can only be ensured by alleviating the threats that are contributing to the decline of that species or impeding its recovery. Therefore, the identification of such threats is a key component of any recovery program (National Marine Fisheries Service 2010a).

The Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance document (National Marine Fisheries Service 2010a) recommends "…*using a threats assessment for species with multiple threats to help identify the relative importance of each threat to the species' status, and, therefore, to prioritize recovery actions in a manner most likely to be effective for the species' recovery*." This Recovery Plan uses this recommended approach to identify and prioritize threats to the Southern California Steelhead DPS. The prioritized threats are then used to guide the identification of specific recovery actions. Chapter 4, Current DPS-Level Threats Assessment, summarizes the threats across the DPS and Chapters 9 through 13 provide a summary of the threats assessments within each of the five BPGs of the DPS. The threats assessment methodology is discussed in Appendix D, Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Threats Assessment (CAP Workbooks) Methodology.



Figure 1-1. Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. Boundaries of Recovery Planning Area extend beyond the current distribution of the listed species.

1.4.1 Southern California Steelhead Technical Recovery Team

As part of its recovery planning efforts, NMFS Southwest Region (SWR) assembled a team of scientists with a wide variety of expertise in biological and physical sciences to provide technical assistance to the recovery planning process for southern California steelhead; this group is known as the Technical Recovery Team (TRT). NMFS' intent in establishing the TRT was to seek geographic and species-specific expertise to develop a scientific foundation for the recovery planning. The TRT produced and published a number of Technical Memoranda, which provide a description of the unimpaired historic populations within the Recovery Planning Area (Boughton *et al.* 2006), and identified viability criteria for anadromous *O. mykiss* in the Southern California Steelhead DPS (Boughton *et al*. 2007b). Additionally, NMFS's Southwest Science Center produced and published a number of additional Technical Memoranda dealing with potential over-summering habitat in the region (Boughton and Goslin 2006), the reduction of the southern range limit of anadromous *O. mykiss* (Boughton *et al*. 2005), research and monitoring (Boughton 2010b), and recovery strategies in a changing environment (Boughton 2010a). Finally, NMFS's Southwest Science Center undertook a number of genetic investigations in an attempt to identify the population structure of the Southern California Steelhead DPS, and provided scientific review of local and regional recovery efforts (Clemento *et al.* 2009, Pearse and Garza 2008, Clemento and Garza 2007, Girman and Garza 2006; see also, Greenwald and Campos 2005, Nielsen *et al*. 2005, 2006).

1.4.2 Public Participation

Local, state, and federal support of recovery planning by those whose activities directly affect the listed species, and whose actions will be most affected by recovery requirements, is essential to the successful implementation of any recovery plan. NMFS supports and participates in collaborative efforts to develop and implement recovery plans by engaging local communities, state and federal entities, and other stakeholders.

As part of the recovery planning process, NMFS published a notice of intent to prepare a Recovery Plan for the species in the Federal Register and conducted a series of Recovery Planning Workshops to solicit information on threats and recovery actions as part of the development of the Recovery Plan for the Southern California Steelhead DPS. Public workshops were held in Ventura, California on April 4-5, 2007 and May 31, 2007 and in Carlsbad, California on June 1, 2007 and April 12-13, 2008.

At these workshops, NMFS provided a general overview of the:

- federal recovery planning process;
- preliminary timeline for NMFS Recovery Plan development;
- current understanding of steelhead populations and their habitats;
- threats assessment process and the threats identified by NMFS; and

NMFS also received public input on potential recovery actions.

Following the overview, workshop participants were separated into smaller, facilitated breakout groups to identify threats to specific steelhead populations and their habitats. In the final set of workshops, breakout groups identified potential recovery actions for specific populations and habitats. Information obtained from these workshops was used in the development of a formal threats assessment analysis using The Nature Conservancy's Conservation Action Planning (CAP) threats assessment methodology, and the identification of a full suite of recovery actions based on those threats. See Appendix D, Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area Threats Assessment (CAP) Workbook Methodology.

NMFS has also established a web page to provide ongoing updates and information to the public about the recovery planning process, access to Recovery Plan materials and implementation of recovery actions. The home web page for NMFS SWR salmonid recovery planning is accessible at: http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/recovery/index.htm. The web page for recovery planning and implementation for the Southern California Steelhead DPS (including the Recovery Plan, related NOAA Technical Memorandum, and Threats Assessment summaries) can be found at: http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/recovery/So_Cal.htm.

Finally, recovery of the species cannot occur without public involvement in the implementation process. NMFS encourages the efforts of watershed groups dedicated to improving watershed ecosystem conditions. NMFS believes it is critically important to base steelhead recovery efforts on the many federal, state, regional, local, and private conservation efforts already underway throughout the region. Local support of the Recovery Plan by those whose activities directly affect the listed species, and whose actions will be most affected by recovery efforts, is essential. NMFS therefore supports and participates in locally-led collaborative efforts to develop projects and plans, involving local communities, state and federal entities, and other stakeholders. NMFS anticipates that watershed groups and private entities can utilize the information and recommendations provided in this Recovery Plan to further refine and develop recovery actions to abate threats and meet recovery objectives.

2. Steelhead Biology and Ecology

"[W]e must constantly keep in mind that variation, i.e., deviation from the norm, is one of the most marked characteristics of animal life. And of the vertebrates, the trout are among the most variable of all. Further, of the trout the steelhead is one of the most variable forms. . . . As an example, in the coastal streams most fish migrate in their first year, third, fourth, or fifth years, or do not migrate at all."

Leo Shapovalov and Alan C. Taft,
Life Histories of Steelhead Trout and Silver Salmon, 1954

2.1 SPECIES TAXONOMY AND LIFE HISTORY

Oncorhynchus mykiss is one of six Pacific salmon in the genus *Oncorhynchus* that are native to the North American coast. O. *mykiss*, along with other species of Pacific salmon exhibit an anadromous life history, which means that juveniles of the species undergo a change that allows them to migrate to and mature in salt water before returning to their natal rivers or streams (*i.e.,* streams where they were spawned) to reproduce.

Two principal steelhead recovery objectives are to increase abundance of steelhead and to preserve the expression of their diverse life history strategies. A schematic illustration of the various life history strategies that occur in the SCS Recovery Planning Area is shown in Figure 2-1. The figure is best understood by tracing the various pathways a freshwater juvenile may follow. Those pathways may remain entirely within freshwater ecosystems or transition between freshwater, estuarine and marine ecosystems. The use of these different environments confers advantages or disadvantages to the survival and reproductive success of the individual depending on the conditions of those environments. Even though neighboring watersheds can differ, a viable population of steelhead may contain individuals expressing many, if not all, the diverse life history strategies exhibited by the species. See discussion below in Section 2.6, Southern California Steelhead Freshwater Life Cycle Habitat Use.

Steelhead are a highly migratory species. Adult steelhead (Figure 2-2) spawn in coastal watersheds; their progeny (Figure 2-3) rear in freshwater or estuarine habitats prior to migrating to the sea. Within this basic life history pattern, the species exhibits a greater variation in the time and location spent at each life history stage than other Pacific salmon within the genus *Oncorhynchus* (Hayes *et al*. 2011a, 2011b, Quinn 2005, Hendry *et al.* 2004).

The life cycle of steelhead generally involves rearing in freshwater for one to three years before migrating to the ocean and spending from one to four years maturing in the marine environment before returning to

spawn in freshwater. The ocean phase provides a reproductive advantage because individuals that feed and mature in the ocean grow substantially larger than freshwater residents, and larger females produce proportionately more eggs; however, the freshwater phase provides protected rearing environment, relatively free of competition and predators. This life history strategy is referred to as "fluvial-anadromous". Out-migration to the ocean (*i.e.*, emigration) usually occurs in the late winter and spring. In some watersheds, juveniles may rear in a lagoon or estuary for several weeks or months prior to entering the ocean. The timing of emigration is influenced by a variety of factors such as photoperiod, streamflow, temperature, and breaching of the sandbar at the river's mouth. These out-migrating juveniles, termed smolts (Figure 2.4), live and grow to maturity in the ocean for two to four years before returning to freshwater to reproduce (Jacobs *et al.* 2011, Borg 2010, Haro *et al*. 2009, Leder *et al.* 2006, Quinn 2005, Davies 1991, Groot and Margolis 1995, 1991, Northcote 1958).

The ocean phase of steelhead has not been studied extensively, though marine migration studies of other species of *Oncorhynchus* have encountered only isolated specimens of *O. mykiss* and as a result it is believed that the species does not generally congregate in large schools like other Pacific salmon of the genus *Oncorhynchus* (Grimes *et al*. 2007, Aydin *et al.* 2005, Burgner *et al*. 1992, 1980, Groot and Margolis 1991, Meyers *et al.* 1996, Hartt and Bell 1985). Consequently, the movement patterns of steelhead at sea are poorly understood. Some anadromous salmonids have been found in coastal waters relatively close to their natal rivers, while others may range widely in the North Pacific (Quinn 2005, Quinn and Myers 2005, Meyers *et al.* 1996, Groot and Margolis 1991, Burgner *et al*. 1992, 1980).

Returning adults may migrate from several to hundreds of miles upstream to reach their spawning grounds. The specific timing of spawning can vary by a month or more among streams within a region, occurring in winter and early spring, depending on factors such as run-off and sand bar breaching (Jacobs *et al.* 2011, Fukushima and Lesh 1998, Shapovalov and Taft 1954). Once they reach their spawning grounds, females use their caudal fin to excavate a nest (redd) in streambed gravels where they deposit their eggs. After fertilization by the male, the female covers the redd (often during construction of additional upstream redds) with a layer of gravel, where the embryos and alevins incubate within the gravel. Hatching time varies from about three weeks to two months depending on water temperature. The young fish emerge from the gravel two to six weeks after hatching. Adult steelhead do not necessarily die after spawning and may return to the ocean, sometimes repeating their spawning migration one or more times. It is rare for steelhead to spawn more than twice before dying, and most that do so are females (Moyle *et al. 2008*, Moyle 2002). The frequency of repeat spawning among southern California populations has not been investigated, and it is therefore unknown how it may differ from other populations, or the role repeat spawning plays in the population dynamics in southern California. Additional details regarding this species' life history can be found in Quinn (2005), Bjornn and Reiser (1991), Barnhart (1986, 1991), and Shapovalov and Taft (1954).

This species may also display a non-anadromous life history pattern (*i.e.*, a "freshwater-resident" strategy). It has been

common practice to refer to non-anadromous individuals that complete their entire life history cycle (incubating, hatching, rearing, maturing, reproducing, and dying) in freshwater as rainbow trout, while referring to those emigrating to and maturing in the ocean as steelhead. However, this terminology does not capture the complexity of the life history cycles exhibited by native *O. mykiss*. Individuals can complete their life history cycle completely in freshwater, or they can migrate to the ocean after one to three years, and spend two to four years in the marine environment before returning to freshwater rivers and streams to spawn.

Additionally, "rainbow trout" which have completed their life history cycle entirely in freshwater sometimes produce progeny which become anadromous and emigrate to the ocean and return as adults to spawn in freshwater. Conversely, it has also been shown that steelhead may produce progeny which complete their entire life cycle in freshwater. This switching of life history strategies has been demonstrated by studying the microchemistry of *O. mykiss* otoliths (small inner ear bones), where time spent in marine and fresh waters can effectively be tracked by the presence or absence of certain ocean-derived elements in the bone tissue (Zimmerman 2005). Zimmerman and Reeves (2000) used this technique to uncover occasional life history switching in *O. mykiss* populations in Oregon. O. *mykiss* in the SCS Recovery Planning Area have not yet been examined in this way, but various lines of evidence (*e.g.*, inland resident fish in systems such as the upper Santa Ynez and Santa Clara Rivers exhibiting smolting characteristics, river systems producing smolts with no regular access for adult steelhead) indicate that switching between freshwater and anadromous life cycles is likely occurring (Kelley 2008, M. Capelli, personnel communication,). The cues that trigger this phenomenon are unknown, but may be linked to environmental variation (Hayes *et al.* 2011b, Satterthwaite *et al.* 2010, 2009, Sogard *et al.* 2011). For example, juvenile residency can be strongly influenced by the hydrologic cycle in southern California, where extended droughts can cause juveniles to become land-locked and therefore unable to reach the ocean (Boughton *et al*. 2009, 2006).

Lastly, there is a third type of life history strategy displayed by *O. mykiss* that is referred to as "lagoon-anadromous." Bond (2006), working at a study site in northern Santa Cruz County, has recently shown that each summer a fraction of juvenile *O. mykiss* over-summered in the estuary of their natal creek. Like southern California estuaries, this estuary was cut off from the ocean during the summer by the formation of a sandbar spit, creating a seasonal lagoon. Bond (2006) showed that many juveniles grow fast enough after their first year of lagoon rearing to migrate to the ocean, and most enter the ocean at a larger size than the same year class fish rearing in freshwater habitats of the stream system. Larger size generally enhances survival in the ocean, and the lagoon-reared fish represented a large majority of the returning adult spawning population (Hayes *et al.* 2008, Bond 2006). Steelhead populations in the SCS Recovery Planning area have not been investigated to determine whether or to what extent they may exhibit this life history strategy; however, steelhead smolts have been documented in southern California estuaries (Anderson *et al.* 2011, United Water Conservation District, 2009, 2008, 2007, Kelley 2008, C. Swift, personnel communication).

Closely related to these life history strategies is the use by steelhead of a wide variety of habitats over their lifespan, including river mainstems, small montane tributaries, estuaries, and the ocean. Steelhead move between these habitats because each habitat supports only certain aspects of what the fish require to complete their life cycle. Different populations frequently differ in the details of the times and habitats that they utilize while pursuing the general pattern of the anadromous life cycle; these differences can reflect the evolutionary response of populations to environmental opportunities, subject to a variety of biological constraints that are also a product of evolution.

Figure 2-1. Summary of the various life history strategies exhibited by Southern California *O. mykiss* and the life stage specific terminology.



Within each of the three basic life history strategies (fluvial-anadromous, freshwater-resident, and lagoon-anadromous), there is additional variation, including examples of

finer-scale habitat switching, such as multiple movements between lagoon and freshwater habitats in the course of a single summer in response to fluctuating habitat conditions; and also so-called "adfluvial" populations that inhabit freshwater reservoirs but spawn in tributary creeks (Hayes *et al.* 2011a, 2011b, 2008, M. Capelli, personnel communication).

Figure 2-2. Adult female anadromous *O. mykiss* (approx. 75 cm), Carpinteria Creek, Santa Barbara County, 2008.

Figure 2-3. Juvenile *O. mykiss* (approx. 10 cm), Juncal Creek, Santa Barbara County, 2003

Figure 2-4. Steelhead smolts (approximately 17 cm), confluence Ventura River and San Antonio Creek, Ventura County, 2008

2.2 SPECIES FRESHWATER DISTRIBUTION AND POPULATION STRUCTURE

Differences between the historical and current distributions of southern California steelhead illustrate their present endangered status. Many anadromous populations have become extirpated, particularly near the southern extent of their range (*i.e.*, in the southern portion of the SCS Recovery Planning Area, south of the Santa Monica Mountains) (Boughton *et al.* 2006, 2005, Boughton and Fish 2003, Augerot 2005). Individual anadromous populations within this SCS Recovery Planning Area have been severely reduced or in many cases extirpated (Table 2-1, Figure 2-5). Many of the southernmost watersheds may have originally supported sporadic steelhead populations, or intermittent resident populations that experienced repeated local extinctions and recolonizations by anadromous immigrants in dry and wet cycles, respectively. This aspect of the freshwater distribution and population structure of O. mykiss has not been extensively studied, and as a result is not well understood (Boughton et al. 2006).

NMFS conducted an extensive *O. mykiss* population survey (targeted primarily at juveniles) in 2002 of most of the coastal watersheds within the Southern California Steelhead SCS Recovery Planning Area (Boughton and Fish 2003). Of the 46 watersheds in which steelhead were known to have occurred historically, between 37

and 43 percent were still occupied by either resident fish or steelhead (a range was reported for the occupancy estimate because several watersheds could not be surveyed). Three watersheds were considered vacant of steelhead because they were dry, 17 were considered vacant due to the presence of impassible barriers to all known spawning habitat, and six were considered vacant because the survey found no evidence of *O. mykiss*. Seventeen watersheds with no known historical record of steelhead occurrence were surveyed (primarily for juveniles); none of these were found to be occupied during the 2002 survey (Table 2-1, Figure 2-5). The distributional study of 2002 also determined that *O. mykiss* was present in two systems (Gaviota Creek and San Mateo Creek) where it was previously reported to be extinct by Nehlsen *et al*. (1991).

One of the objectives of this Recovery Plan is to maintain the current distribution of steelhead and restore distribution to a variety of previously occupied areas. Fish-passage barriers appear to have played a large role in watershed-wide extirpations of steelhead; however, in many cases, ancestors of sea-run steelhead continue to persist as resident populations above barriers in these same stream systems, and in some cases produce progeny that emigrate downstream, past the barriers to the ocean as smolts. In an investigation of the contraction of the southern range limit of *O. mykiss*, it was found that the majority (68%) of anadromous population extirpations were associated with anthropogenic barriers which restricted the use of upstream habitats for spawning and rearing by the anadromous form of *O. mykiss.* Between 58% and 65% of these stream systems maintain *O. mykiss* populations, either above or below the anthropogenic barriers (Boughton *et al.* 2005). Land use practices have also contributed significantly to the reduction in steelhead distribution, particularly in mainstem habitats such as the Santa Maria River basin, and in several major basins within the Mojave Rim and Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPGs.

These resident populations could include fish that are considered naturally persistent residents, descendants of steelhead that have been blocked from downstream emigration by barriers (including irregular or inadequate flows to the ocean) and have been forced to adopt a resident life cycle strategy (*i.e.,* "residualized" populations), or in some cases perhaps progeny of stocked *O. mykiss* found above barriers to steelhead migration (Boughton *et al.* 2005).

Table 2-1. Southern California watersheds historically occupied by populations of steelhead (listed from north to south). Several watersheds with historical populations now have barriers that block migration to portions of the watershed.

WATERSHED[1]	HISTORICALLY OCCUPIED[2]
Santa Maria River	Yes
Santa Ynez River	Yes
Jalama Creek	Negative obs.[3]
Cañada de Santa Anita	Yes
Cañada de la Gaviota	Yes
Cañada San Onofre	Negative obs.
Arroyo Hondo	Yes
Arroyo Quemado	Barrier[2]
Tajiguas Creek	Barrier
Cañada del Refugio	Negative obs.
Cañada del Venadito	Barrier
Cañada del Corral	Yes
Cañada del Capitan	Negative obs.
Las Llagas	Negative obs.
Gato Canyon	Not determined
Dos Pueblos Canyon	Yes
Eagle Canyon	Not determined
Tecolote Creek	Yes
Bell Canyon	Barrier
Goleta Slough Complex	Yes
Arroyo Burro	Yes
Mission Creek	Yes
Montecito Creek	Yes
Oak Creek	Barrier
San Ysidro Creek	Yes
Romero Creek	Yes
Arroyo Paredon	Yes
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Complex	Barrier
Carpinteria Creek	Yes
Rincon Creek	Yes

WATERSHED[1]	HISTORICALLY OCCUPIED[2]
Ventura River	Yes
Santa Clara River	Yes
Big Sycamore Canyon	Negative obs.
Arroyo Sequit	Yes
Solstice Creek	Yes
Malibu Creek	Yes
Topanga Canyon	Yes
Ballona Creek	Yes
Los Angeles River	Yes
San Gabriel River	Yes
Santa Ana River	Yes
San Juan Creek	Yes
San Mateo Creek	Yes
San Onofre Creek	Negative obs.
Santa Margarita River	Yes
San Luis Rey River	Yes
San Dieguito River	Yes
San Diego River	Yes
Sweetwater River	Yes
Otay River	Yes
Tijuana River	Yes

[1] A watershed includes all of the tributaries and main-stem which share a common outlet to the ocean.
[2] Data from: Becker, *et al. 2008,* Boughton *et al. (2005),* Sleeper *(2002),* Titus *et al. (2010),* M. Larson, California Department of Fish and Game, personal communication (2007-2011).
[3] "Negative obs." means juveniles were not observed during a spot-check of best-occurring summer habitat in 2002; however, such spot observations should not be interpreted as definitive determinants of absence of O. mykiss. "Dry" indicates the stream had no discharge in anadromous reaches during the summer of 2002; because of the high variability of the hydrologic regime, such spot-checks do not necessarily reflect the potential suitability of such reaches for migration, spawning, or rearing of *O. mykiss*. "Barrier" indicates that all over-summering habitat was determined to be above an anthropogenic barrier, believed to be impassable, and therefore steelhead were not expected to be present; however, such an assumption may not be warranted since rearing juvenile steelhead can make use of ephemeral reaches (Boughton *et al. 2009).* See Boughton *et al. (2005)*.

Several reports describe the historical steelhead populations of the SCS Recovery Planning Area (Boughton *et al*. 2005, Boughton and Goslin 2006, Boughton *et al*. 2006). Using this information, the TRT proposed a structure for steelhead of the SCS Recovery Planning Area composed of five BPGs (Table 2-2). The division of steelhead populations into Biogeographic Population Groups (BPG) utilized two basic rules: First, populations were sorted into a coastal super-group and an inland super-group, based on whether or not the most potential freshwater habitats lay on an ocean-facing watershed subject to marine-based climate inversion and orographic (*i.e.,* lifting) precipitation from offshore weather systems. Second, within the coastal and inland super-groups, populations were sorted into groups defined by contiguous areas with broadly similar physical geography and hydrology. The combinations of these physical characteristics represent differing natural selective regimes for steelhead populations utilizing the individual watersheds. These differing physical characteristics have led to life history and genetic adaptations that can enable the populations to persist in the widely varying and distinctive habitat regimes represented by the five BPGs. The purpose of delineating the BPGs is to guide recovery efforts across the SCS Recovery Planning Area to ensure the preservation and recovery of the range of natural diversity of the SCS Recovery Planning Area. From north to south, these BPGs are known as: Monte Arido Highlands, Conception Coast, Santa Monica Mountains, Mojave Rim, and Santa Catalina Gulf Coast (Figure 2-5).

Table 2-2. Ecological characteristics of BPGs in the Southern California steelhead Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area(originally Table 4 in Boughton *et al*. 2007b).

Southern California Steelhead ESU					
	Ecological Characteristics				
Population Group	**Migration Corridor**	**Migration reliability**	**Summer Climate Refugia[1]**	**Intermittent Streams**	**Winter Precipitation**
Monte Arido Highlands	Long alluvial valleys	Moderate/Low	Montane	Many	60 – 75 cm (highlands)
Conception Coast	Coastal terrace	Moderate	Marine	Many	30 – 60 cm
Santa Monica Mountains	Short, steep	Low	Marine	Many	30 – 60 cm
Mojave Rim	Long alluvial valleys	Very Low	Montane	Many	75 – 135 cm (highlands)
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	Coastal terrace & mesas	Low	Marine	Many	Mostly < 75cm

[1] Marine and Montane-influenced refugia refers to habitats influenced by climate, rather than the habitat type itself; marine climate influence encompasses inland habitats in the Conception Coast, Santa Monica Mountains, and Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPGs.

The separate watersheds comprising each BPG are generally considered as individual *O. mykiss* populations (*i.e.,* one watershed = one population of steelhead). Thus, single BPGs encompass multiple watersheds and multiple *O. mykiss* populations. However, many coastal watersheds in several of the BPGs (*e.g.,* Conception Coast, Santa Monica Mountains) are relatively small, and may be capable of supporting only small steelhead runs. The basis for the persistence of independent steelhead populations in these small watersheds is uncertain and further research is needed. (See Chapter 14, Southern California Steelhead Research, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management). The TRT (Boughton *et al.* 2007b) proposed that at least three scenarios (not necessarily mutually exclusive) are plausible:

1. Some of the populations in the coastal BPGs, though small, may be exceptionally stable and sustain the continued presence of steelhead in neighboring watersheds via adult dispersal between watersheds (an independent population supporting one or more dependent populations, thus forming a metapopulation).
2. Adult dispersal between neighboring watersheds within a coastal BPG may be common enough to knit together the steelhead in individual watersheds into a small number of "trans-watershed" populations (an independent population comprised of the fish from two or more neighboring streams, thus forming a metapopulation).
3. The populations in the smaller coastal BPGs (*e.g.,* Conception Coast or Santa Monica Mountains BPG) may be dependent upon occasional or frequent adult dispersal pulses from populations in the larger inland BPGs (*e.g.,* Monte Arido BPG).



Figure 2-5. Biogeographic Population Groups (BPGs) in the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area (after Boughton *et al*. 2007b).

In characterizing the historic, pre-European settlement population structure of the SCS Recovery Planning Area, the TRT: 1) identified the original anadromous *O. mykiss* populations and attempted to determine which ones were still extant; 2) delineated the potential unimpaired geographic extent of each population on a watershed scale; 3) estimated the relative potential viability of each population in its (hypothetical) unimpaired state; and 4) assessed the potential demographic independence of each population in its (hypothetical) unimpaired state Boughton and Goslin 2006, Boughton *et al.* 2006, Helmbrecht and Boughton 2005). This analysis entailed a consideration of available historical and current data on the distribution and abundance of *O. mykiss*, new genetic data, landscape data, climate data, and stream discharge data. However, data limitations, particularly a lack of long-term run-size data, prevented the TRT from providing definitive characterizations of pre-European or current anadromous *O. mykiss* populations, including the geographic extent of individual populations, their intrinsic viability, or demographic independence. For a discussion of the constraints imposed by limited relevant data see Boughton and Goslin (2006) and Boughton *et al*. (2006). See Appendix B, Watershed Intrinsic Potential Rankings, Appendix C, Composition of SCS Recovery Planning Area Steelhead BPGs.

2.3 SPECIES ABUNDANCE

One of the recovery objectives for steelhead is to increase abundance of steelhead, including the expression of all life history forms and strategies. Current documented population abundances are extremely small; but the run size for most watersheds continues to be poorly characterized. Additionally, the presence of steelhead in watersheds is often sporadic. The status of steelhead populations along the West Coast was assessed in 1996 by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Biological Review Team (BRT) (Busby *et al*. 1996). The status of the DPS was subsequently reviewed in 2005 (Good *et al.* 2005, Helmbrecht and Boughton 2005), and again in 2011 (Williams *et al*. 2011). The following summarizes the findings from these status reviews:

The steelhead populations in this region have declined dramatically from estimated annual runs totaling between 32,000 and 46,000 adults to less than 500 total adults (Busby *et al*. 1996). However, this run-size estimate is based on information from only four major watersheds bearing steelhead (Santa Ynez River, Ventura River, Santa Clara River, and Malibu Creek) located in the northern portion of the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Run-size estimates from coastal and inland watersheds south of the Los Angeles Watershed have generally not been estimated or recorded. Additionally, available run-size estimates represent only average annual estimates, and do not describe the wide annual variation in run-size that would be expected in a region with a highly variable climate and habitat conditions (see for example, Alagona *et al.* 2011 and Entrix Inc. 1995). Quantitative estimates of historic runs in the SCS Recovery Planning Area are based largely on observations made by CDFG personnel. No long term (20+ years) time-series data are available for any of the populations within this Recovery Planning Area. Since the listing of southern California steelhead, there have been increased efforts made to make periodic observations of adults as well as more systematic monitoring on a few watersheds with recently constructed fish passage facilities or active restoration efforts. For example, the Robles Diversion on the Ventura River (Casitas Municipal Water District 2010, 2009, 2008, 2007, 2006, 2005), the Vern Freeman Diversion on the Santa Clara River (United Water Conservation District 2010a, 2009, 2008, 2007), the lower Santa Ynez River (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation 2011, Santa Ynez River Adaptive Management

Committee 2009, Engblom 2003a, Engblom 2001), and Arroyo Sequit, Malibu and Topanga Creeks (Dagit and Krug 2011, Dagit *et al.* 2009, Dagit *et al.* 2007, Dagit and Abramson 2007, Dagit and Reagan 2006, Dagit *et al.* 2004a).

In summary, while a majority of watersheds historically supporting *O. mykiss* are still occupied (often with individuals currently able to express only a resident life history strategy), steelhead run sizes have been sharply reduced. The four watersheds historically exhibiting the largest annual anadromous runs (*i.e.*, Santa Ynez, Ventura, Santa Clara, and Malibu Creek) have experienced declines in run size of 90 percent or more. Present population trends within individual watersheds that continue to support steelhead runs are generally unknown, and may vary widely between watersheds. Available run-size estimates for all watersheds represent only average annual estimates that likely include wide annual variations expected in a region with a highly variable climate. However, these averages are extremely small, and raise the question of how such small runs of anadromous fish persist (potentially either by dispersal from some source population, and/or by consistent production of smolts by local populations of freshwater, non-anadromous *O. mykiss*. The consensus of the most current BRT was that the status of the Southern California Steelhead DPS has not changed appreciably in either direction since publication of the initial status review (Busby *et al.* 1996), and that Southern California Steelhead DPS is still in danger of extinction (Williams *et al*. 2011).

2.4 SPECIES GENETIC STRUCTURE AND DIVERSITY

A recovery objective for steelhead is to restore and conserve genetic diversity and interchange of genetic material between and within populations. Since the late 1990s, a number of genetic studies have been conducted to elucidate the structure of *O. mykiss* populations within the SCS Recovery Planning Area (Martìnez, *et al.* 2011, Clemento *et al.* 2009, Pearse and Garza 2009, Clemento and Garza 20007, Garza and Clemento 2007, Girman and Garza 2006, Greenwald and Compton 2005, Nielsen *et al*. 2005, 2003, 1997). These studies have provided useful insights into the historic distribution of the species, as well as the potential influence of past (and current) stocking practices within the watersheds historically occupied by native *O. mykiss*. Berg and Gall (1988) surveyed steelhead populations throughout California, including a small number of populations from the SCS Recovery Planning Area. They discovered considerable variability among California populations, but did not discern a clear geographic pattern to the variation. Busby *et al.* (1996) also reported a high level of genetic variability in California coastal populations, including four from the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Busby *et al.* (1996) also reported an allozyme allele fixed in some populations but entirely absent in others, which is unprecedented in anadromous salmonids, except when comparing populations at the extreme ends of their ranges.

Recent genetic investigations have shed light on the relationship between steelhead and the *O. mykiss* above barriers within the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Girman and Garza (2006) and Clemento *et al.* (2009) reported that above-barrier *O. mykiss* were more closely associated with below-barrier populations than to populations from other watersheds; that they were more related to the fish below the barrier than to any other geographically proximate populations. In addition, their results supported the idea that planted hatchery fish from other watersheds have had no detectable influence on the genetics of above-barrier populations. These results indicate that the above-barrier populations are not the descendants of hatchery fish. They are most likely the descendants of contiguous *O. mykiss* populations, because most of these areas have historical accounts of

steelhead populations prior to construction of the barriers (Becker *et al.* 2008, Swift *et al.* 1993, Benke 1992, Hubbs 1946, Culver and Hubbs 1917, Jordan and Gilbert 1881). While the fish that remain above barriers do not have an opportunity to interbreed with adult steelhead, they can, and in some cases do, produce progeny that emigrate downstream past the barriers to the ocean as smolts.

Two recent genetics studies of *O. mykiss* in the Santa Ynez River reached similar conclusions: 1) the spatial genetic structure of the Santa Ynez River watershed was similar to most other coastal watersheds; 2) the estimated effective population size [1] in two tributaries varied between approximately 25-50 individuals; 3) there were significant differences between populations from four sub-watersheds (Salsipuedes, Juncal, Santa Cruz, and Hilton Creeks); and 4) all four populations (two below and two above barriers to anadromy) are primarily of coastal ancestry, and not the progeny of stocked resident *O. mykiss* (Clemento *et al*. 2009, Garza and Clemento 2007).

2.5 HABITAT CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA STEELHEAD RECOVERY PLANNING AREA

The major steelhead bearing watersheds in the SCS Recovery Planning Area include the Santa Maria, Santa Ynez, Ventura, and Santa Clara Rivers (Good *et al*. 2005, Busby *et al*. 1996,). South of the Santa Monica Bay, several major drainages and a number of smaller streams also supported runs of anadromous *O. mykiss* (of unknown size and frequency); these include the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, Santa Ana, Santa Margarita, San Luis Rey, San Dieguito, San Diego, Sweetwater Rivers, and San Juan and San Mateo Creeks (Titus *et al*. 2010, Swift *et al.* 1993).

Significant portions of the upper watersheds within the SCS Recovery Planning Area are contained within four U.S. National Forests (Los Padres, Angeles, Cleveland, and San Bernardino National Forests). These forests are managed primarily for water production and recreation, with limited grazing and oil, gas, and mineral production (United States Forest Service, 2005a, 2005b, 2004, Berg *et al*. 2004, Stephenson and Calcarone 1999). Additionally, a significant amount of land within the SCS Recovery Planning Area is protected within military installations, and in the southern portions, within large scale regional parks. Urban development is centered in coastal areas and inland valleys, with the most expansive and densest urban development located within the Los Angeles Basin. Coastal valleys, and some foothills, are extensively developed with agriculture, principally row-crops, citrus and fruit trees, and vineyards (Kier Associates 2008b, Hunt & Associates 2008a, Keeley 1993, Hornbeck 1983; Lantis *et al*. 1981, Lockmann 1981).

The SCS Recovery Planning Area is comprised of geologically young mountainous topography with a number of inland valleys and coastal terraces. The geomorphology (*i.e.,* the shape and composition of the land surface) is strongly influenced by tectonic activity and various other signs of stress (*e.g.,* highly folded and faulted rocks of varying types), including metamorphic formations (*i.e.,* rocks that have changed under pressure and heat over time). Sedimentary formations (*i.e.,* formations comprised of sediment deposited out of the air, ice, and/or water flows) are characteristics in the Transverse Ranges, and metamorphic-granite formations (*i.e.,* igneous rock formed from cooled magma)

[1] The effective population size (N_e) can be generally thought of as the number of individuals that contribute offspring to the next generation, and is generally smaller than the absolute population size (N). It is a basic parameter in many models in population genetics.

in the southern Peninsular Ranges. The legacy of tectonic activity and other physical stresses has created the steep slopes and unconsolidated rock formations that characterize this region. These geologic factors combined with an active, annual fire-cycle and intense winter storms have created spatially complex and frequently unstable river and stream habitats to which anadromous fishes and other aquatic species have adapted through evolutionary processes (Boughton *et al*. 2006, Sugihara *et al.* 2006, Norris 2003, Norris and Webb 1990, Faber *et al*. 1989, Endler 1986, 1977, Bailey 1966, Felton 1965, Mayr 1963).

The SCS Recovery Planning Area is characterized by ten broad native terrestrial plant communities within the Californian floristic province: Estuarine Wetlands, Beach and Dunes, Riparian Forests, Coastal Prairie, Coastal Sage Scrub, Oak Woodlands, Chaparral, Valley Grasslands, Vernal Pools, and Southern California Conifer Forests (Barbour, *et al*. 2007, Ferren *et al*. 1995, Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf 1995, Hickman 1993, Munz 1974,). Upland areas of the northern portion of the SCS Recovery Planning Area are dominated by a mix of Chaparral, Valley Grasslands, Oak Woodlands, and Southern California Conifer Forests. Upland areas of the southern portion of the SCS Recovery Planning Area are dominated by Southern Coastal Scrub, Valley Grassland, Oak Woodland, and Southern California Conifer Forests. Both of these upland areas are subject to catastrophic wildfires (Sugihara *et al.* 2006, Keeley 2006). Riparian forests consist of deciduous species. Large segments of the valley grasslands and riparian forests have been converted for agricultural, residential, and a variety of other commercial land-uses (Berg *et al*. 2004, California Department of Fish and Game 2003, Stephenson and Calcarone 1999, Holland 1996, Kreissman 1991, Mayer and Laundenslayer 1988, Warner and Hendrix 1984, Capelli and Stanley 1984). However, the interior uplands within the four U.S. National Forests are largely undeveloped, and a number of large parks, preserves, and greenbelts have been created in recent years on non-Federal lands.

The climate in the California floristic province is Mediterranean, with long dry summers and short, sometimes intense cyclonic winter storms. Rainfall is restricted almost exclusively to the winter months (December through March), though the extreme southern portion of the SCS Recovery Planning Area is subject to occasional summer storms originating from the Gulf of California. The California floristic province is subject to an El Niño/La Niña weather cycle which can significantly affect winter precipitation, causing highly variable rainfall between years. Additionally, there is a wide disparity between winter rainfall from north to south, as well as between coastal plains and inland mountainous areas. Mean annual precipitation ranges along the coast (north to south) from 32 to 24 centimeters (cm) per year, with larger variations (24-90 cm/year) from the coast inland (west to east) due to the orographic effects of the various mountain ranges. Fog along the coastal areas is typical in late spring and summer, extending inland along coastal reaches with valleys extending into the interior. This fog has been shown to moderate conditions for rearing *O. mykiss* in these lower, coastal reaches. Southern California also experiences seasonally high, down slope winds during the early fall and winter that blow through the mountain passes of southern California. These winds, which can reach 40 miles per hour, are warm and dry and can severely exacerbate brush or forest fires, especially under drought conditions (Mastrandrea *et al*. 2009, Miller and Schlegel 2006, Haston and Michaelsen 1997, Philander 1990, Leipper 1994, Ryan and Burch 1992, Hornbeck 1983, Karl 1979, Bailey 1966, Felton 1965).

River flows vary greatly between seasons, and can be highly "flashy" (rapidly increased flows with high volume but short duration) during the winter season, changing by several orders of

magnitude over a few hours in response to winter storms. Snow accumulation is generally small and of short duration, and does not contribute to peak run-off in most years. Baseflows in some river reaches can be influenced significantly by groundwater stored and transported through faults and fractured rock formations. Many rivers and streams naturally exhibit interrupted baseflow patterns (alternating channel reaches with and without perennial surface flow) controlled by geologic formations, and a strongly seasonal precipitation pattern characteristic of a Mediterranean climate. Water temperatures are generally highest during summer months, but can be locally controlled by springs, seeps, and rising groundwater, creating micro-aquatic conditions suitable for salmonids (Boughton, *et al*. 2007a, Harrison *et al*. 2005, Faber *et al.* 1989, Mount 1995, Jacobs 1993, Reid and Wood 1976).

Within the SCS Recovery Planning Area steelhead habitat occurs in chaparral ecosystems which differ in significant ways from steelhead habitats found in snow-fed and/or conifer-lined ecosystems in the Sierra Nevada or North and Central Coasts of California. From the perspective of steelhead ecology, it is useful to divide these chaparral ecosystems which dominate the SCS Recovery Planning Area into two categories: coastal basins draining directly westward into the ocean, and inland basins set back from the coast, often separated from it by extensive mountain ranges. The inland basins are relatively few, large, and have a terrestrial climate whereas the coastal basins tend to be small, numerous and a heavily marine-influenced climate. These differences (and others that result from them, such as the reliability of suitable summer temperatures) likely impose different sorts of limiting factors on steelhead populations. Coastal basins are often characterized by a "mountain-terrace" system, in which a broad coastal terrace is backed by a steeper mountain range. These types of systems occur along the southern coast of Santa Barbara County, in some parts of the Santa Monica Mountains, and much of the coast of Orange and San Diego Counties. The mountains harvest orographic rain from incoming storm systems, creating flashy streamflows that carve out well-shaded step-pool systems in the uplands, and braided gravel-bed streams and pool-riffle systems in the terraces. They also produce seasonal lagoons at the interface of the stream with the ocean. Each of these parts of the stream system produces habitat for a particular life stage of steelhead. Due to the movement of water, sediment and fish, stream systems function as integrated wholes with steelhead acting as effective strategists using the entire suite of resources provided them by the coastal and inland basins of the SCS Recovery Planning Area.

2.6 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA STEELHEAD FRESHWATER LIFE CYCLE HABITAT USE

Steelhead spend a majority of their life in the ocean, but must enter freshwater to reproduce. Understanding the interaction between steelhead and their freshwater habitats is critical for effective steelhead recovery and management. Many of the naturally limiting factors described in this section that affect the growth and survival of juvenile steelhead in their freshwater phase are exacerbated by the artificial modification freshwater habitats and watershed processes that create and sustain these habitats. The freshwater habitats used by steelhead within the SCS Recovery Planning Area occur in two types of watersheds featuring distinctly different environmental regimes. One type is the series of rivers that flow through hot inland valleys and cut through coastal ranges to the sea. These watersheds have warm seasonal climates and are in coastal rain shadows. The other freshwater habitats are the small, steep coastal watersheds with higher rainfall, lower

air temperatures, and a greater proportion of perennial streams (Boughton *et al*. 2006, Boughton *et al.* 2007b).

The *O. mykiss* life cycle can be conceptualized as a biological network in which environmental opportunities can be represented as a set of linkages:



Figure 2-6. Southern California *O. mykiss* Life Cycle Habitat Linkages (Schwing *et al.* 2010, after Boughton).

The sequence of habitats required for the fish to complete the egg-to-egg life cycle involves a series of linkages, the loss of any of which prevents the completion of the life cycle. While serial linkages are a source of vulnerability, some of the linkages can be realized through alternative pathways: for example, over-summering in different sorts of thermal refugia, such as tributary headwaters or seasonal lagoons/estuaries next to the ocean; or maturation in freshwater versus the ocean. These alternative pathways in the network increase the resilience of the population to extirpation, because if one pathway fails in a particular year, some members of the population can still complete their life cycle by pursuing an alternative pathway.

The following provides a more detailed discussion of the freshwater life cycle phases of steelhead and the environmental factors that control the successful transition between freshwater life cycle phases prior to entering the ocean life cycle phase (Schwing, *et al.* 2010, after Boughton, Boughton, *et al*. 2006).

Spawning Migration. Steelhead passage limitations arising from periodic drought (or longer term climate change) is one of the principal limiting factors affecting adult steelhead (Boughton *et al.* 2006). Steelhead are iteroparous (*i.e.*, can reproduce more than once), and, to realize the evolutionary benefits of repeat spawning, must have an opportunity to both enter and exit the stream system. The migration of steelhead into freshwater spawning and rearing streams is strongly associated with higher winter and spring flows which provide a continuous hydrological connection between the ocean and upstream spawning and rearing habitats. Some large steelhead adults in this domain may remain in freshwater after spawning, and can become trapped in deep residual pools in the summer (see for example, Capelli 2007b, 2009). This sort of trapping is probably a function of the precise timing, duration, and magnitude of storms in a given

winter. Periodic droughts further constrain migration opportunities during dry periods, and may have a bigger effect on repeat-spawning, which requires both an in- and out-migration opportunity in a given year, followed by an in-migration opportunity a year or two later. Finally, spawning efforts may be abrogated by one or more successive high flow events following spawning that erodes the spawning redds and exposes or flushes recently laid eggs out of the redd, exposing them to predation, or terminating the incubation process prematurely.

Initial Spring Feeding. The development and hatching of *O. mykiss* eggs is controlled by temperature and dissolved oxygen, which is itself influenced by flow rates, ambient air temperature, riparian cover, and groundwater input. Following the hatching and emergence from spawning gravels juvenile *O. mykiss* (fry) either stay near the redds from which they were hatched and establish territories, or disperse to favorable feeding areas (Boughton *et al.* 2009, Quinn 2005). Rainfall and runoff conditions conducive to adult upstream migration and spawning are also conducive to initial rearing conditions for the first spring growth of juvenile steelhead. As flows drop later in the spring and summer, rearing fish may move out of initial rearing reaches, or may continue to reside in deeper pools, where they may be trapped between temporary dry reaches of stream channel until the following winter rains reconnect perennial reaches.

An increase in rearing temperatures, either as a result of inter-annual, seasonal variability or longer-term climatic changes will likely produce warmer conditions during early rearing. If temperatures stay below about 17^0 Celsius, a warming or an increase in week-scale variability of temperature can increase the growth rate of salmonids if food is abundant. But it would also increase metabolic demand and thus reduce growth if food is limiting (Boughton *et al*. 2007b, Smith and Li 1983, Brett 1971). Consequently, the effect of warmer conditions on growth is crucially dependent on per-capita food availability, which in turn depends on a host of other factors, such as primary productivity of the stream network, biomass of terrestrial insects caught in stream drift, and stream geomorphology as it affects the territorial dynamics of juvenile *O. mykiss*.

First Rearing Summer. The hot, rain-free summers of southern California require that juvenile *O. mykiss* retreat for the summer to sections of the stream network that do not dry up or overheat too much. Regionally, there are two alternative mechanisms for maintaining thermal refugia: the temperature lapse rate (*i.e.,* the decrease in temperature with an increase in altitude), which maintains cool, montane uplands, and the ocean heat sink, which maintains cool conditions proximate to the coast. In many small coastal basins, these two mechanisms merge geographically, whereas in inland basins the operation of these mechanisms may be separated by a long stretch of dry or warm channel that enforces a summer-long barrier to movement. Numerous tributaries draining various mountain ranges provide a high level of redundancy in the montane thermal refugia.

Probably as important as air temperature in maintaining cool water is protection from sunshine, which in summer is often the single biggest source of heat flux into a stream (Hannah *et al.* 2008, Evans *et al*. 1998). Wind effects can also be significant (Bogan *et al*. 2003). In coastal areas, fog and onshore winds provide shade and cooling wind, respectively. In the montane refugia, the closed tree canopy appears necessary to maintain suitably cool conditions (Leipper 1994, Boughton, unpublished data). Therefore, the resilience of montane thermal refugia to current inter-annual seasonal or longer-term climatic changes is probably highly dependent on the resilience of the closed tree canopy.

Mountain refuges appear more vulnerable than the coastal refuges to thermal increase (Snyder *et al*. 2002), perhaps because the latter are buffered by the ocean. An alteration of fire regime, flood regime, and/or sediment may eliminate the closed riparian canopy by burning trees, increasing the depth to the water table, or destroying trees via debris flows or floods (Bendix and Cowell 2010b, May and Gresswell 2004, Bendix and Hupp 2000, Bendix 1998). The water table can be lowered not just by increased sediment deposition, but also by decreased summer base flows, driven by lowered rainfall or greater evaporative demand of plants (Tague *et al*. 2009).

Lowered summer water tables may not just indirectly affect rearing juveniles via alteration of riparian trees; it may also affect the fish directly by reducing the summertime surface flow, and eliminating it entirely in dry parts of the rain shadow or in reaches with deep alluvium (*i.e.* response stream reaches). The gravel-bedded reaches used for spawning tend to have deep alluvium, and therefore can be especially vulnerable to loss of surface flow or incomplete riparian shading (Boughton *et al*. 2009). Timing is important for young-of-the-year development in gravel-bedded channels followed by retreat into "hydro-thermal" refugia once growth and size permits; large amounts of juvenile movement and stranding are commonly observed in southern California (see for example, Shapovalov 1944).

Groundwater inputs and heat-exchange with the channel-bed can serve to buffer daily and annual temperature fluctuations in a stream (Hannah *et al*. 2004, Tague *et al*. 2008). In a stable climate the ground stores heat seasonally (absorbing heat in summer and supplying heat in winter), but should have an annual net flux close to zero (Bogan *et al*. 2004). Decreased base flows during the summer may actually help the ground (channel-bed) buffer stream temperatures more effectively, by increasing the surface area of the bed-water interface, relative to the volume of water in the stream and the air-water surface area. The magnitude of such a buffering is not known, and would also probably shrink the amount of fish habitat and feeding opportunities for rearing juvenile fish.

The coastal thermal refugia are closely tied to the heat dynamics of the ocean and maritime air, and thus to the future pattern of seasonal upwelling and winds along the coast. Many tributaries and the lower sections of mainstems fall within the climatic influence of the marine inversion layer that develops in summertime. Except for the mainstems, many of these coastal streams also benefit thermally from the temperature lapse rate in the coastal mountains, as well as receiving large doses of orographic precipitation in the wintertime - the converse of the rain shadow-starved streams in more inland areas. This band of steelhead-hospitable coastal terrain is probably significantly more resilient to climate change than inland areas, and highly productive per unit of habitat. However, it is a very narrow band and so its total productivity may be limited.

Each stream system terminates at the coast with some type of estuary-lagoon system. In southern California, seasonal lagoons currently tend to form each summer when decreased streamflows allow marine processes to build a sand berm at the mouth of each system. Juvenile steelhead over-summer in these lagoons, where they often grow so rapidly that they can undergo smoltification at age 1 and enter the ocean large enough to experience enhanced survival to adulthood (Hayes *et al*. 2008, Bond 2006). Both effects should increase the resilience of the steelhead component of *O. mykiss*. In contrast, juveniles over-summering in some montane thermal refugia display very little or no growth during the summer (Sogard *et al*. 2009, Hayes *et al.* 2008, Boughton *et al*. 2007a, Bond 2006) .

Fall and Winter Feeding. Steelhead rearing ecology during the fall and winter is less documented, but likely is under fewer constraints than early life history or over-summering phases. Baseflows rebound in many creeks as the weather cools in September and October, and sections of channel that were dry during the summer months begin flowing again, even before the first rains of the fall. This is due to reduced evaporative demand by riparian plants. (Initial rainstorms of fall have relatively little effect on stream flows, as most precipitation gets absorbed into the ground). The cooling of the weather and the rebounding of baseflows releases over-summering fish that were trapped in small residual pools and thermal refugia, so that a relatively small number of fish potentially gain access to a large extent of stream habitat (Boughton *et al*. 2009).

In some areas of southern California, this time of the year is marked by peak emergence of aquatic arthropods and inputs into streams of terrestrial arthropods, suggesting the opening of increased feeding opportunities to the fish that survived the summer. Arthropod productivity appears sensitive to local geologic and vegetative factors (Rundio 2009), but where it occurs it may allow juvenile steelhead to transform relatively warm temperatures into opportunities for rapid growth (Rundio and Lindley 2008). If these opportunities occur in sparsely populated intermittent creeks, the conditions are conducive to potential rapid growth into large smolts.

The timing of these peaks of productivity and growth opportunities is likely to be modified by current inter-annual as well as longer climatic changes. Because warmer autumns would increase metabolic costs as well as well as scope for growth (Boughton *et al*. 2007a), the impact on *O. mykiss* growth and survival could be either negative or positive, depending on a sensitive balance of factors. Compared to fall feeding, winter-feeding and growth is presumably more constrained by cooler temperatures, less arthropod production, and disturbances associated with high-flow events.

Smolting and Outmigration. Intensive studies of steelhead populations in the redwood systems of Santa Cruz County indicate that most *O. mykiss* become smolts and migrate to the ocean at age 2 or 3, but a small proportion smolt at age 1 (Hayes *et al*. 2011, Sogard *et al*. 2009, Hayes *et al*. 2008, Shapovalov and Taft 1954). Since larger size at ocean entry greatly increases ocean survival (Hayes *et al*. 2008, Bond 2006, Ward *et al*. 1989), smolting at age 1 is probably only a viable strategy for fish that have achieved unusually rapid growth during their first year (Satterthwaite *et al*. 2009). Bond (2006) has shown that fish over-summering in lagoons can achieve such growth. It is possible that rapid growth can be achieved in other habitats as well (see for example, Moore 1980a), but most studies have shown growth to be slower in upland tributaries.

Quantitative data on growth and life history are not yet available for the chaparral and coastal terrace systems of the SCS Recovery Planning Area. It is likely that age at smolting of individual fish is based on locally adapted "decision rules", including also a "decision" as to whether to smolt at all versus maturing in freshwater. Local adaptation is likely to be dominated by a tradeoff between ocean mortality and the much greater fecundity that fish can realize by growing to a larger size in the ocean (Satterthwaite *et al*. 2009). Since ocean survival appears so strongly sensitive to size at ocean entry, the balance of anadromous versus freshwater-resident fish may be sensitive to juvenile growth rates. As noted above, warmer temperatures offer the possibility of either reducing or accelerating juvenile growth, depending on food availability, which itself may respond inter-annual and longer climatic effects on precipitation, riparian vegetation, and life

cycle patterns sensitive to temperature, and nonlinear food-web dynamics.

An increase in the frequency, intensity, or duration of multi-year droughts would further limit migration opportunities for smolts. Loss of surface flow appears to occur more commonly in the deep alluvium of downstream reaches rather than in headwater tributaries (Boughton *et al*. 2009). Additionally, the sandbar barriers at the mouths of estuaries sometimes fail to breach in dry years, so drought would probably have greater impacts on migrating smolts (and migrating adults) than on the *O. mykiss* maturing in headwater tributaries (Jacobs *et al*. 2011). The loss of opportunity would force a higher proportion of fish to adopt a freshwater-maturation strategy rather than the anadromous strategy. Since freshwater residents are significantly less fecund than steelhead, the resulting population would be less resilient to extirpation, and gene flow among populations by straying steelhead would also be reduced. All these outcomes would tend to reduce the capacity of *O. mykiss* populations to recover from and adapt to changing conditions.

Subsequent Years in Freshwater; Maturation in Freshwater. The majority of juvenile *O. mykiss* that do not smolt their first year must again cycle through stages of spring-feeding, over-summering, and fall and winter feeding, although at a larger body size. Most of these fish probably smolt at age 2 or 3 or adopt the freshwater-resident strategy, maturing and eventually spawning in a suitable section of the stream network; the proportions adopting these pathways (*i.e.,* either multiple pre-smolts rearing years or freshwater maturation and reproduction) are unknown and probably sensitive to both growth and survival at all stages of life history (Satterthwaite *et al*. 2009).

The over-summering stage probably poses the greatest constraints. Compared to young-of-the-year, older fish appear to require deeper water for over-summering (Spina 2007, Spina *et al.* 2005, Spina 2003, Spina and Johnson 1999), and thus may be more restricted to the parts of the watershed that provide well-shaded perennial pools of sufficient depth. These appear to be concentrated in headwater streams well-fed by orographic precipitation, where baseflows are stable, riparian canopies are relatively complete, and geomorphic processes produce an abundance of pools (Boughton *et al*. 2009, Harrison and Keller 2006). The pool-forming mechanisms in these uplands are highly variable, involving self-formation of step-pools, scour around large boulders that roll off hillsides, and rock outcrop which create force-pools.

The upland habitats used by older juvenile fish are a subset of the upland habitats used by the fish initially in their first summer. Consequently, vulnerabilities to repeated inter-annual seasonal changes (and longer-term climate changes) are similar to those described previously (*e.g*., loss of baseflow, loss of riparian cover). Additional factors influencing productivity of upland habitats relied upon by rearing fish for multiple years are: (1) a lower level of redundancy, due to the more restricted distribution of high-quality pool habitat; (2) the vulnerability of pools to being transiently filled by fine sediments following wildfires; and (3) the long-term robustness of step-pools and bedrock force-pools, which should tend to re-scour after being filled, and are presumably resilient to a broader range of conditions compared to the reaches further downstream (Chin *et al*. 2009, Montgomery and Buffington 1997).

In summary, while freshwater habitats provide important spawning and rearing opportunities to steelhead, the inherent instability of these habitats can limit productivity depending on the pre-smolting growth patterns of individual fish, the pattern of rainfall, run-off, and input of sediments from natural hill-slope and channel

erosion processes (accelerated, including its unique fish and wildlife resources by periodic wildfires).

3. Factors Leading to Federal Listing

"Steelhead on the west coast of the United States have experienced dramatic declines in abundance during the past several decades as a result of human-induced and natural factors. The scientific literature is replete with information documenting the decline of steelhead populations and anadromous salmonid habitats. There is no single factor solely responsible for this decline."

Factors for Decline: A Supplement to the Notice of Determination for West Coast Steelhead under the Endangered Species Act, 1996

3.0 INTRODUCTION

When evaluating a species for protection under the ESA, the law provides that the Secretary of Commerce must consider whether any one (or more) of five listing factors affect the species. Listing factors deal with those aspects of the species' biology or habitat that affect the level of threat to the species' continued persistence. The ESA requires that in developing recovery plans for listed species, each of the factors which contributed to the species' listing as threatened or endangered be addressed in the recovery actions identified in recovery plans.

The five listing factors are:

1. Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
2. Over-Utilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes
3. Disease and Predation
4. Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms
5. Other Natural or Human-Made Factors Affecting Continued Existence

NMFS' listing determinations regarding the SCR Recovery Planning Area (71 FR 834, January 5, 2006, 67 FR 21586, May 1, 2002, 62 FR 43937, August 18, 1997), and supporting technical reports (*e.g.*, Boughton *et al.* 2005, Good *et al.* 2005, Busby *et al.* 1996, National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a) have provided a detailed discussion of the factors affecting steelhead at the time of listing. There was no single factor responsible for the decline of southern California steelhead; however, of those factors identified, the destruction and modification of habitat and natural and man-made factors had been recognized as the primary causes for the decline of the Southern California Steelhead DPS.

This chapter summarizes the factors identified at the time of the listing of the species. All of these factors are still prevalent and widespread. As a result, there have been few changes to the factors affecting the species since the time of original listing. The following chapter, Chapter 4, discusses the current threats facing the Southern California Steelhead DPS and represents our current understanding of how the listing factors continue to affect the species.

3.1 FACTOR 1: Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification or Curtailment of Habitat or Range

Southern California steelhead declined in large part as a result of a wide variety of human activities, including, but not limited to, agriculture, mining, and urbanization activities that have resulted in the loss, degradation, simplification, and fragmentation of habitat. Water storage, withdrawal, conveyance, and diversions for agriculture, flood control, domestic, and hydropower purposes have greatly reduced or eliminated historically accessible habitat. Modification of natural flow regimes by dams and other water control structures have resulted in increased water temperatures, changes in fish community structures, depleted flow necessary for migration, spawning, rearing, flushing of sediments from spawning gravels, and reduced gravel recruitment. The substantial increase of impermeable surfaces as a result of urbanization (including roads) has also altered the natural flow regimes of rivers and streams, particularly in the lower reaches.

Lake Hodges, San Dieguito River

In addition to these indirect effects these structures have also resulted in increased direct mortality of adult and juvenile steelhead. Land-use activities associated with urban development, mining, agriculture, ranching, and recreation have significantly altered steelhead habitat quantity and quality. Associated impacts of these activities include: alteration of stream bank and channel morphology; alteration of ambient stream water temperatures; degradation of water quality; elimination of spawning and rearing habitats; fragmentation of available habitats; elimination of downstream recruitment of spawning gravels and large woody debris; removal of riparian vegetation resulting in increased stream bank erosion; and increased sedimentation input into spawning and rearing areas resulting in the loss of channel complexity, pool habitat, suitable gravel substrate, and large woody debris.

Flood Control Work – Ventura River

In addition, a significant percentage of estuarine habitats have been lost, with an average of 22 percent of estuarine habitat remaining across the SCS Recovery Planning Area. The condition of these remaining wetland habitats is largely degraded, with many wetland areas at continued risk of loss or further degradation. Although many historically harmful practices have been halted, much of the historical damage remains to be addressed, and the necessary restoration activities will likely require decades. Many of these threats are associated with most of the larger river systems such as the Santa Maria, Santa Ynez, Ventura, Santa Clara, Los Angeles, San Gabriel, Santa Ana, San Luis Rey, Santa Margarita, San Dieguito, and San Diego Rivers, and many also apply to the smaller coastal systems such as Malibu, San Juan, and San Mateo creeks (National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a).

Wetland Fill - Santa Ana River Estuary

3.2 FACTOR 2: Over-Utilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes

Steelhead populations traditionally supported an important recreational fishery throughout their range. Recreational angling for both winter adult steelhead and summer rearing juveniles was a popular sport in many coastal rivers and streams until the mid-1950s. Recreational angling in coastal rivers and streams for native steelhead increased the mortality of adults (which represent the current generation of brood stock) and juveniles (which represent the future generations of brood stock) and may have contributed to the decline of some naturally small populations but is not considered the principal cause for the decline of the species as a whole. During periods of decreased habitat availability (*e.g.*, drought conditions or summer low flow when fish are concentrated in freshwater habitats), the impacts of recreational fishing or harassment on native anadromous stocks have been heightened.

Until the listing of the Southern California Steelhead DPS as endangered, recreational angling for *O. mykiss* was permitted in all coastal drainages (and continues in areas above barriers, such as major dams, which are currently impassible to fish migrating upstream). Angling for both adults and juveniles in those portions of coastal rivers and streams accessible to anadromous runs from the ocean, with the notable exceptions of the Sisquoc River (including Manzana and Davy Brown Creeks) in Santa Barbara County, and the upper portions of the North Fork of Matilija Creek (including Bear Creek), and Sespe Creek above Alder Creek in Ventura County) has been eliminated through modification of the CDFG's angling regulations following the listing of the DPS as endangered in 1997. However, poaching or harassment remain potential forms of unauthorized take of southern California steelhead.

NMFS had previously concluded that recreational harvest is a limiting factor for Southern California steelhead (Good *et al.* 2005, Busby *et al.* 1996, National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a). Steelhead are not targeted in commercial fisheries. High seas driftnet fisheries in the past may have contributed slightly to a decline of this species in local areas, although steelhead are not targeted in commercial fisheries and reports of incidental catches are rare. Commercial fisheries are not believed to be principally responsible for the large declines in abundance observed along most of the Pacific coast over the past several decades. Sport and commercial harvest of steelhead in the ocean is prohibited by CDFG (California Department of Fish and Game 2011a).

3.3 FACTOR 3: Disease and Predation

Infectious disease is one of many factors that can influence adult and juvenile steelhead survival. Specific diseases such as bacterial kidney disease, Ceratomyxosis, Columnaris, Furunculosis, infectious hematopoietic necrosis, redmouth and black spot disease, Erythrocytic Inclusion Body Syndrome, and whirling disease among others are present and are known to affect steelhead and salmon (Noga 2000, Wood 1979, Rucker *et al*. 1953). Very little current or historical information exists to quantify changes in infection levels and mortality rates attributable to these diseases for steelhead. Warm water temperatures, in some cases can

contribute to the spread of infectious diseases (Belchik *et al.* 2004, Stocking and Bartholomew 2004). However, studies have shown that native fish tend to be less susceptible to pathogens than hatchery cultured and reared fish (Buchanan *et al*. 1983).

Introductions of non-native aquatic species (including fishes and amphibians) and habitat modifications (*e.g.*, reservoirs, altered flow regimes, *etc*.) have resulted in increased predator populations in numerous river systems, thereby increasing the level of predation experienced by native salmonids (National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a). Non-native species, particularly fishes and amphibians such as large and smallmouth basses and bullfrogs have been introduced and spread widely. These species can prey upon rearing juvenile steelhead (and their conspecific resident forms), compete for living space, cover, and food, and act as vectors for non-native diseases (Marks *et al.* 2010, Scott and Gill 2008, Fritts and Pearsons 2006, Bonar *et al.* 2005, Dill and Cordone 1997).

Juvenile Redeye Bass—Santa Margarita River

Artificially induced summer low-flow conditions may also benefit non-native species, exacerbate spread of diseases, and permit increased avian predation. NMFS concluded that the information available on these impacts to steelhead did not suggest that the DPS was in danger of extinction, or likely to become so in the foreseeable future, because of disease or predation. It is recognized, however, that small populations such as southern California steelhead can be more vulnerable to extinction through the synergistic effects of other threats, and the role of disease or predation may be heightened under conditions of periodic low flows or high temperatures characteristic of steelhead habitats within the SCS Recovery Planning Area.

Finally, the introduction of a variety of non-native plant and animal species can alter ecosystems and related food-webs in complicated and subtle ways that can have unpredictable, long term impacts on native organisms (Cucherousset and Olden 2011, Davis 2009, Lockwood *et al*. 2007, Bonar 2005, Sax *et al.* 2005, Bossard 2008, Gamradt *et al.* 1997, Gamradt and Kats 1996, Williamson 1966, Elton 1958).

3.4 FACTOR 4: Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

3.4.1 Federal Mechanisms

At the time of listing, several principal federal regulatory and planning mechanisms affected the conservation of steelhead populations within the SCS Recovery Planning Area (National Marine Fisheries Service 1996b, 1997a). These included: 1) land management practices within the four U.S. National Forests within the CSS Recovery Planning Area (Los Padres, Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland); 2) the regulation of dredging and the placement of fill within the waters of the United States by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) through the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Program; 3) the regulation of dredging and the placement of fill within the waters of the United States through the CWA section 401 water quality certification regulations; 4) the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) administration of a Flood Insurance Program which strongly influences the development in waterways and floodplains; and 5) inadequate implementation of the CWA sections

303(d)(1)(C) and (D) to protect beneficial uses associated with aquatic habitats, including fishery resources, particularly with respect to non-point sources of pollution (including increased sedimentation from routine maintenance and emergency flood control activities within the active channel and floodplain).

For example, the USACE's program is implemented through the issuance of a variety of Individual, Nationwide and Emergency permits. Permitted activities should not "cause or contribute to significant degradation of the waters of the United States." A variety of factors, including inadequate staffing, training, and in some cases regulatory limitations on land uses (e.g., agricultural activities) and policy direction, resulted in ineffective protection of aquatic habitats important to migrating, spawning, or rearing steelhead. The deficiencies of the current program are particularly acute during large-scale flooding events, such as those associated with El Niño conditions, which can put additional strain on the administration of the CWA Section 404 and 401programs.

Similarly, the National Flood Insurance Program regulations allow for development in the margins of active waterways if they are protected against 100-year flood events, and do not raise the water elevations within the active channel (floodway) more than one foot during such flood events. This standard does not adequately reflect the dynamic, mobile nature of watercourses in southern California, and the critical role that margins of active waterways (riparian areas) play in the maintenance of aquatic habitats. In addition, FEMA programs for repairing flood related damages (Public Assistance Program, Individual and Households Program, and Hazard Mitigation Grant Program) promote the replacement of damaged facilities and structures in their original locations, which are prone to repeated damage from future flooding, and thus lead to repeated disturbance of riparian and aquatic habitats important to migrating, spawning, or rearing steelhead.

3.4.2 Non-Federal Mechanisms

At the time of listing, several principal non-federal regulatory and planning mechanisms affected the conservation of steelhead populations within the SCS Recovery Planning Area (National Marine Fisheries Service 1997a, 1996b). These included: 1) administration of the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) water rights permitting system which controls utilization of waters for beneficial uses throughout the state; 2) state and local government permitting programs for land uses on non-federal and non-state owned lands; 3) administration of the Fish and Game Code Sections 1600-1603 (Streambed Alteration Agreements) program and 5957-5937 (regulation of dams); and 4) the lack of a Coast-Wide Anadromous Fish Monitoring Plan for California to inform regulatory actions such as angling restrictions. For example, the SWRCB water rights permitting system contains provisions (including public trust provisions) for the protection of instream aquatic resources. However, the system does not provide an adequate regulatory mechanism to implement the CDFG Code Sections 5935-5937 requirements for the owner of any dam to protect fish populations below impoundments. Currently the SWRCB's administrative policy implementing California Water Code Section 1294.4 applies only to northern California counties. Additionally, SWRCB generally lacks the effective oversight and regulatory authority over groundwater development comparable to surface water developments for out-of-stream beneficial uses.

The Section 1600 Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreements program is the principal mechanism through which the CDFG provides protection of riparian and aquatic habitats. Inadequate funding, staffing levels, training and administrative support have led to inconsistent implementation of this program, resulting in inadequate protection of riparian and aquatic

habitats important to migrating, spawning and rearing steelhead.

Additionally, within the SCS Recovery Planning Area there is limited institutional organization specifically dedicated to steelhead recovery planning and implementation. Currently, the principal entities include the Tri-Counties Fish Team (which covers Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo Counties), South Coast Habitat Restoration (which covers Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties), the south coast Chapter of Trout Unlimited (which covers the area south of Los Angeles), and the state-wide organization, CalTrout (which has a Southern California area office); other portions of the SCS Recovery Planning Area are the focus of attention of individuals, watershed groups, or agencies with broader responsibilities or interests.

Finally, monitoring of stocks (particularly annual run-sizes) is essential to assess the current and future status of individual populations and the DPS as a whole, as well as to develop basic ecological information of the steelhead populations of the SCS Recovery Planning Area. However, the Coast-Wide Anadromous Fish Monitoring Plan remains unfinished and funding for its implementation has not been identified and secured.

3.5 FACTOR 5: Other Natural or Human-Made Factors Affecting Continued Existence

This factor category encompasses two specific threats to the species identified at the time of listing: 1) environmental variability and 2) stocking programs. Similar to the other listing factors, these threats persist and recent information about environmental variability, including the effects of ocean conditions on the survival of salmonid populations and increases in wildfire occurrence and severity, indicate that the threat from "environmental variability" can be expected to increase. The current and future threat to species recovery from environmental variation is further discussed in Chapter 4, Current DPS-Level Threats Assessment, and 5, Southern California Steelhead and Climate Change.

3.5.1 Environmental Variability

Variability in natural environmental conditions has both masked and exacerbated the problems associated with degraded and altered riverine and estuarine habitats. Floods and persistent drought conditions have periodically reduced naturally limited spawning, rearing, and migration habitats.

Southern California Wildfires (Courtesy NASA)

Furthermore, El Nino events and periods of unfavorable ocean-climate conditions can threaten the survival of steelhead populations already reduced to low abundance levels due to the loss and degradation of freshwater and estuarine habitats. However, periods of favorable ocean productivity and high marine survival can temporarily offset poor habitat conditions elsewhere and result in dramatic increases in population abundance and productivity by increasing the size and correlated fecundity of returning adults (National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a).

3.5.2 Stocking Programs

There are no steelhead hatcheries operating in or supplying hatchery reared steelhead to the SCS Recovery Planning Area. However, there is an extensive stocking program of hatchery cultured and reared, non-anadromous *O. mykiss* which supports a "put-and-take" fishery that is stocked for removal by anglers. These stockings are now

generally conducted in non-anadromous waters although other non-native game species such as large and smallmouth bass and bullhead catfish are stocked into anadromous waters by a variety of public and private entities (California Department of Fish and Game and Fish and Wildlife Service 2010, Entrix Inc. 2004b, Sleeper 2002, Leitritz 1970). Nevertheless, fish may enter anadromous waters during spillage at dams.

Fillmore Fish Hatchery—Catchable Rainbow Trout

While these programs have provided seasonal fishing opportunities, the impacts of these programs on native, naturally-reproducing steelhead stocks is the subject of considerable discussion and active research (Berejikian 2011, Chilcote 2011, Tatara *et al.* 2011a, 2011b, Fraser 2008, Meyers *et al.* 2004, California Department of Fish and Game and National Marine Fisheries Service 2001).

Competition, genetic introgression and disease transmission resulting from hatchery introductions may have the potential to reduce the production and survival of native, naturally-reproducing steelhead (Chilcote 2011, Hayes *et al.* 2004, Meyers *et al*. 2004). However, genetic investigations of southern California steelhead have not detected any substantial interbreeding of native with hatchery reared *O. mykiss* (Abadia-Cardoso *et al*. 2011, Christie *et al*. 2011, Clemento *et al.* 2009, Garza and Clemento 2007, Girman and Garza 2006, Greenwald 2005).

Stocking to support recreational angling within the SCS Recovery Planning Area are now generally conducted in non-anadromous waters, though fish in some cases may escape into anadromous waters (California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2010). Collection of native steelhead for hatchery broodstock purposes has the potential harm small or dwindling natural populations. However, artificial propagation can also, in some situations, play an important role in steelhead recovery through, among other means, preservation of individuals representing genetic resources which would otherwise be lost as a result of local extirpations. See Chapter 7, Steelhead Recovery Strategy, and Chapter 8, Summary of DPS-Wide Recovery Actions.

4. Current DPS-Level Threats Assessment

"A widespread trend observed in this Steelhead Recovery Planning Area is severe to very severe degradation of habitat conditions along the mainstems of impaired watersheds, while the upper mainstem and tributaries retain relatively high habitat values for steelhead."

Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area: Threats Assessment
Hunt & Associates 2008

4.0 INTRODUCTION

Anadromous *O. mykiss* in southern California face significant threats from water and land management practices that have degraded or curtailed freshwater and estuarine habitats, reducing the capability of the species to persist within most watersheds (Moyle *et al.* 2011, 2008). Extensive agricultural development in two northern Biogeographic Population Groups (Monte Arido Highlands and Conception Coast) and urban development in two southern Biogeographic Population Groups (Mojave Rim and Santa Catalina Gulf Coast) have significantly modified and degraded major steelhead-bearing watersheds, particularly their mainstems and estuarine habitats. In addition, given the current status of the species and the degraded condition of many freshwater and estuarine ecosystems, the persistence and recovery of the species may be further threatened by shifts in climatic and oceanographic conditions. See Chapter 5, Southern California Steelhead and Climate Change.

Table 4-1 summarizes the top-ranked[1] sources of threats across the SCS Recovery Planning Area. These were identified as part of the threats assessment performed for watersheds within each BPG. The threat sources with a "very high" or "high" severity ranking within the largest percentage of the watersheds within the SCS Recovery Planning Area were dams and surface water diversions, wildfires, and groundwater extraction. Urban development, levees and channelization, and other passage barriers also affect a large percentage of steelhead watersheds in the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Finally, while not captured in the threats assessment process that ranked the threats by threat source categories associated with Biogeographic Population Groups, the impacts of environmental variability, including projected changes in precipitation patterns and the consequences of fluctuations in ocean conditions play a significant role in the persistence and recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS; these and are dealt with in Section 4.2.6 and Chapter 5, Southern California Steelhead and Climate Change.

This chapter provides an introduction to the threats assessment process and summarizes the results of NMFS' threats assessment at the DPS level. Summaries of the threats posed to

[1] Threat sources were ranked in terms of the level of contribution and irreversibility of the stressors emanating from the threat source. See Appendix D for further information.

individual BPGs are presented in the chapters devoted to each BPG.

4.1 THREATS ASSESSMENT PROCESS

NMFS assessed the current and expected future threats to the species' persistence and recovery in a set of watersheds identified by the TRT and NMFS staff. This assessment was undertaken with the use of The Nature Conservancy's Conservation Action Planning (CAP) methodology. This methodology and NMFS' application to the threats assessment for southern California steelhead is further detailed in Appendix D, Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area Threats Assessment (CAP Workbooks) Methodology. Use of this methodology allows NMFS to organize the best available information and professional judgment on the threats facing the species into electronic workbooks that are programmed to summarize and track the information for use in identifying, developing and implementing recovery actions designed to address the identified threats. The threats assessment process is intended to be iterative so that new information can be incorporated as it becomes available or as periodic status reviews of the species occur (Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b, Hunt & Associates 2008a).

Current conditions of essential habitat elements for steelhead were assessed with information from a variety of sources including published and unpublished reports. The severity of threats to steelhead or their habitat was estimated and ranked. Based on the initial threats assessment, the threats and associated sources of those threats across the SCS Recovery Planning Area, within each BPG, and within specific watersheds, were identified. A listing of the individual watersheds that were evaluated in the CAP workbooks that were used to summarize threats at these scales can be found in Appendix D.

In addition to the CAP threats assessment process, NMFS considered the best available information regarding the impacts of predicted shifts in climate and the marine environment on the ability of the species to recover. These two threats are not easily addressed in the CAP workbooks and so are not reflected in the tables depicting the threats assessments results below. However, NMFS considered the threats posed by shifting climate and a varying marine environment when recommending a recovery strategy for the species and particular recovery actions. Steelhead will best be able to persist in changing environmental conditions through the recovery of well-distributed viable populations across the SCS Recovery Planning Area able to support their different life stages and strategies. Recovery actions to address climate and marine environmental conditions are therefore embedded within recovery actions designed to achieve these objectives.

4.2 CURRENT DPS-WIDE THREATS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The following discussion presents the available information on the current and future threats faced by the species. The discussion is organized around a set of threat sources identified for each BPG in Chapters 9-12. The information presented in this chapter is a summary of the threats faced by the species across the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Specific information on threats within the different BPGs is presented in BPG-specific.

The general current conditions of 45 major watersheds within the SCS Recovery Planning Area ranged from "Fair" to "Poor" (see CAP Workbook summaries for more detailed information). Only four of the 45 watersheds analyzed were rated with an overall condition of "Good" or "Very Good" (in part due to relatively good access to spawning

Table 4-1. High or Very High severity threat sources identified for the SCS Recovery Planning Area by BPG.

Threat Source[1]	Biogeographic Population Group (BPG)					
	Monte Arido Highlands	Conception Coast	Santa Monica Mountains	Mojave Rim	Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	Average Percentage Affected
Dams and Surface Water Diversions	85%	30%	20%	88%	90%	63%
Wildfires	85%	50%	20%	75%	60%	58%
Groundwater Extraction	62%	60%		63%	100%	57%
Urban Development	62%	40%	20%	63%	70%	51%
Levees and Channelization	38%	50%	20%	63%	60%	46%
Other Passage Barriers	8%	80%	60%	13%	40%	40%
Flood Control	62%	20%		88%	20%	38%
Roads	15%	60%	100%		10%	37%
Agricultural Development	62%	40%			60%	32%
Recreational Facilities	31%	30%	60%		30%	30%
Non-Native Species	54%		20%		30%	21%

[1]Percentages reflect the percent of component watersheds whose threat source is ranked as "Very High" or "High." See individual BPG Threat Summaries in their respective chapters for additional information.

and rearing habitats) in the CAP Workbook analyses: San Antonio Creek and Santa Paula Creek in the Monte Arido Highlands BPG, Arroyo Hondo in the Conception Coast BPG, and Topanga Canyon Creek in the Santa Monica Mountains BPG. Many of the watersheds contain high-quality spawning and rearing habitat, but are compromised by one or more anthropogenic factors; for example, Matilija Creek (Matilija Dam), North Fork Matilija Creek (other passage barriers), and Sespe Creek (groundwater extraction, flood control, and diversions in the lower reaches) in the Monte Arido Highlands BPG. A widespread trend observed in the SCS Recovery Planning Area is severe to very severe degradation of habitat conditions along the mainstem of impaired watersheds, while the upper mainstem and tributaries retain relatively high habitat values for steelhead. Another DPS-level threat is impacts associated with wildland fires, including fire-fighting measures to control or extinguish them, and the post-fire measures to repair damages incurred in fighting wildland fires. See for example, Cooper 2009, Capelli 2009.

4.2.1 Dams, Surface Water Diversions and Groundwater Extraction

Dams, surface water diversions, and groundwater extraction are common across the SCS Recovery Planning Area, especially on the larger rivers, such as the Santa Maria, Santa Ynez, Ventura, Santa Clara Rivers, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana Rivers, some of which contain multiple major dams on the mainstem (California Department of Fish and Game 2011b, California Department of Water Resources 1988). Loss of surface flows or other passage impediments along the mainstem of the river affect important upstream tributaries providing spawning and rearing habitat, even if the tributaries themselves remain undisturbed. Re-establishing or maintaining connections between the ocean and upper watersheds expands access to historically important spawning and rearing habitats, and improves habitat conditions in these watersheds for steelhead, as well as the existing populations of native residualized *O. mykiss* that currently are isolated above dams and reservoirs.

Bradbury Dam – Santa Ynez River

Dams also negatively affect the hydrology, sediment transport processes, and geomorphology of the affected drainages. In addition, dams and reservoirs frequently include recreational development for fishing and camping, which can introduce non-native predators and/or competitors (*e.g.*, largemouth and smallmouth bass, carp, crayfish, western mosquitofish) as well as promote trampling of the active channel, which potentially can lead to direct loss of redds (Johnson *et al.* 2008, Keefer 2008, Caudill *et al.* 2007, Malcolm *et. al.* 2003, Williams and Bisson 2002, Brandt 2000, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission 1999, National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a, Roberts and White 1992).

4.2.2 Agricultural and Urban Development, Roads, and Other Passage Barriers

Human population density is high in some parts of the SCS Recovery Planning Area and development pressures in general are concentrated in the coastal terraces and middle and lower portions of watershed. Population density is a relative measure of intensity of land use and impacts to individual watersheds. Some of the watersheds in the Monte Arido BPG have been extensively developed for agriculture, which typically utilizes floodplains. In addition, the upland slopes in several of the watersheds in the Conception Coast BPG are extensively planted in orchard crops (California Department of Water Resources 1978).

Agricultural Activity – San Mateo Creek

The typical pattern of urban and agricultural development focuses on the flatter portions of a watershed, typically within the floodplain and usually along the mainstem of the drainage and one or more tributaries, thereby magnifying potential impacts to steelhead even if most of the watershed remains undeveloped. Public ownership of lands in the SCS Recovery Planning Area varies widely between

watersheds but generally decreases southward. Although public ownership of these watersheds (U.S. National Forest and BLM lands, military reservations, *etc.*) can be extensive, these public lands are typically concentrated in the upper watersheds leaving the middle and lower watersheds subject to private development. The lands under the control of military installations such as Vandenberg Force Base and Camp Pendleton are notable exceptions (United States Air Force 2011, Kier Associates 2008b, Hunt & Associates 2008a, United States Army 2007, National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a, Hunt 1993).

4.2.3 Flood Control, Levees and Channelization

Urban and agricultural conversion of floodplain lands adjacent to the mainstem of rivers and streams frequently requires levees or other structures to protect these lands from flooding. The urban and agricultural reaches of a majority of the watersheds in the SCS Recovery Planning Area have been subjected to some degree of channelization and/or levee construction with the resulting loss or degradation of the riparian corridor and streambed. Flood control practices and associated channelization of streams and placement of levees impair the function and quality of stream habitats (Dettinger *et al.* 2009, Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service 2008b, Hunt & Associates 2008a, Brown *et al.* 2005a, 2005b, Gray 2005Orsi 2004, Gumprecht 1999, Bendix 1998, National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a, Faber *et al.* 1989).

Channelization – San Juan/Arroyo Trabuco Creek

Habitat impairments for *O. mykiss* may include increased water temperature, incision of the streambed and loss of structural complexity and instream refugia (meanders, pools, undercut banks, *etc.*), complete loss of bed and bank habitat, increased sedimentation, turbidity, and substrate embeddedness, and excessive nutrient loading (Naiman *et al.* 2005, Newcombe 2003, National Research Council 2002, Naiman and Bilby 1998, Capelli and Stanley 1984, Warner and Hendrix 1984, Newcombe and McDonald 1991).

4.2.4 Non-Native Species

Non-native game species, such as large and smallmouth bass and bullhead catfish, are often stocked into both non-anadromous and anadromous waters by a variety of public and private entities. While these programs have provided seasonal fishing opportunities, the impacts of these programs on native, naturally-reproducing *O. mykiss* stocks are not well understood, though there is a potential adverse impact as a result of predation, disease, disruption of behavior or habitat displacement Cucherousset and Olden 2011, Davis 2009, Fraser 2008, Fritts and Pearsons 2006, Hayes *et al.* 2004, Noga 2000, Wood 1979, Dill and Cordone 1997, National Marine Fisheries Service 1996a, Rucker and Ordall 1953).

Juvenile Bullhead Catfish – Sespe Creek

There are no steelhead hatcheries operating in or supplying hatchery reared steelhead to the Southern California Steelhead DPS. However, there is an extensive stocking program of hatchery cultured and reared, non-anadromous *O. mykiss* (*i.e.,* rainbow trout) that supports a put-and-take fishery. Competition and disease transmission resulting from hatchery introductions have the potential to reduce the production and survival of native, naturally-reproducing steelhead, though genetic investigations of southern California steelhead have not detected any substantial interbreeding of native with hatchery reared *O. mykiss* (Clemento *et al.* 2009, Garza and Clemento 2007, Girman and Garza 2006, Greenwald *et al.* 2005). These stockings are now generally conducted in non-anadromous waters. However, California's steelhead stocking practices have distributed non-native steelhead stocks in many coastal rivers and streams in California (California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2019). Because of problems associated with the practice of transplanting non-native steelhead stocks, CDFG developed its Salmon and Steelhead Stock Management Policy. This policy recognizes that such stock mixing can be detrimental and seeks to maintain the genetic integrity of all identifiable stocks of salmon and steelhead in California, as well as minimize interactions between hatchery and natural populations. To protect the genetic integrity of individual salmon and steelhead stocks, this policy directs CDFG to evaluate the stocks of each salmon and steelhead stream and classify it according to its probable genetic source and degree of integrity (McEwan and Jackson 1996). Additionally, CDFG has eliminated the stocking of hatchery cultured and reared fish in most coastal streams where steelhead have direct access from the ocean (California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Serviced 2010).

In addition to the intentional introduction of non-native game species of fish, many other non-native species of wildlife and plant species have been introduced into the watersheds of southern California which have the potential to displace native species, or adversely affect aquatic habitat conditions. Invasive plants such as the Giant reed *(Arundo donax)* and Tamarisk (*Tamarix* spp.) currently displace extensive areas of native riparian vegetation in major drainages such as the Santa Clara and San Luis Rey River drainages and, in some cases, can reduce surface flows through the uptake of large amounts of groundwater. Non-native plant species such as water primrose (*Ludwigia uruguayensis*) can displace aquatic living space and, in extreme conditions, inhibit or block the instream movement of fish. Non-native plants can also reduce the natural diversity of insects that are important food sources for juvenile *O. mykiss* (Bell *et al.* 2009, Ventura County 2006, Bossard *et al.* 2000, McKnight 1993).

4.2.5 Estuarine Loss

The mouths of most southern California watersheds are characterized by one of several distinct types of estuaries formed by a combination of coastal topography, geology, and the hydrologic characteristics of the watershed (Jacobs *et al.* 2011, Ferren *et al.* 1995). Estuaries are used by steelhead as rearing areas for juveniles and smolts as well as staging areas for smolts acclimating to saline conditions in preparation for entering the ocean and adults acclimating to freshwater in preparation for spawning.

Estuarine Fill – San Luis Rey River Estuary, 2007

Estuarine Fill Removed – San Luis Rey River Estuary, 2009

Because estuaries are located at the downstream end of coastal watersheds, and on relatively level coastal plains which are the most heavily urbanized portions of southern California, they have been subjected to a majority of the DPS-wide threats identified through the threats assessment. Estuarine functions have been adversely affected in a wide variety of ways (*e.g.*, degradation of water quality, modification of hydrologic patterns, changes in species composition). One indicator of the magnitude of the loss of estuarine functions is loss of wetland acreage, through a range of activities, including filling, diking, and draining. Approximately 75 percent of estuarine habitats across the SCS Recovery Planning Area have been lost and the remaining 25 percent is constrained by agricultural and urban development, levees, and transportation corridors highways and railroads (Grossinger *et al.* 2011, Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service 2008b, Dahl 1990, Ferren *et al.* 1995, 1990). In addition to the loss of overall acreage the habitat complexity and ecological functions of southern California estuaries have also been substantially reduced as a result of the loss of shallow-water habitats such as tidal channel, the degradation of water quality through both point and non-point waste discharges and the artificial breaching of the seasonal sandbar at the estuaries mouth which can reduce and degrade steelhead rearing habitat. Estuarine habitat loss varies widely across BPGs, with the Santa Maria River and Santa Ynez River, and San Mateo Creek estuaries being the most physically intact, though they are impaired by reduced freshwater inflows and point and non-point waste discharges from both municipal and agricultural sources. Table 4-2 provides an estimate of the relative loss of southern California wetland estuarine acreage for some of the estuaries associated with steelhead populations in southern California for which information was available. See Chapter 2, Steelhead Biology and Ecology for a discussion of the role of estuaries in the life history of steelhead.

Table 4-2. Estuarine habitat loss in component watersheds of the SCS Recovery Planning Area by BGP.[1]

BPG	Watershed	Estimated Remaining Estuarine Habitat (% of historical habitat)	BPG Range
Monte Arido Highlands	Santa Maria River	81	*15% - 81% remaining*
	Santa Ynez River	94	
	Ventura River	32	
	Santa Clara River	15	
Conception Coast	Gaviota Creek	25	*5% - 31% remaining*
	Arroyo Hondo	5	
	Tecolote Creek	25	
	Goleta Slough	31	
	Mission Creek	10	
	Montecito Creek	5	
	Carpinteria Creek	20	
	Rincon Creek	5	
Santa Monica Mountains	Big Sycamore Canyon Creek	10	*3% - 34% remaining*
	Arroyo Sequit	10	
	Malibu Creek	34	
	Las Flores Canyon Creek	3	
	Topanga Canyon Creek	7	
Mojave Rim	Los Angeles River	0	*0% - 2% remaining*
	San Gabriel River	2	
	Santa Ana River	3	
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	San Juan River	10	*9% - 76% remaining*
	San Mateo Creek	76	
	San Onofre Creek	20	
	Santa Margarita River	41	
	San Luis Rey River	10	
	San Dieguito River	43	
	San Diego River	9	
	Sweetwater River	5	
	Otay River	14	
	Tijuana River	52	

[1] Adapted from Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service (2008a, 2008b).

4.2.6 Marine Environment Threats

Steelhead spend a majority of their life history cycle in the marine environment. Unlike the other anadromous Pacific salmon in the genus *Oncorhynchu*s, steelhead do not die after entering freshwater to spawn, but may return to the marine environment and complete another year of ocean growth before returning to freshwater to repeat their reproductive cycle. Steelhead have not been observed in the marine environment in large aggregating schools with well-defined ocean migratory patterns. The incidental capture of steelhead in the marine environment as a by-catch of commercial fishing activities is uncommon. As a result of the apparent dispersal of single individuals or small groups in the marine environment, information on the movements, feeding habits, and predator-prey relationships of steelhead has not been extensively studied and is not well understood (Grimes *et al*. 2007, Aydin *et al.* 2005, Burgner *et al*. 1992, 1980, Groot and Margolis 1991, Hartt and Bell 1985). Table 4-3 outlines some of the metrics which are relevant to assessing conditions in the marine environment for both sub-adult and adult steelhead, though the actual conditions are either highly variable, or unknown.

Table 4-3. Southern California Coast Steelhead Marine Environment Threats Assessment.

Southern California Coast Steelhead Marine Environment Threats Assessment								
1. Sub-Adult Steelhead								
Category	**Key Attribute**	**Indicator**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Very Good**	**Current Indicator Status**	**Current Rating**
Landscape Context	Habitat Availability	Vegetation density in nearshore marine areas of CA – e.g., kelp/hectare	Low kelp density		High kelp density		Baseline data unavail-able	Variable
Landscape Context	Oceano-graphic Conditions	Ocean production index	Poor ocean conditions		Good ocean conditions			Variable
Condition	Fish Health	Condition of factor of sub-adult conspecifics collected in seines or other surveys	Data unavailable					Unknown
Condition	Fish Health	Incidence of disease/ parasitism in sub-adult conspecifics; salmon obtained from seine or other surveys	Baseline data unavailable					Unknown
Condition	Food Availability	Upwelling index	Poor ocean conditions		Good ocean conditions			Variable
Condition	Variability in Run Timing	Proportion of # of current vs. historic life history variations represented in domain	25% or less of historically known variation in run timing preserved in current runs	50% of historically known variation in run timing preserved in current runs	75% of historically known variation in run timing preserved in current runs	All historically known variation in run timing preserved in current runs		Unknown

2. Adult Steelhead								
Category	**Key Attribute**	**Indicator**	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Very Good**	**Current Indicator Status**	**Current Rating**
Landscape Context	Oceano-graphic conditions	Ocean Production Index	Poor ocean conditions		Good ocean conditions			Variable
Condition	Fish Health	Condition factor of ocean-intercepted conspecifics	Data unavailable					Unknown
Condition	Fish Health	Incidence of disease/ parasitism in ocean-intercepted conspecifics	Baseline data unavailable					Unknown
Condition	Food Availability	Upwelling Index	Poor ocean conditions		Good ocean conditions			Variable
Condition	Variability in Run Timing	Proportion of # of current vs. historic life history variations represented in domain	25% or less of historically known variation in run timing preserved in current runs	50% of historically known variation in run timing preserved in current runs	75% of historically known variation in run timing preserved in current runs	All historically known variation in run timing preserved in current runs		Unknown

4.2.7 Natural Environmental Variability

Natural environmental variation has exacerbated the problems associated with degraded and altered riverine and estuarine habitats. See discussion in Chapter 2, Steelhead Biology and Ecology, Section 2.6. The current climate of the SCS Recovery Planning Area is classified as Mediterranean. This climatic regime is characterized by two distinct annual seasons, with a high degree of inter-annual and decadal variability: a long rainless season extending from May through November and a brief rainy season from December through March. Rainfall is associated with brief, but intense, cyclonic winter storms, though the extreme southern portion of the SCS Steelhead Recovery Planning Area is subject to occasional summer storms originating from the Gulf of California. This region is also subject to an El Niño/La Niña weather cycle which varies in length from seven to ten years. This large-scale weather pattern can significantly affect winter precipitation, causing highly variable rainfall and significant changes in oceanic conditions between years (McMullen and Jabbour 2010, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2007a, Changnon 2000, Philander 2004, 1990). In addition to these temporal climatic patterns, there is a wide disparity between winter rainfall from north to south, as well as between coastal plains and inland mountainous areas. Annual precipitation ranges along the coast (north to south) from 32 to 24 cm, with larger variations (24 – 90 cm) due to the orographic effects of the various mountain ranges (Bailey 1966, Felton 1965).

River discharge, and therefore freshwater habitat conditions within southern California watersheds, is strongly influenced by the intra- and inter-annual pattern of short-duration cyclonic storms (*e.g.*, frequency, timing, intensity, and duration). As a result, river discharge varies greatly between seasons, and can be highly "flashy" during the winter season, sometimes changing by several orders of magnitude over a few hours. Snow accumulation is generally small and of short duration, and does not contribute significantly to peak run-off. Base flows in some river reaches can be influenced significantly by groundwater stored and transported through alluvium, faults, and fractured rock formations. Many rivers and

streams naturally exhibit interrupted base flow patterns (alternating channel reaches with perennial and seasonal surface flow) controlled by geologic formations, and the strongly seasonal precipitation pattern characteristic of a Mediterranean climate (Boughton *et al.* 2009, 2006, Holland 2001, Mount 1995, Jacobs, *et al.* 1993, Faber *et al.* 1989).

Over the course of their life cycle steelhead occupy both freshwater and marine environments. Freshwater habitats are critical for their reproductive phase, providing suitable habitat for the deposition, fertilization, and incubation of eggs in nests (redds) created by adults in spawning gravels. Freshwater habitats also provide a sheltered environment, relatively free of native predator species, and with suitable food sources, for rearing juveniles. Marine habitats are important for the growth and maturation of sub-adults, providing more abundant and appropriately sized food sources to support the large numbers of maturing fish emigrating from coastal watersheds of the Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area, as well as fish originating from other coastal watersheds of the North Pacific Watershed (Quinn 2005, Moyle 2002). Both freshwater and marine environments are affected by weather and climatic conditions that vary on time scales ranging from hours to millennia. Despite the highly mobile nature of steelhead, and their ability to exploit freshwater and marine habitats in multiple ways, they remain vulnerable to natural changes in their environment.

5. Southern California Steelhead and Climate Change

"The West Coast's salmon and steelhead populations have always been sensitive to the variability of the northeast Pacific climate-ocean system . . . So steelhead recovery as a form of human stewardship has to be judged over a broader timeline, with multi-year setbacks in population size considered to be a normal and expected event, and progress judged at the scale of multiple decades and even multiple human generations."

Dr. David A. Boughton, Chair, NOAA Fisheries South-Central/Southern California Steelhead Technical Recovery Team, 2010

5.0 INTRODUCTION

The addition of CO_2 and other greenhouse gasses to the atmosphere over the past two centuries, as a result of industrialization and changes in land use, has substantially altered the radiative balance of the Earth. Less of the energy entering the Earth's atmosphere as sunlight is being re-radiated to space, with the effect that the planet is currently heating up at a pace not seen in human history, and perhaps not for millions of years (Archer and Pierrehumbert 2011, Solomon *et al.* 2009, Archer 2007).

The potential physical effects of projected future climate changes are manifold and complex, varying in range and intensity, across various landscape scales and ecosystem types. The biological response is also complex, and with many species, including Pacific anadromous salmonids, uncertain. While southern California steelhead have evolved a suite of historically effective adaptations to a highly variable environment (including multiple paths for completing their life cycle), the rapid rate of projected climate presents yet another challenge to their persistence. Recent assessments of global climate change and climate change in the United States summarize the general effects on ecosystems (Cayan, *et al*. 2009, Dettinger, *et al*. 2009, Mastrandera *et al.* 2009, Medellin-Azuara *et al.* 2009, Shaw *et al.* 2009, Westerling *et al.* 2009, Backland *et al.* 2008, Bedworth and Hanak 2008, and Gutowski *et al*. 2008, Barbour and Kueppers 2008, Hanak and Moreno 2008, Hanak and Lund 2008, Luers and Mastrandrea 2008, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2007a, 2007b).

These general physical effects include: 1) warmer atmospheric temperatures; 2) rises in sea level due to ice cap melting and thermal expansion of ocean water; 3) acidification of ocean waters; 4) increased

droughts (frequency, severity, and duration) coupled with more severe cyclonic storms (intensity and duration); 5) increases in the intensity, frequency and duration of wildland fires; 6) modification of a variety of watershed processes, including run-off, erosion, sedimentation, and a variety of hill-slope processes ranging from ravel to mass-wasting and debris flows; 7) increases in water temperatures in rivers and streams; and 8) alterations in stream morphology (*e.g.*, occurrence and distribution of sediments, pools, riffles, etc.) as a result of changes in the frequency and intensity of high-flow events.

A review of existing studies indicates that regional climate changes would drive ecosystem changes in diverse ways (Dawson *et al*. 2011, Schwing *et al.* 2010). The ability to model and forecast the effects of such changes on steelhead populations is likely to be quite limited due to limitations on the predictability of behavior of non-linear causal networks (Schindler *et al.* 2008). This problem is common to many threatened and endangered species, but is exacerbated for Pacific salmonids due to their requirements for a succession of different habitats over the course of their life history cycle. However, the environmental changes anticipated for southern California steelhead are not as profound as other regions of California. For example, in the Central Valley anadromous fish populations dependent on snowmelt-fed river systems may undergo a conversion to rain-fed systems, or along the central and north coastal areas where coho populations which have a fixed life history strategy may be less adaptable to environmental changes than steelhead (Moyle *et al.* 2008).

The projected climate changes in southern California are expected to mainly intensify patterns that are characteristic of a semi-arid Mediterranean Climate (periodic droughts, intense cyclonic rainstorms, dry, hot summers) and to which southern populations of steelhead appear to have already evolved a flexible, opportunistic survival strategy. An important factor for coastal populations is the continuing role of the ocean in moderating coastal climates due to its high heat capacity. Thus coastal steelhead populations, even in the southern portions of California, appear to have a more predictable future than inland populations which are vulnerable to faster and more extreme changes in climate (Boughton 2010a).

5.1 PROJECTED CLIMATE CHANGES

5.1.1 Terrestrial and Freshwater Environment

Geographically, California is situated at the transition between regions of net gain and net loss of water, and predicted future water availability is sensitive to model assumptions and emissions scenarios (Hayhoe *et al*. 2004). Climate models appear to make a median prediction of about 10% loss of precipitation statewide by 2100, under a low emissions scenario (Cayan *et al*. 2009). However, there is enough variability in the predictions that significantly drier or wetter futures are also reasonable expectations (Hayhoe *et al*. 2004, Leung *et al*. 2004, Snyder *et al*. 2002).

For California, the mid-century (2035- 2064) response to global climate change is consistent across scenarios: an annual maximum temperature increase of about +1.9° to +2.3°C for sensitive climate models, and 1°C less for the less sensitive model (Shaw *et al.* 2009). The statewide precipitation response is relatively small, ±4cm across the various scenarios and models, though more precipitation falls as rain rather than snow. Also, the snow melts

sooner; and more is evaporated leading to lower soil moisture and streamflows (Null *et al.* 2010, Cayan *et al.* 2009a). The model simulations suggest that predictability is reasonably good at the 40-year time-scale, perhaps because global climate outcomes at this timescale are dominated not by positive atmospheric feedbacks, but by the inertial effect of the ocean, which acts as transient negative feedback that limits the pace of climate change (Baker and Roe 2009).

By 2100 the temperature scenarios diverge much more severely, about +2.5°C versus +4.2°C for the lower and middle-upper emission scenarios, respectively. Under the middle-upper emission scenario, the end-of-the-century also marks a period of unprecedented wildfires and significantly more erratic precipitation in the southern and south-central coastal regions, and the possibility of large decreases in mean precipitation (Cayan *et al.* 2009, Shaw *et al.* 2009).

Perhaps more importantly, under the middle-upper emission scenario, the end-of-the-century marks a period of *accelerating* greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, whereas in the lower scenario it is a period of emissions *shrinking* toward zero and global change that is decelerating toward equilibrium (Cayan *et al.* 2009, Solomon *et al.* 2009). Thus the changes projected under the middle-upper emissions scenario are the prelude for even faster changes in the 22nd Century, with no prognosis for stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations and climate.

Regional climate projections for the south-central and southern California coast ranges suggest a future of longer, hotter summers, but with a potentially higher incidence of fog along the immediate coast, more extreme heat waves and droughts, but with perhaps more intense precipitation events in some areas (Karl *et al.* 2009, Cayan *et al.* 2008a, Snyder and Sloan, 2005, *et al.* 2004, Snyder *et al.* 2004, Snyder *et al.* 2002).

Climate change has the potential to profoundly affect both terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems in California (Maurer *et al.* 2010, Bakke 2008, Barbour and Kueppers 2008, Schindler *et al.* 2008). There are a number of potential negative effects on steelhead and their freshwater and estuarine habitats which are of particular significance. Many of these effects could be exacerbated by the human response to climate change, particularly as a result of the increase competition for limited freshwater supplies. These are summarized below (Schwing *et al.* 2010).

Rainfall and Runoff. Steelhead depend on adequate rainfall and run-off during their migratory seasons to both enter and emigrate from coastal watersheds. In southern California adequate stream flow is not only necessary for adults to reach upstream spawning areas and juveniles to emigrate to the ocean, but also to breach the sand bar, which seasonally forms at the mouth of most coastal rivers and streams, to allow entrance to and emigration from the watershed (Jacobs *et al.* 2011, Maurer 2006, Quinn 2005).

Rivers and riparian areas (and associated wetland areas) make up less than one percent of the landscape in arid regions such as southern California. These highly productive ecosystems are embedded within upland systems with much lower productivity. The primary driver of terrestrial hydrologic systems is precipitation. Most of the United States experienced increases in precipitation and stream flow and decreases in drought during the second half of the past century. However, there are indications that increases in the severity and duration of droughts have increased in the western and southwestern United States. The full effects

of these changes on aquatic organisms such as *O. mykiss* are not well understood (Schwing *et al.* 2010).

Groundwater. Groundwater is an important source of surface flows during dry periods in many southern California watersheds. Groundwater can therefore contribute to sustaining suitable over-summering juvenile rearing conditions in mainstem and tributary habitats. Surface flows can be maintained as a result of the intersection of a high groundwater table or through the transmission of water through geologic fault systems. The effects of climate change on groundwater systems have not been as extensively studied as have the effects of climate change on surface water systems. One recent investigation in the Santa Ynez Mountains of southern California suggests that an increase in the biomass of watersheds dominated by chaparral is likely to increase with the increase of atmospheric CO_2 and atmospheric temperature, leading to reductions in summer stream flow (Tague *et al.* 2009). Other Global Climate Models (GCMs) projecting a decrease in vegetative cover could lead to an increase in summer stream flow (Boughton 2010a).

Water Temperature. Increased minimum atmospheric temperatures and warmer spring and summer temperatures have led to increased stream temperatures in most of the continental Unites States. Increased stream temperatures likely will have both direct and indirect adverse impacts on juvenile *O. mykiss.* These include subjecting the species to physiological stress, and altering the aquatic environment through such modifications as reducing dissolved oxygen levels or increasing the growth of algae and rooted aquatic vegetation. Elevated stream temperatures can also favor the proliferation of non-native warm water species that can compete for living space, and also prey on native *O. mykiss*, particularly juveniles. Changes in water temperature are most likely to occur during low-flow periods that coincide with over-summering rearing juvenile *O. mykiss*. Stream temperature increases have already begun to be detected across the United States, though no comprehensive analysis similar to streamflow trends has been conducted. An increase in the incidence of coastal fog could moderate these effects in some coastal areas (Wenger *et al.* 2011, Mantua 2010, Keefer 2009, Schindler *et al.* 2008, Daufresne 2007, Battin 2005, Mohseni and Eaton 2003, Eaton and Schaller 1996).

Wildland Fire. Chaparral is the predominant vegetation type within the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Wildfires are a natural phenomenon essential for the periodic renewal of chaparral plant communities (Sugihara *et al.* 2006). In addition, wildfires can have at least temporary major impacts on freshwater habitats of anadromous and non-anadromous *O. mykiss.* These effects range from increasing the erosion, transportation, and deposition of massive amounts of fine sediments into watercourses containing coarser-grained spawning gravels to destroying riparian vegetation and facilitating the spread of non-native plant and animal species. The frequency and size of wildfires is expected to increase as a result of increases in atmospheric temperatures (Bell *et al.* 2009, Westerling and Bryant 2008, Westerling *et al.* 2009, Lenihan *et al*. 2006, Miller and Schlegel 2006).

Santa Ana winds and human-triggered ignitions play important roles in the fire regime of southern California chaparral and scrubland forests. These seasonal, hot, dry winds occur primarily during the fall and winter and are driven by large-scale patterns of atmospheric circulation resulting from high pressure over the Great Basin,

coupled with low pressure off the coast of southern California, that drives dry air toward the coast. These winds can reach 40 miles per hour and can spread fires rapidly, sometimes burning 115 square miles of chaparral and shrub vegetation per day (Ryan and Burch 1992). Using GCMs, Miller and Schlegel (2006) predict that the total number of annual Santa Ana wind events would not change over the next 30 years, though one of the General Climate Model simulations showed a shift in the seasonal cycle, with fewer Santa Ana wind events occurring in September and more occurring in December. The potential implications of this shift for the fire regime are unclear (Keeley 2006, Keeley *et al.* 1999). Wildland fire impacts can be compounded by fire-fighting measures to control or extinguish wildland fires (*e.g.*, the use of fire retardants) as well as by post-fire measures to repair damages incurred in fighting wildland fires (Capelli 2009, Cooper 2009, National Marine Fisheries Service 2008d, Finger 1997).

5.1.2 Marine Environment

Steelhead spend the majority of their lives in the marine environment, entering freshwater habitats for brief periods to reproduce and rear. While steelhead are subjected to the same basic oceanic conditions (*e.g.*, currents, water temperature, up-welling, abundance of prey base, predator-prey interactions, and water quality) as other anadromous Pacific anadromous salmonids, they may respond and be affected by such conditions differently because of their distinctive behavioral, physiological and other ecological characteristics. However, as with other anadromous Pacific salmon, conditions in the marine environment are crucial to the growth, maturation, mortality, and abundance of returning adult steelhead to their freshwater spawning habitats.



Fig. 5-1. Principle Ocean Currents in the North-East Pacific Ocean Affecting Coastal Waters of California (J. A. Barth, Oregon State University)

California Current Ecosystem. The California Current Ecosystem (CCE) is one of eight large marine ecosystems within the jurisdiction of the United States. The northern end of the current is dominated by strong seasonal variability in winds, temperature, upwelling, plankton production and the spawning times of many fishes, whereas the southern end of the current has much less seasonal variability. Climate signals in this region are quite strong. During the past 10 years, the North Pacific has seen two El Niño events (1997/98, 2002/03), one La Niña event (1999), a four-year climate regime shift to a cold phase from 1999 until late 2002, followed by a four-year shift to warm phase from 2002 until 2006 (Schwing *et al*. 2010, Peterson and Schwing 2003, Mantua *et al.* 1997). However, because of the dearth of information on the marine phase of steelhead it is difficult to assess the biological response to projected climate driven changes in the CCE.

Climate-Induced California Current Ecosystem Responses

Numerous climate stressors (*e.g.,* warming, sea level rise, freshwater flow) impact productivity and structure throughout the CCE. The following provides a summary of these issues based upon the analysis developed as part of a NMFS framework for a long-term plan to address climate impacts on living marine resources (Schwing *et al.* 2010, Osgood 2008).

1. Future climate variability in the context of global climate change and a warmer planet

One of the likely consequences of global climate change will be a more volatile climate with greater extreme events on the intra-seasonal to inter-annual scales. For the CCE this will mean more frequent and severe winter storms, with greater wind mixing, higher waves and coastal erosion, and more extreme precipitation events and years, which would impact coastal circulation and stratification. Some global climate models predict a higher frequency of El Niño events; others predict that the intensity of these events will be stronger. If true, primary and secondary production will be greatly reduced in the CCE, with negative effects transmitted up the food chain, including to the Pacific anadromous salmonids (Mastrandrea *et al.* 2009, Karl *et al*. 2008, Bell and Sloan 2006, Benestad 2006, Bell *et al.* 2004, Trenberth 1999).

2. The extent and timing of freshwater input and its impact on the nearshore habitat of anadromous fishes

Variability in ocean conditions has substantial impacts on salmon survival and growth, and can be influenced in continental shelf waters by river runoff. Potential changes in rainfall and snow pack are likely to increase winter and spring runoff but decrease summer runoff. Climate models project the 21st century will feature greater precipitation in the Pacific Northwest, extreme winter precipitation events in California, and a more rapid spring melt leading to a shorter, more intense spring period of river flow and freshwater discharge. This will greatly alter coastal stratification and mixing, riverine plume formation and evolution, and the timing

of transport of anadromous populations to and from the ocean (Maurer *et al*. 2011, 2006, Mantua *et al*. 2010, Poff *et al.* 2010, Barnett 2008, Kim *et al.* 2002).

The situation in southern California may be more complex, and difficult to model, because of the uncertainty surrounding the projected climate changes; further the response of southern steelhead to these climate driven changes is uncertain (Boughton 2010a, Boughton *et al.* 2006, 2007b).

3. The timing and strength of the spring upwelling transition and its effect on production and recruitment of marine populations

Coastal upwelling of cold water carries significant plankton and krill populations into coastal waters. These populations are an important food source for young Pacific anadromous salmonids entering the ocean to begin the marine phase of their life cycle. At present there is some evidence that coastal upwelling has become stronger over the past several decades due to greater contrasts between warming of the land (resulting in lower atmospheric pressure over the continent) relative to ocean warming (Bakun 1990). Regional climate models project that not only will upwelling-favorable winds be stronger in summer, but that the peak in seasonal upwelling will occur later in the summer (Snyder *et al.* 2003), delaying the availability of an important food source to juvenile Pacific anadromous salmonids. However, the winds may not be able to mix this light buoyant water or transport it offshore, resulting in the inability of cold nutrient-rich water to be brought to the sea surface.

Fig.5-2 Seasonal Coastal Upwelling Pattern Along the California Coast (Courtesy NOAA)

Thus, phytoplankton blooms may not be as intense, which may impact organisms up the food chain including Pacific anadromous salmonids (Roemmich and McGowan, 1995). Given that the future climate will be warmer, the upper ocean at the watershed scale will likely be, on average, more stratified. The result will be lower primary productivity everywhere (with the possible exception of the nearshore coastal upwelling zones).

4. Ocean warming, increased stratification and their effect on pelagic habitat

The vertical gradient in ocean temperature off California has intensified over the past several decades (Palacios *et al*. 2004). Areas with enhanced riverine input into the coastal ocean will also see greater vertical stratification. Generally warmer ocean conditions will cause a northward shift in the distribution of most marine

species, and possibly the creation of reproductive populations in new regions. Existing faunal boundaries are likely to remain as strong boundaries, but their resiliency to shifts in ocean conditions due to global climate change is not known. The effects of any shift of pelagic species, particularly predator and prey species, on Pacific anadromous salmonids are unclear, but may vary with individual species such as steelhead (Lindley *et al.* 2009).

5. Changes in gyre strength, regional transport, and source waters to the California Current and their impact on species distribution and community structure

Observations of the biota of the California Current show that there are pronounced latitudinal differences in the species composition of plankton, fish, and benthic communities, ranging from cold water boreal sub-arctic species in the north to warm water subtropical species in the south.

Copepod biodiversity increases in coastal waters due to shoreward movement of offshore waters onto the continental shelf, which is caused by either weakening of southward wind stress in summer or strengthening of northward wind stress in winter.



Fig. 5-3. Shift in Cold and Warm-Water Faunal Assembles During Pacific Decadal Oscillations and El Niño/La Niña/Southern Oscillations (Osgood 2008)

Regardless of the season, the source waters that feed into the California Current from the north and from offshore can exert some control over the phytoplankton and zooplankton species that dominate the current. The occurrence of low returns of Pacific anadromous salmonids when the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) is in a positive, warm-water phase, and high returns when the PDO is in a negative, cold-water phase suggests a mechanistic link between PDO sign change and the growth and survival of Pacific anadromous salmonids. However, for Alaska salmon, the typical positive PDO condition is associated with enhanced streamflows and nearshore ocean

mixed-layer conditions favorable to high productivity (Mantua and Hare 2002, Mantua *et al*. 1997). Most climate models project roughly the same timing and frequency of decadal variability in the North Pacific under the impacts of global warming. However, combined with a global warming trend, the CCE is likely to experience more years of positive, warm phases (*i.e.,* periods of lower productivity).

Two other marine related effects of global climate change are relevant to steelhead as well as other Pacific anadromous salmonids: sea-level rise and ocean acidification.

Sea Level Rise. One of the several life history strategies exhibited by steelhead is the "lagoon-anadromous" strategy in which juveniles rear a portion of the year in the estuary of their natal river or stream. Studies in small coastal estuaries seasonally closed off from the ocean by sand bars have shown these areas to be productive rearing areas for *O. mykiss*, with juveniles growing fast enough to migrate to the ocean after their first year, and generally at a larger size than juveniles rearing in the freshwater portion of the stream system. Fish that enter the ocean at a larger size exhibit greater survival rates in the ocean, and thus tend to be disproportionately represented in the adult spawning population (Hayes *et al.* 2008, Bond 2006).

Changes in sea level, which have the potential to affect important estuarine habitats, have already been reported and are expected to continue. Researchers have projected that by 2035-2064 global sea level rise will range between 6-32 cm above 1990 levels, regardless of the emission scenarios used. However, between 2070-2100 the projected range of sea level rise varies between 11-54 cm to 17-72 cm depending on the emission scenario used (Cayan *et al*. 2009, 2008b, Pilkey and Young 2009, Ewing 1989). This more recent analysis suggests a larger rise in sea level than previously projected by Hayhoe *et al*. (2004). A projected 1m rise in sea level would lead to the potential inundation of 65 percent of the coastal marshlands and estuaries in the continental United States. In addition to the inundation and displacement of estuaries/lagoons, there would be shifts in the quality of the habitats in affected coastal regions. Prior to being inundated, coastal watersheds would become saline due to saltwater intrusion into the surface and groundwater (Pilkey and Young 2009). A rise in sea level will most dramatically affect those estuaries which have been confined by surrounding development that prohibits their boundaries from naturally shifting in response to inundation. As discussed in Chapter 4 (Current DPS-Level Threats Assessment), estuarine habitat functions and habitat loss may be of particular importance to steelhead, though their role in southern California has be the subject of limited investigation (see for example, Kelley 2008).

Ocean Acidification. Another projected effect of climate change on the marine environment is acidification. As a result of increased anthropogenic CO_2 in the oceans since the industrial

revolution, the pH of seawater has dropped from 8.2 to 8.1 (on a logarithmic scale, this represents a c. 26% increase in the concentration of H^+ ions). Estimated future increase in atmospheric CO_2 could result in a decrease in surface water pH of 0.3-0.4 by the end of the century, depending on the emission scenario used (Feely *et al.* 2008, Feely, *et al*. 2004,). The effects of CO_2 concentration in the marine environment are not uniform, but are expected to vary with water depth, circulation and temperature, and in coastal waters with upwelling and freshwater input and nutrients (National Research Council 2010).

The reaction of CO_2 with seawater reduces the formation of calcium carbonate used in skeleton and shell formation of marine organisms, and can change many biologically important chemical reactions. The effects of ocean acidification will vary among organisms. As an example, ocean acidification has been shown to reduce the abundance of some carbonate forms, such as pteropods (Fabry *et al.* 2008). Because pteropods are an important food source for certain species of Pacific salmon (*e.g*., sockeye, pink, and chum salmon), a reduction in pteropods can affect the marine growth of these species. One bioenergetics/food web model predicts that a 10% reduction in pteropod production would result in a 20% reduction in the growth of pink salmon (Aydin *et al.* 2005). Because of the lack of information on the marine phase of steelhead, it is unclear if pteropods or other carbonate forming prey constitute a signification portion of the diet of steelhead when in the marine environment. The significance of ocean acidification for steelhead and other anadromous salmonids may depend on the change of pH and carbonate equilibrium, its effect on pteropods and pelagic planktonic community structure, and the ability of juvenile and adults to modify their diets accordingly (Schwing *et al*. 2010). The long-term consequences of ocean acidification on marine ecosystems are poorly understood, but potentially significant (National Research Council, 2010). Because the marine life history phase of steelhead is not well understood, as noted above, the long-term consequences of ocean acidification for this species are even less certain (Nielsen and Ruggerone 2009, Meyers *et al*. 2000).

5.2 CLIMATE INFLUENCES ON STEELHEAD

5.2.1 Steelhead Life Histories and Habitats

The intricate life history of salmonids as well as the complexity of their multiple aquatic habitats means that it is rare that an isolated environmental factor, or driver, is responsible for variability in a given population. Numerous climate stressors (*e.g*., warming, sea level rise, freshwater flow) affect population productivity and structure throughout the habitats and life history stages of a

species. To understand the implications of climate change for salmonids, it is useful to establish a conceptual framework that organizes this complexity (Schwing *et al.* 2009). Such a framework is reflected in the viability criteria and recovery strategy described in Chapters 6, Steelhead Recovery Goals, Objectives, & Criteria and 7, Steelhead Recovery Strategy, in this Recovery Plan which is based on the current climate conditions, and should provide guidance in the adaptive management of steelhead as the climate changes in the SC Recovery Planning Area.

The framework used here organizes complexity into four broad spheres: 1) the multiple life history pathways that are open to salmonids as a function of their adaptations and ecological tolerances; 2) the environmental opportunities that aquatic habitats offer to salmonids at each stage of their life history (Mobrand *et al*. 1997); 3) the suite of habitat-generating processes and stressor-pathways, by which climate (and other drivers) create, destroy, or maintain these aquatic habitats; and 4) the spatial connectivity and timing by which the other domains are knitted into a productive and viable salmonid population. This way of organizing the material allows a systematic treatment of each life stage, each habitat used by each life stage, and each way in which climate change potentially impacts each habitat-generating mechanism (Schindler *et al*. 2008, Waples *et al.* 2008).

5.2.2 Life History Pathways

The life history network described in Chapter 2, Sub-section 2.6 (Southern California Steelhead Freshwater Life Cycle Habitat Use) can be related to the Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) concept of McElhany *et al*. (2000), where viability is measured in terms of four parameters: abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure. Each link in a habitat network involves an interaction between a life history stage and a particular habitat, and has two attributes that emerge from this interaction: survival and capacity. The patterns of survival and capacity across the network translate to abundance and productivity, respectively, for the population as a whole, two of the four VSP parameters (Mobrand *et al*. 1997).

Diversity and spatial structure, the other two VSP parameters, emerge from the parallel linkages in the life history network. Diversity has two broad components: the diversity of pathways offered by the environment (habitat diversity), and the ability of the species to pursue those opportunities (phenotypic plasticity, generalist strategies, and genetic diversity). Spatial structure, the fourth VSP parameter, provides the physical space for parallel linkages to occur in greater numbers and larger capacities, thus increasing the overall resilience of the population.

Because climate is changing, it can be expected that steelhead populations will respond, along with other species, but in variable ways. In so far as evolution has raised steelhead populations to an

adaptive peak, climate change will generally be expected to reduce the fitness of steelhead populations at least temporarily (Schwing *et al.* 2010).

The interactions between steelhead at distinctive phases in their life history and the habitat conditions characteristically associated with those life history phases should be the focus of future research into the effects of projected climate change on steelhead life histories and habitats.

5.2.3 Environmental Opportunities and Habitat Diversity

Environmental opportunities are times and places where physical, chemical and biological conditions support the survival, growth, migration and reproduction of anadromous salmonids. Some of these conditions are predictable or discernable, and some are not. Frequently the relatively predictable components are physical or possibly chemical conditions, traceable to the interaction of climate acting on a geologic template (Buffington *et al*. 2004). In freshwater habitats, these physical components of environmental opportunity are generally functions of variation along three axes: flow, channel morphology or substrate, and water quality - especially temperature (Beechie *et al*. 2010, Orr *et al*. 2008, Newson and Large 2006, Thorp *et al*. 2006, Stanford *et al*. 1996). In marine habitats, climate-related opportunities tend to be physically structured by water temperature, currents and circulation patterns, chemistry (especially acidification), and for the near-shore domain, sea level rise.

Climate largely shapes where in time and space anadromous salmonids can persist or flourish, within the constraints of past evolution and the geologic/topographic template. A change in climate means a change in the space and time where anadromous salmonids can persist and flourish; but these changes are filtered through a set of processes in the watershed, by which precipitation, elevated CO_2, and air-temperature patterns are converted into flow, and stream temperature patterns (Schwing *et al.* 2009).

5.2.4 Habitat-Forming Processes

The processes that convert climate patterns into spatial and temporal habitat for salmonids are sometimes called habitat-forming processes (Beechie and Bolton 1999). Salmonid habitats are generated by the operation of four broad process domains: watershed (or terrestrial), fluvial, estuarine, and marine domains (Montgomery 1999).

These functional domains can be further subdivided to make meaningful connections between climate processes, spatial and temporal habitat, and salmonid life history pathways. For example, the precipitation pulses from Pacific storm systems drive fluvial processes that tend to produce an ordered sequence of channel types from headwaters to the estuary (Montgomery and Buffington 1997). Some of these, such as step-pools and pool-riffle channels, play specific roles (rearing and spawning, respectively) in salmonid life history.

These broad processes can also be subdivided to indicate differential response to climate change. (Boughton *et al.* 2009, Davy and Lapointe 2007, Buffington *et al*. 2004, Moir *et al*. 2004, Kahler *et al*. 2001). For example, the fluvial domain can be divided into a sediment-transport domain and a response, or alluvial, domain downstream (Montgomery and MacDonald 2002). These are expected to have different sensitivities to changes in flow regime and sediment supply. Estuarine domains tend to be small interfaces between the much more extensive fluvial and marine domains; they thus exhibit a dynamism that is inherently responsive to alteration of either marine or fluvial dynamics (Jay *et al*. 2000).

As with the life history networks of anadromous salmonids, if multiple ecosystem processes produce the same sort of resource for a salmonid population, resiliency of the population tends to improve. Parallel linkages fall into two general categories: redundant pathways and alternative pathways (Edelman and Gally 2001, Tononi *et al*. 1999).

Redundant pathways are multiple instances of the same process providing the same outcome. For example, if headwater streams provide fish with thermal refugia during the summer, a stream system with multiple tributaries, each providing a refugium, is highly redundant. Redundancy provides resilience against small-scale disturbances, such as chemical spills (Nielsen *et al*. 2000) or wildfire. But redundant pathways tend to respond in a coordinated fashion to large-scale disturbances, such as droughts or heat waves, and thus provide little resilience to them because they would all tend to respond the same way.

Alternative pathways are different processes that produce the same physical conditions. For example, thermal refugia can be generated either by a headwater stream (via the temperature lapse rate), or by a coastal lagoon (via proximity to the ocean heat sink). Due to the large thermal mass of the ocean, coastal thermal refugia would probably be relatively resilient to heat waves, and may even be enhanced by them through onshore movement of fog. Alternative pathways are less likely than redundant pathways to exhibit a consistent response to a large-scale disturbances, and this can promote resiliency even more effectively than redundancy (Levin and Lubchenco 2008). Moreover, alternative pathways appear able to make living systems both more robust and more resilient to sustained directional change – such as climate change - not just disturbances (Whitacre and Bender 2010, Moritz et al. 2005, Carlson and Doyle 2002, Tononi *et al*. 1999).

5.2.5 Spatial Connectivity and Timing

The fourth element in this conceptual framework deals with the continuity of environmental opportunities for successive life stages of anadromous salmonids. The timing of fish movement from one habitat to another depends on

whether environmental conditions in the habitats and migration corridors connecting them are suitable, and whether fish are at a suitable stage of development to require or be capable of the movement between habitats.

Rapidly changing climate may alter such opportunities by creating critical mismatches in development and habitat conditions to which anadromous runs are currently adapted. In principle, a river-ocean system could contain the full suite of habitats necessary for all life stages, but if the fish cannot reliably move from one habitat type to the next at the appropriate time in its life cycle, the system is unlikely to support a viable population.

Adult southern steelhead currently enter freshwater in the winter and late spring when flows are high and migrate to high elevation habitats that will be inaccessible to later in the season when flows are lower. The timing of these flows depends on precipitation. Following successful spawning and incubation fry emerge some time later, depending almost entirely on water temperature experienced while they are in the gravel. Growth and development to the smolt stage also depends upon temperature. Smolts typically enter the ocean from late winter to late spring, when feeding conditions are optimal due to seasonal upwelling supporting enhanced primary production. The timing of salmon life cycle stages has been shaped by centuries or millennia of climate conditions, and can be adversely affected by rapid climate change that alters the timing, rate, and spatial location of key physical and biological processes (Crozier *et al*. 2008).

5.3 RECOVERY PLANNING FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CLIMATE CHANGE

5.3.1 Core Principles

While some physical parameters of climate change are likely to be predictable, the response of ecosystems and hence the future conditions of steelhead habitats are much less predictable. This suggests that the over-arching strategy for dealing with climate changes will be to enhance the resilience of the steelhead metapopulations to respond to ecosystem changes, through forecasting and managing the physical envelope of the species according to a few core principles (see Boughton *et al.* 2009 for a discussion of these principles):

- Widen opportunities for fish to be opportunistic (*i.e.,* exploit a variety of habitat types)

Maximize connectivity of habitats (i.e., within and between habitats)

- Promote the evolvability of populations and metapopulations (*i.e.,* the ability of a population to generate novel functions, through genetic change and natural selection, that help individuals of a population survive and reproduce)
- Maintain the capacity to detect and respond sustainably to ecosystem changes as they occur.

The viability criteria outlined in Chapter 6, Steelhead Recovery Goals, Objectives & Criteria, and the recovery strategy identified in Chapter 7, Steelhead Recovery Strategy, applied these core principles to the current climate regime, and should be applied to future climate regimes.

As a result, there will likely be a need to extend the results of the TRT. The following climate change related questions have already been identified by the TRT:

How will the climate trends alter the wildfire regime, and thus alter sedimentalogical and hydrological processes that affect the distribution of steelhead habitat?

- Will different watersheds develop distinctly different wildfire regimes, with implications for habitat dynamics, carrying capacity, and viability?
- What environmental factors maintain suitable creek temperatures during the summer, and will they moderate the response of stream temperatures to climate change?
- Are there natural freshwater refugia that sustain *O. mykiss* during droughts longer than the generation time of the fish?
- How are patterns of intermittency likely to respond to climate change, and where are suitable flows likely to intersect with suitable water temperatures under scenarios of climate change?
- Flood and drought regimes have been highly episodic, were even more so in the 19th Century, and may become even more so under future climate patterns. What are the implications for steelhead population viability?

See Chapter 14, Southern California Steelhead Research, Monitoring and Adaptive Management.

6. Steelhead Recovery Goals, Objectives & Criteria

"Recovery is the process by which listed species and their ecosystems are restored and their future safeguarded to the point that protections under the ESA are no longer needed. A variety of actions may be necessary to achieve the goal of recovery, such as the ecological restoration of habitat or implementation of conservation measures with stakeholders."

Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance, National Marine Fisheries Service, 2010

6.1 DPS RECOVERY GOAL

The goal of this Recovery Plan *to prevent the extinction of southern California steelhead in the wild and ensure the long-term persistence of viable, self-sustaining, wild populations of steelhead distributed across the Southern California Distinct Population Segment (DPS). It is also the goal of this Recovery Plan to re-establish a sustainable southern California steelhead sport fishery.*

Recovery of the DPS will require the protection, restoration, and maintenance of habitats of sufficient quantity, quality, and natural complexity throughout the SCS Recovery Planning Area so that the full range of all life history forms of *O. mykiss* (*e.g.,* switching between resident and anadromous forms, timing and frequency of anadromous runs, and dispersal rates between watersheds) are able to successfully use a wide variety of habitats in order to overcome the natural challenges of a highly variable physical and biological environment.

A **viable population** is defined as a population having a negligible risk (< 5%) of extinction due to threats from demographic variation, non-catastrophic environmental variation, and genetic diversity changes over a 100-year time frame. A **viable DPS** is comprised of a sufficient number of viable populations broadly distributed throughout the DPS but sufficiently well-connected through ocean and freshwater dispersal to maintain long-term (1,000-year) persistence and evolutionary potential (McElhany *et al*. 2000).

6.2 DPS RECOVERY OBJECTIVES

To ensure recovery of the DPS, specific objectives are necessary to guide recovery efforts and to measure the species' progress towards recovery. Similarly, specific, measurable and objective criteria are also necessary to describe the recovery of the species.

Steelhead in southern California occupy a wide array of watersheds, some portions of which are severely degraded with highly modified natural watershed processes and streamflows. Under these degraded habitat conditions, steelhead populations in some watersheds have declined to very low numbers where they continue to persist. In other watersheds, populations have been extirpated, particularly near the southern

end of the species' range. Existing threats constrain the species' current distribution to small, disjunct portions of its historic range and preclude it from expressing its full range of life history strategies in response to naturally varying habitat conditions. In order to recover, the species needs substantially higher numbers of returning adults, successful spawning and rearing in freshwater and estuarine environments, and successful emigration of juveniles to the ocean. To achieve these goals, it is essential to preserve and restore the species' existing habitat, as well as restore its access to historically important spawning and rearing habitats throughout the SCS Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. Individual watersheds, and in some cases groups of watersheds, must have the capacity to support self-sustaining populations of steelhead in the face of natural variation in environmental conditions such as droughts, floods, wildfires, variable ocean-rearing conditions, and long-term climate changes.

To recover steelhead, the following objectives have been identified:

- Prevent steelhead extinction by protecting existing populations and their habitats
- Maintain current distribution of steelhead and restore distribution to some previously occupied areas
- Increase abundance of steelhead to viable population levels, including the expression of all life history forms and strategies
- Conserve existing genetic diversity and provide opportunities for interchange of genetic material between and within viable populations
- Maintain and restore suitable habitat conditions and characteristics to support all life history stages of viable populations
- Conduct research and monitoring necessary to refine and demonstrate attainment of recovery criteria

6.3 RECOVERY CRITERIA

Prior to determining that a species has "recovered" and can therefore be removed from the List of Threatened and Endangered Species (*i.e.,* delisting) or have its protective status lowered from "endangered" to "threatened" (*i.e.,* down listing), certain criteria for recovery, related to the condition of the species and the status of the threats to the species, must be met. In the case of delisting the Southern California Steelhead DPS, biological recovery criteria regarding the abundance, productivity, spatial structure, and diversity of the populations within the DPS and the DPS as a whole, are the measures of recovery. Threats abatement criteria are indicators that key threats to the populations and DPS have been abated or controlled. Both types of recovery criteria will be used by NMFS to assess whether the species is recovering (moving towards meeting the criteria, and down listing may be appropriate) or has recovered (meets the criteria and delisting may be appropriate). Several of the criteria have not been established quantitatively because additional research is needed to define or refine them. For this reason, one of the six recovery objectives focuses on the research and monitoring needed to refine the criteria and directly measure whether steelhead populations are meeting the criteria. In addition, NMFS has proposed down- listing criteria that would mark the transition between endangered and threatened status for the Southern California Steelhead DPS, but further information is needed for refinement of these criteria as well. Given the species' condition and the severity of the threats to the species, however, it is clear that significant increases in population and DPS health and reductions in critical threat sources are needed before the species' risk of extinction shifts from imminent to the "foreseeable future." In the meantime, strategies and actions needed

to move the species towards a threatened status are the same as those needed for recovery.

The Technical Recovery Team (TRT) identified two different approaches to articulating viability criteria: 1) prescriptive criteria, which identify specific targets, generally expressed in quantitative terms, and 2) performance criteria, which identify standards for final performance, expressed in theoretical terms. Because uncertainties regarding southern California steelhead, quantitative prescriptive criteria must be precautionary, while performance criteria require the development of direct estimates of risk, and a quantitative account of uncertainty (Boughton *et al*. 2007b, 2006). Because of the uncertainty of the efficacy of the provisional prescriptive criteria, which are based on limited quantitative population data from southern California steelhead, the Recovery Plan uses the performance based criteria until more specific prescriptive criteria are available.

6.3.1 Biological Recovery Criteria

The TRT developed general viability criteria for both individual steelhead populations and for the DPS as a whole. These criteria describe characteristics of both individual populations and the DPS that if achieved would indicate that the DPS is viable, and therefore at a low risk of extinction over a specific period of time. [1] The population and DPS criteria are independent of anthropogenic effects in the sense that they must be met regardless of habitat conditions and human-caused threats. The time frame and related recommended criteria address the preservation of the evolutionary potential of the species (*i.e.*, existing genetic, phenotypic, and behavioral diversity) by ensuring that the DPS will persist over a long enough period of time to exhibit future evolutionary changes such as adaptation or diversification in response to environmental changes. Preserving the evolutionary potential of the species is an important component in ensuring the species' long-term viability.

The viability criteria recommended by the TRT provide guidance for judging recovery of steelhead populations and the DPS given the current level of knowledge and understanding of the biology and ecology of southern California steelhead. All of the recommended criteria carry varying levels of uncertainty depending on the amount of information available on steelhead in the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Given the high levels of scientific uncertainty, NMFS proposes to adopt many of the viability criteria as recovery criteria until such time as sufficient scientific information is available to refine the criteria for assessing population and DPS viability; additionally, these criteria will be reviewed as part of NMFS 5-year review of Recovery Plans.

[1] For a detailed discussion of the methods used by the TRT to develop the recommended viability criteria, see Boughton *et al.* 2007

Table 6-1. Biological Recovery Criteria for the Southern California Steelhead DPS.

POPULATION-LEVEL CRITERIA: Applies to Populations Selected to Meet DPS-Level Criteria		
Criterion Type[1]	**Recovery Threshold**	**Notes**
P.1 Mean Annual Run Size	Run size is sufficient to result in an extinction risk of < 5% within 100 years	Monitoring run size will provide information on year-to year fluctuations in the population necessary to determining the appropriate recovery threshold for individual populations. Research on the role of non-anadromous spawning fraction in stabilizing anadromous faction will also enable refinement of the minimum recovery threshold (see Boughton *et al.* [2007] for discussion of steps in determination of threshold value for each viable population)
P.2 Ocean Conditions	Run Size criterion met during poor ocean conditions	"Poor ocean conditions" determined empirically, or size criterion met for at least 6 decades
P.3 Spawner Density	*Unknown at present*	Research needed
P.4 Anadromous[2] Fraction	N = 100% of Mean Annual Run Size	Requires further research
DPS-LEVEL CRITERIA		
Criterion Type	**Recovery Threshold**	
D.1 Biogeographic Diversity	1. Biogeographic Population Group contains minimum number of viable populations: Monte Arido Highlands: 4 populations Conception Coast: 3 populations Mojave Rim: 3 populations Santa Monica Mountains: 3 populations Santa Catalina Gulf Coast: 8 populations[3] 2. Viable populations inhabit watersheds with drought refugia 3. Viable populations separated from one another by at least 42 miles or as widely dispersed as possible[4]	
D.2 Life History Diversity	All three life history types (fluvial-anadromous, lagoon-anadromous, freshwater resident) are exhibited and distributed across each Biogeographic Population Group	

[1] It is assumed that all spawner criteria represent escapement (*i.e.*, unharvested spawning adults) rather than migrating adults that may be captured before having an opportunity spawn.

[2] The anadromous fraction is the percentage of the run size that must exhibit an anadromous life history to be counted toward meeting the mean annual run size criteria. However, the recovery strategy recognizes the potential role of the non-anadromous form of *O. mykiss* and includes recovery actions which would restore habitat occupied by the non-anadromous form, as well as reconnect such habitat with anadromous waters, and thus allow the anadromous and non-anadromous forms to interbreed, and the non- anadromous forms to potentially express an anadromous life history.

[3] See Boughton *et al*. 2007 for detailed discussion

[4] This geographic separation is based on the maximum width of recorded historic wildfires; see additional discussion below under Section 5.3.1. 2

The population level criteria apply to certain populations in all of the BPGs.[2] Further research is needed to refine the population criteria in the BPGs; for example, data on the magnitude of natural population fluctuations could reveal that smaller mean run sizes would be sufficient to attain viability in some basins (Williams *et al.* 2011). Additionally, further research could refine the role of each of the BPGs in the recovery of the DPS. At a minimum, all BPGs will need to achieve sufficient spatial structure and diversity (*i.e.,* two of the four criteria that define a viable DPS in the wild). Dispersal of steelhead between BPGs may be an important mechanism for maintaining viability of steelhead populations. In addition, preservation of the resident form of the species and habitats that support that life history form may be critical to conserving the genetic diversity of steelhead and providing stock that can re-establish and support the fluvial-anadromous and lagoon-anadromous life history strategies.

6.3.1.1 Discussion of Population-Level Recovery Criteria

Criterion P.1 – Mean Annual Run Size. There is substantial uncertainty regarding the mean annual run size that would represent viable anadromous *O. mykiss* populations throughout the DPS. The TRT estimated a mean annual run size for the DPS using a method derived from Lindley's 2003 "random-walk-with-drift" model and quantitative field data for one anadromous *O. mykiss* population and 19 Chinook salmon populations in California's Central Valley for estimating variability in population growth estimates (Lindley 2003). The resulting criterion of 4,150 spawners per year provides for a 95 percent chance of persistence of the population over 100 years and applies to a generalized situation where there are no quantitative field data on specific local populations (Boughton *et al*. 2007b). Based on the irregular inter-annual patterns of precipitation, anecdotal accounts of highly variable spawning runs and the expectation that larger abundances buffer populations against the increased extinction risks that come with variations in freshwater and marine survival, it can be expected that an average of 4,150 spawners per year, persisting through a cycle of poor ocean conditions would be adequate to safeguard a population (see also discussion below, P.2 – Ocean Conditions). This target may be biologically feasible in larger watersheds within the SCS Recovery Planning Area, such as occur within the Monte Arido Highlands), but may be too high for relatively small watersheds that may support viable populations at average run sizes well below 4,150. Factors such as reliable access to spawning and rearing areas, a stable freshwater environment, the role of non-anadromous forms of *O. mykiss*, inter-watershed exchanges of anadromous forms of *O. mykiss*, or other factors, may play an important role in refining the population-level recovery criteria. Additionally, data on the magnitude of natural fluctuations in anadromous run sizes in individual watersheds may identify a smaller mean run size that is sufficient for viability in some basins (Williams *et al.* 2011). Until research is undertaken and revisions are made to the prescriptive viability criteria, the population-level viability criterion for determining whether a demographically-independent population of *O. mykiss* to be considered viable for the purpose of steelhead recovery is presumed to be 4,150. This criterion will be reviewed during NMFSs periodic 5-year review of the Recovery Plan, and potentially during the Southwest Fisheries Science Center's 5-year status review updates for Pacific salmon and steelhead listed under the ESA.

The separate watersheds comprising each BPG are treated as individual steelhead populations for the purposes of meeting the run-size criterion. Because of uncertainty regarding the applicability of 4,150 spawners per year to many of the watersheds within the SCS Recovery Planning Area and the lack of current data to develop more refined criteria, this Recovery

[2] See Chapter 2 and Table 2-2, Steelhead Biology and Ecology and Chapter 6, Recovery Strategy, for a discussion of these populations.

Plan proposes that performance-based run-size criteria be developed for different core populations throughout the DPS. Development of this criterion for each population would utilize a precautionary approach towards determining run sizes that provide for a 95 percent chance of persistence of the population over 100 years. In general, the 4,150 number can be thought of as an approximate upper bound on what the ultimate viability targets will turn out to be, although there is a chance that development of a performance-based criterion would result in values higher than 4,150 spawners in some watersheds (Boughton *et al*. 2007b).

Methods exist for estimating extinction risk through the use of time-series of spawner counts (Dennis *et al*. 2006, Lindley 2003, Holmes 2001). In general, about 20 years of data are necessary to obtain reasonable confidence in such estimates (Lindley 2003), though recovery to some level is necessary in some watersheds to have a sufficient number of spawners to refine viability criteria. The development of performance-based criteria requires an understanding of some key risk factors before settling on final viability targets, including: 1) the magnitude of year-to-year fluctuations in spawner abundance; 2) the magnitude and duration of poor ocean survival during poor ocean conditions; and 3) the ability or inability of rainbow trout to contribute progeny to steelhead populations and thereby bolster steelhead populations during periods of otherwise poor survival. These factors and the years of data collection required, highlight the critical need for immediate implementation of population abundance monitoring in key watersheds. However, some populations may currently have run sizes so low that obtaining accurate counts would be difficult because of the small sample size, or surveying may be detrimental because of the associated mortality associated with sampling techniques. Collecting useful data may not be practical until such populations have been recovered to some level, depending on the field methods used for monitoring. Boughton *et al.* (2007b) describe a decision tree for use in refining and establishing a viability criterion for mean population size.

Criterion P.2 – Ocean Conditions. Year-to-year variation in a population's survival and/or reproduction can cause large fluctuations in population growth rate irrespective of population size. Consequently, larger variance causes the number of fish to fluctuate more, increasing the chance of the population fluctuating to zero. A large mean population growth rate lowers this risk by shortening the recovery time from downward fluctuations, and a large mean population size keeps the population further away from zero to begin with (McElhany *et al*. 2000, Lande 1993, Foley 1997, 1994).

Variation in ocean conditions is known to have dramatic impacts on marine survival of Pacific salmonids (Mantua and Hare 2002, Mueter *et al.* 2002, Mantua, *et al.* 1997). A conservative working assumption is that salmonid ocean survival fluctuates widely and is connected with variations in ocean conditions. Periods of poor ocean conditions (as reflected in a significant increase in mean ocean mortality of *O. mykiss*) can last for multiple decades and may result in as much as a five-fold decrease in ocean survival of salmonids (Mantua *et al.* 1997). A population that meets the run-size criterion (P.1) during a period of good ocean survival is likely to decline to risky levels when ocean survival deteriorates for long periods. Therefore, a simple but effective criterion for ocean condition is that the run size criterion must be met during a period of poor ocean survival. This criterion could be met via two distinct strategies:

1. Monitor population size for at least the duration of the longest-period climate "cycle" (about 60 years according to Mantua and Hare [2002], though others question the notion of predictable cycles), or

2. Concurrently monitor population size and ocean survival, so that periods of low ocean survival can be empirically determined.

Data on ocean survival (derived from smolt counts combined with adult counts) should be useful for separating the effects of ocean cycles and watershed conditions on population growth. Investment in both smolt counts and adult counts allows an estimation of ocean survival as distinct from freshwater production and survival (with only adult counts, the vital rates in the two habitats are confounded and cannot be estimated separately). In addition, short-term improvements in run size due to watershed restoration could be distinguished from short-term improvement due to ocean cycles. The Coastal Monitoring Plan being prepared by NMFS and CDFG (Adams *et al.* 2011) provides for a series of "Life Cycle Monitoring Stations" which involve the monitoring of smolts and spawners to allow ocean survival to be estimated for specific watersheds; if fish from other watersheds have similar rates of ocean survival, these results could be extrapolated to address this issue for southern California steelhead.

As performance-based run-size criteria are developed for populations within this DPS, the methods and data used to develop those values may change the ocean conditions criterion or even preclude the need for such a specific criterion, though not the consideration of marine conditions. As discussed above, the magnitude and duration of poor ocean survival on the extinction risk of the population is a key factor to consider when developing the run-size criterion.

Criterion P.3 – Spawner Density. The distribution of adult or juvenile fish across a watershed can influence the viability of a population. If too thinly distributed, populations can decline as a result of the difficulty in locating mates, but may also reduce their vulnerability to localized catastrophes or environmental variations by occupying a broader range of habitats. If too densely packed within a limited spatial distribution, populations may be more vulnerable to unpredictable environmental events as all the members of the population experience the same conditions. The TRT concluded that a viability criterion related to the density of spawners (at some scale) in a population is warranted, particularly for populations that were historically large, but are unlikely to be recovered to those historic levels due to a risk that a thinly distributed population in such a watershed could meet the criterion for mean size, and yet not be viable. The TRT also found that the viability threshold should be high enough to ensure that fish generally inhabit good-quality habitats that promote the resilience of the population.

A potentially suitable threshold for both these purposes is the density at which intra-specific competition for redd sites becomes observable. For coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) this appears to be on average about 40 spawners per kilometer (one spawning pair per 50 meters of stream length), although individual streams vary considerably around this mean (Bradford *et al*. 2000). However, the TRT could not find data for deriving a corresponding steelhead criterion. The Coastal Monitoring Plan proposes to implement redd-counting for monitoring salmon and steelhead in the northern coastal area of California (Aptos Creek to the Oregon border). This should provide data that will be useful for deriving a specific spawner density criterion; also redd-counts could be made in the southern Life Cycle Monitoring Stations if it is necessary for developing specific southern California criterion.

Criterion P.4 – Anadromous Fraction. Anadromous fraction is the mean fraction of reproductive adults that are anadromous (steelhead). Steelhead in the SCS Recovery Planning Area co-occur with rainbow trout. Elsewhere, steelhead have been observed to

have trout among their progeny, and vice versa (Zimmerman and Reeves 2000). It is not known how often these transitions occur in southern California *O. mykiss*, or what factors bring them about, though clearly individual populations can have more than one life history type (Sogard *et al*. 2011, Hendry *et al.* 2004, 2004a). Depending on the rate of transition, a group of resident and anadromous fish may function as a single population; two completely distinct populations; or something in between.

Interchange between resident and anadromous fish groups would almost certainly lower the extinction risk of both groups, for the same two reasons that dispersal between separate steelhead populations reduces risk: 1) the existence of a "rescue effect" and 2) the possibility of recolonization (Hanski and Gilpin 1997, Foley 1997). The rescue effect would occur at low steelhead abundance, when input from the trout population prevents their complete disappearance. Recolonization occurs when steelhead disappear completely, but are regenerated by the trout population via "recolonization" of the steelhead niche (Hendry *et al.* 2004). These phenomena may have maintained steelhead in the Santa Clara River system , and possibly other southern California watersheds, in recent times, since modern steelhead runs appear far too small to be self-sustaining (Boughton *et al*. 2005). Unfortunately, lack of data on life history polymorphism prevents a reasonable estimate for the magnitude of the rescue effect, or for a viability threshold for anadromous fraction. Lacking such data, the precautionary criterion for anadromous fraction must assume that the rescue effect is negligible, and that anadromous fraction must be 100% - that is, when applying the population size criterion discussed previously, 100% of the spawners must be annual anadromous immigrants. Future research on this topic could be used to estimate a viability threshold that is more efficient than the precautionary "100% rule." One of the most useful scientific tools for addressing the interchange question involves otolith microchemistry but, as this technique requires lethal sampling of fish, a scientific collecting permit under section 10(1)(A) of the ESA would be required to authorize mortality using this methodology. Newer, non-lethal genetic techniques are also being explored (D. Pearse, personal communication). However, in populations where anadromous fish are currently quite rare, it will probably be necessary to recover run sizes somewhat before numbers are sufficient for useful ecological research.

6.3.1.2 DPS-Level Recovery Criteria

Criterion D.1 (.1, .2, and .3) – Biogeographic Diversity. This criterion contains three elements that address issues of redundancy and separation between populations and within-watershed conditions to provide for resilience against natural environmental events such as droughts and wildfires. The BPGs are an important component in the recovery of this DPS and all BPGs must be restored to viability before the DPS as a whole can be recovered and eventually delisted. The delineation of BPGs was based on suites of basic environmental conditions (*e.g.,* large inland and short coastal stream networks in a range of climatic, terrestrial, and aquatic regimes). The recovery of multiple watersheds and populations in each BPG ensures that there are sufficient populations within the BPG and across the DPS to provide resiliency in the face of environmental fluctuations, and also that a variety of habitat types and conditions are represented (*e.g.,* different stream gradients and estuary size, complexity and function).

Recovery of this DPS will require recovery of a sufficient number of viable populations (or sets of interacting trans-watershed populations) within each of the five BPGs to conserve the natural diversity (genetic, phenotypic, and behavioral), spatial distribution, and resiliency of the DPS as a whole.

Criterion D.2 – Life History Diversity. Essential to the recovery and long-term conservation of this DPS is the preservation and restoration of all the life history forms and strategies the species has evolved to exploit the diversity and range of habitat conditions that are characteristic of southern California. These life history forms include the fluvial-anadromous, lagoon-anadromous, and freshwater life history patterns that can be exhibited by native *O. mykiss* throughout the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Achieving this goal will require a number of closely coordinated activities, such as further research into the diverse life history patterns and adaptations of steelhead to a semi-arid and highly dynamic environment including the ecological relationship between non-anadromous and anadromous populations; monitoring of existing populations; and the implementation of the habitat protection and restoration actions would allow focusing on management activities (*e.g.,* removal of physical or hydrologic migration barriers,) to produce the suite of conditions that promote the coexistence of the different life history forms. Research may indicate that not all life history forms may have to be present in all viable populations on a regular basis, but only periodically.

Criteria D.2 – Redundancy and Geographic Separation. Wildfires, droughts, and debris flows pose the greatest natural threats to entire populations. Preservation of the various life history forms of *O. mykiss* requires that not all viable populations in a BPG be extirpated as a result of a natural catastrophic event – this requires both a redundancy of populations and an effective separation of populations. To ensure the survival of a minimum number of viable populations in each BPG, recovered populations should be separated by a sufficient distance to minimize the likelihood that individual wildfires do not encompass the entire suite of watersheds in any BPG. To determine the level of redundancy of viable populations and spatial differentiation between populations necessary to withstand catastrophic wildfires, the expected geographic extent of a thousand-year wildfire was estimated, based on wildfire data from 1910 through 2003. Fire return times were estimated using standards methods, and the number of wildfires that might be expected to affect each BPG was estimated, based on the number of fire-starts per mile in each BPG. From this analysis it was determined that the number of viable populations necessary for each BPG was at least one viable population plus the maximum number of wildfires expected for the BPG, or the number of historic viable populations in the BPG, whichever was less. The minimum geographic distance between individual viable populations, to the maximum extent feasible, should be 42 miles to minimize the likelihood that the minimum number of viable populations would be extirpated by the same thousand-year wildfire event. The preservation of a necessary minimum number of viable populations within a BPG against droughts and debris flows is achieved through the redundancy and geographic separation prescribed to protect against wildfire risk (Boughton *et al.* 2007b).

6.4 THREATS ABATEMENT CRITERIA

The current threat regime that is impeding the ability of anadromous *O. mykiss* to recover must be addressed to meet the population and DPS-level recovery criteria described above. In addition efforts to reduce the threats facing the species must also take into consideration future threats to species recovery such as climate change, ongoing human population growth, and associated land and water developments. Basic threats abatement criteria identified below are used in tracking the success of recovery efforts. The identified existing and future threats fall within the categories of listing factors identified during the species listing process (see Chapters 9 through 13, sub-sections 9.4 – 13.4 for each BPG). Each of these factors must be addressed prior to making a determination that a species has recovered and no longer requires the protections of the ESA.

This Recovery Plan prioritizes recovery actions for the watersheds within the BPGs according to the role of the watershed in recovery of the species, the severity of the threat addressed by the action, and the listing factors addressed by the action. Each recovery action has been given a priority of 1 or 2 as defined in the NMFS Interim Recovery Planning Guidance (see box, below, for definitions) for purposes of providing general guidance in the implementation of individual recovery actions. Further, a priority 3 ranking has been assigned for all other recovery actions which do not meet the criteria used for priority 1 or 3 recovery actions. Each recovery action has also been qualified with an additional descriptor: A) if the action addresses the first listing factor regarding the destruction or curtailment of the species' habitat, or B) if the action addresses one of the other four listing factors (See Chapter 3, Factors Leading to Federal Listing, for definition of listing factors). Where the recovery action addresses both types of listing factors, the descriptor is based on the principal listing factor addressed. Priority 1 recovery actions are necessary to prevent the extinction of the DPS or an irreversible decline of which would lead to extinction of the DPS. Priority 2 actions are intended to avoid prejudicing the recovery of the DPS by ensuring that individual populations essential to recovery are not further degraded or lost. Priority 3 actions are the remainder of the full suite of actions necessary to address all the viability criteria identified for the full recovery of the DPS (including recovery of individual populations identified in Table 7-1).

Priority 1: Actions that must be taken to prevent extinction or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly.

Priority 2: Actions that must be taken to prevent a significant decline in species population/habitat quality or in some other significant negative impact short of extinction.

NMFS proposes that all watershed threats having a priority 1A or 1B recovery actions in core 1 and 2 populations be abated to a "low" level using the same threats assessment process used to establish threat levels for this plan.

In addition, for watershed threats with recovery actions ranked as either priority 2 or 3, the threat must be abated one level below its current threat ranking based on the ranking system used in the threats assessment (*e.g.*, abate from "high" to "medium," or "medium" to "low").

The application of these threats abatement criteria is illustrated in the example in Table 5-2. High-level (red) threats associated with high-priority (1A and 1B) recovery actions are abated to low (green) levels. However, high-level threats associated with secondary (2A and 2B) priority recovery actions need only be abated one threat level to medium (yellow).

Table 6-2. Example application of basic threats abatement criteria.

Threat	Current Threat Level	Recovery Action Rank	Target Abatement Level for Recovery
Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)		1A	
Urban Development		1B	
Wildfires		1B	
Roads		2B	
Groundwater Extraction		2B	

The threats abatement criteria are linked to one or more of the listing factors identified for the Southern California steelhead DPS. Only Listing Factor 2, Over-utilization, does not have specific threats abatement criteria identified, as changes in fishing regulations have already ameliorated the threat posed to the species from angling through the prohibition of angling in most anadromous waters within the Southern California DPS. These threats abatement criteria are intended to ensure that:

- Viable populations have unimpeded access to previously occupied habitats (Listing Factors 1, 4, and 5).
- Freshwater migration corridors supporting viable populations meet the life history and habitat requirements of steelhead (Listing Factors 1, 3, 4, and 5).
- Watersheds supporting viable populations have habitat conditions and characteristics that support all life history stages (Listing Factors 1, 3, 4, and 5).
- Adequate funding, staffing, and training are provided to state and federal regulatory agencies to ensure the ecosystem and species protections of state and federal requirements are properly implemented and remain in place (Listing Factor 4).
- Standardized monitoring of populations and their habitats in each BPG across the DPS evaluates the effectiveness of recovery actions and measures progress towards recovery (Listing Factors 4 and 5).

6.5 PROVISIONAL RECLASSIFICATION CRITERIA

6.5.1 Reclassification of an Endangered Species.

When a species is listed as endangered, it is appropriate to identify intermediate recovery criteria which if achieved would allow for the reclassification (or down listing) of the species from endangered to threatened. A threatened species is defined in the ESA as "any species which is likely to become endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range" but is not currently in danger of extinction (Sec 3 [19]).

The determination regarding reclassification must be made by the Secretary of Commerce based on any one or a combination of the following factors which are also used for listing a species under the ESA:

1. Present or Threatened Destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range;
2. Over Utilization for Commercial Recreational, Scientific or Educational purposes;
3. Disease or Predation;

4. Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms; or
5. Other Natural or Manmade Factors Affecting its Continued Existence.

The reclassification of a species from endangered to threatened, as with the initial listing, must be based on the best scientific and commercial data available, without reference to possible economic or other impacts, after conducting a status review of the species. The ESA provides a process for regularly assessing the status of a listed species through the completion of periodic review of the species that are listed as threatened or endangered to ensure that the listing status of a species remains current. Specifically, Section 4(c) (2) of the ESA provides that:

"The Secretary shall –

(A) conduct, at least once every five years, a review of all species included in a list . . . which is in effect at the time of such review; and

(B) determine on the basis of such review whether any such species should-

i. be removed from such list;

ii. be changed in status from an endangered species to threatened species; or

iii. be changed in status from a threatened species to an endangered species."

Evaluating the status of a species for potential reclassification requires an explicit analysis of the threats specified under the five listing factors, in addition to an evaluation of the population or other demographic parameters of the listed species (*e.g.,* anadromous fraction, life history types, *etc*.) Status reviews of a species periodically conducted by NMFS may serve as a 5-year review for the purposes of reclassification.

As with recovery criteria, reclassification criteria address both the status of the species (biological criteria) and the status of the threats to the species (threats abatement criteria). The biological criteria deal with the abundance, spatial distribution, and diversity of the populations within the DPS, and the DPS as a whole. The threats abatement criteria are indicators that the key threats to the population and the DPS as a whole have been abated or mitigated.

Because of the uncertainty regarding key recovery criteria (*e.g.,* annual run size) reclassification criteria must necessarily be both provisional and precautionary (see discussion regarding recovery criteria in sections 5.3.1.1 - 5.3.1.2). Further, reclassification criteria must ensure that the full recovery of the species is not prejudiced or precluded by failing to address the fundamental threats to the species, including, but not limited to its natural spatial distribution and diversity. The reclassification criteria identified below, if met, are intended to achieve partial recovery of the species, and ultimately contribute to the full recovery and delisting of the species. These criteria constitute a sub-set of the recovery criteria and address the most significant threats in the highest priority watersheds in each of the five BPGs within the DPS. Full recovery will require addressing the complete set of recovery criteria, including lower priority threats in the full suite of watersheds which would constitute a recovered DPS.

6.5.2 Population Level Reclassification Criteria

The following reclassification criteria must be met for the specified number of populations in each of the five BPGs (listed below) to down-list the species from endangered to threatened:

- *Population Reclassification Criterion PR 1: Mean Annual Run Size* – Run size is sufficient to result in an extinction risk of <5% within 50 years (not including poor ocean conditions).

- *Population Reclassification Criterion PR 2: Anadromous Fraction* – N= 100% of Mean Annual Run Size.

6.5.3 DPS-Level Reclassification Criteria

The following reclassification criteria must be met for the DPS to down-list the species from endangered to threatened:

- DPS Biogeographic Diversity Criteria DR 1: Meet the population level reclassification criteria for the specified number of populations in each of the five BPGs:

Monte Arido Highlands BPG:

2 *Viable Populations*

Conception Coast BPG:

2 *Viable Populations*

Santa Monica Mountains BPG:

1 *Viable Population*

Mojave Rim BPG:

1 *Viable Population*

Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG:

2 *Viable Populations*

Core 1 populations are generally those which the TRT has identified with the highest intrinsic potential within each BPG, and therefore are most likely to contribute to the long-term persistence of the species (See Appendix B, Watershed Intrinsic Potential Rankings.)

6.5.4 Reclassification Threats Abatement Criteria

In order to meet the above population and DPS level reclassification criteria the current threat regime that is impeding the ability of anadromous *O. mykiss* to recover must be addressed. The threats analysis conducted for the endangered Southern California Steelhead DPS has prioritized recovery actions in each BPG (see Recovery Action Tables in Chapters 9 through 13). Priority 1 recovery actions are defined as those actions that must be taken to prevent the extinction of the species, or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly, thus precluding the recovery of the species. To meet the reclassification threats abatement criteria the threat levels identified as high priority threats in the minimum number required viable of populations must be reduced to medium or low, whichever is necessary to meet the population level reclassification criteria.

As noted above these reclassification criteria are provisional and precautionary, and before reclassification can occur, the status of the species must be evaluated, either through a five-year review or a separate status review pursuant to the requirements of the ESA and applicable administrative regulations.

7. Steelhead Recovery Strategy

"The aim of the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) is to recover species that would otherwise go extinct, and to that end it requires the Federal government to prepare recovery plans. A recovery plan outlines a strategy for lowering extinction risk to an acceptable level. . ."

NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team, Population Characterization for Recovery Planning, 2006

7.0 INTRODUCTION

The biological recovery strategy is the approach undertaken to achieve the individual recovery criteria and objectives and, in turn, the ultimate recovery goal of de-listing the Southern California Steelhead DPS. The recovery strategy in this Recovery Plan identifies the core watersheds where recovery of viable populations is necessary to achieve the recovery goal and implement watershed-specific actions (*e.g.*, removal of migration barriers, modification of land-use practices, including agriculture, and protection and restoration of spawning and rearing habitats) that are necessary to reverse the effects of past and ongoing threats to population abundance, growth rate, diversity, and spatial structure of endangered steelhead within the SCS Recovery Planning Area. An integral element in this recovery strategy is the development and implementation of a research and monitoring program which will provide the additional information necessary to refine recovery criteria and objectives, as well as assess the effectiveness of recovery actions and the overall success of the recovery program.

Recovery of southern California steelhead will require an effective implementation, as well as a scientifically sound biological recovery strategy. The framework for a durable implementation strategy involves two key principles: 1) solutions that focus on fundamental causes for watershed and river degradation, rather than short-term remedies; and 2) solutions that emphasize resilience in the face of an unpredictable future to ensure a sustainable future for both human communities and steelhead (Beechie *et al*. 2010, 1999, Boughton 2007a, Lubchenco 1998).

Implementation of this Recovery Plan will require a shift in societal attitudes, understanding, priorities, and practices. Many of the current land and water use practices that are detrimental to steelhead (particularly water supply and flood control programs) are not sustainable. Modification of these practices is necessary to both continue to meet the needs of the human communities of southern California and restore the habitats upon which viable steelhead populations depend. Recovery of steelhead will entail significant investments, but will also provide economic and other ecosystem and societal benefits. Restored, viable salmonid populations provide ongoing direct and indirect economic benefits, including recreational fishing, and other tourist related activities. A comprehensive strategic framework is necessary to serve as a guide to integrate the actions

contributing to the larger goal of recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS. This strategic framework incorporates the concepts of viability at both the population and DPS levels, and the identification of threats and recovery actions for watersheds within each BPG.

7.1 ACHIEVING RECOVERY

For millennia, southern California steelhead have successfully dealt with natural environmental fluctuations such as prolonged droughts, flash-floods, uncontrolled wildfires, sea level alternations, periodic massive influxes of sedimentation, and climate changes—natural environmental fluctuations which also currently challenge the human population of southern California (Waples, 2008a, 2008b).

Of the approximately 37 million people currently living in California, approximately 22 million live in the southern California counties of Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Imperial, and San Diego. As a result of this large human population, and related development, steelhead populations, along with many other indigenous species of both animals and plants, have been severely reduced or extirpated in many coastal watersheds. Despite extensive landscape modifications, steelhead have continued to persist, in one or more of its several life history forms, in portions of many southern California watersheds, including some of the most highly urbanized.

Recovery of viable, self-sustaining populations of anadromous southern California steelhead will entail the re-integration of these populations into the human configured landscape. Such re-integration will necessarily include an effort to restore habitats and operate the human built system in ways which conserve and better utilize land and water resources in mutually beneficial ways for southern California steelhead and the current and projected human population. Uncertain future precipitation and associated wildfires will create challenges in maintaining traditional water supply and flood control structures such as dams, levees, and channelization. Engineered systems which control hydrological systems have often been overvalued, and frequently overwhelmed when their design parameters have been exceeded by natural forces (floods, droughts, wildfires, earthquakes, debris flows, *etc.*). Investments in more sustainable productive capital can at least partially offset these challenges while also providing more suitable habitat conditions for steelhead. Dedicating space for natural stream behavior via setback levees and underground or off-channel water storage are some of the ways to take advantage of the self-organizing capacity of natural systems. Such an approach can offer a more efficient mix of technological and natural capital, and is more likely to be a more economical, self-maintaining strategy. See for example, Orsi 2004, Gumprecht 1999, and Mount 1995. Steelhead recovery that is based on watershed and river restoration has the potential to reconcile three conditions: steelhead viability, self-adjustment of stream systems, and the provision of ecological services for people.

Addressing these challenges therefore provides an opportunity to meet a wide variety of public policy objectives to ensure a sustainable future for the endangered southern California steelhead, as well as other native riparian species, including a number of other federally listed species such as California red-legged frog, Southwestern willow flycatcher, Least Bell's vireo, Arroyo toad, Tidewater goby, Santa Ana sucker, and the Western snowy plover that co-occupy the SCS Recovery Planning Area.

Under present conditions, the viability of individual populations is more likely achievable by focusing recovery efforts on larger watersheds capable of sustaining larger populations, and DPS viability is more likely to be achievable by focusing on the most widely-dispersed set of such core populations capable of maintaining dispersal connectivity between southern California coastal watersheds.

Effective implementation of recovery actions will entail: 1) development of cooperative relationships and a shared vision with private land owners, special districts, and local governments with direct control and responsibilities over non-federal land-use practices to maximize recovery opportunities; 2) participation in the land use and water planning and regulatory processes of local, regional, State, and Federal agencies to integrate recovery efforts into the full range of land and water use planning; 3) close cooperation with other state resource agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Game, California Coastal Commission, CalTrans, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation, State Water Resources Control Board, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards to ensure consistency of recovery efforts; and 4) partnering with federal resource agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Defense, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to utilize agencies' expertise and resources. To support all of these efforts, NMFS and its partners will need to provide technical expertise and public outreach and education regarding the role and value of the species within the larger watershed environment and the compatibility of sustainable development with steelhead recovery.

An implementation schedule describing time frames and estimated costs associated with individual recovery actions has been developed. Estimating time and total cost to recovery is challenging for a variety of reasons. These reasons include the large geographic extent of the SCS Recovery Planning Area; the need to refine recovery criteria; the need to complete watershed-specific investigations such as barrier inventories and assessments; the establishment of flow regimes for individual watersheds; and the review and possible modification of a variety of existing land-use and water management plans (including waste discharge requirements) under a variety of local, state, and federal jurisdictions. Additionally, the biological response of many of the recovery actions is uncertain, and achieving full recovery will be a long-term effort likely requiring decades, while addressing new stressors that emerge over time. However, NMFS estimated the costs associated with certain common restoration activities such as those undertaken as part of the California Department of Fish and Game Fisheries Restoration Grants Program. Appendix E, Habitat Restoration Cost References For Steelhead Recovery Planning, contains preliminary estimates for these categories of typical watershed and river restoration actions.

7.2 CORE POPULATIONS

The findings of the TRT (Boughton *et al*. 2007b, 2006) and additional review by NMFS indicate certain watersheds and the steelhead populations within those watersheds constitute the foundation of the recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS. (See Table 7-1). These watersheds exhibit the physical and hydrological characteristics (*e.g.*, large spatial area, perennial and reliable winter streamflow, stream network extending inland) that are most likely to sustain independently viable populations, and that are critical for ensuring viability of the DPS as a whole. Population viability is more likely achievable by focusing recovery efforts on larger watersheds in each Biogeographic Population Group capable of sustaining larger populations, and DPS viability is more likely achievable by focusing on the most widely-dispersed set of such core populations capable of maintaining dispersal connectivity (see Boughton *et al.* 2007b, 2006).

In Table 7-1 populations are identified as Core 1, Core 2, or Core 3.[1] The Core 1 populations are

[1] The minimum number of recovered populations identified in Table 7.1 is comprised of a combination of Core 1, 2, and 3 populations.

those populations identified as the highest priority for recovery actions based on a variety of factors, including: the intrinsic potential of the population in an unimpaired condition; the role of the population in meeting the spatial and/or redundancy viability criteria; the current condition of the populations; the severity of the threats facing the populations; the potential ecological or genetic diversity the watershed and population could provide to the species; and the capacity of the watershed and population to respond to the critical recovery actions needed to abate those threats. Core 1 populations form the nucleus of the recovery implementation strategy and must meet the population-level biological recovery criteria set out in Chapter 6, Steelhead Recovery Goals, Objectives & Criteria, Table 6-1. This set of Core 1 populations should be the first focus of an overall recovery effort; however, NMFS also recognizes that the timing of such efforts may be influenced by practical considerations such as the availability of funding, environmental review and permitting requirements, as well as willing and able partners. Core 2 populations also form part of the recovery implementation strategy and contribute to the set of populations necessary to achieve recovery criteria such as minimum numbers of viable populations needed within a BPG. Similar to Core 1 populations, Core 2 populations must meet the biological recovery criteria for populations set out in Table 7-1; while these populations are ranked slight lower than Core 1 populations based on the factors noted above, NMFS recognizes that the timing of recovery actions on these populations may be influenced by practical considerations such as the availability of funding, environmental review and permitting requirements, and willing and able partners. While recovery actions on Core 3 populations are not assigned as high an implementation priority as Core 1 and 2 populations, these populations could be important in promoting connectivity between populations and genetic diversity across the SCS Recovery Planning Area, and therefore are an integral part of the overall biological recovery strategy.

Populations identified in Table 7.1 as Core 1 and 2 populations should meet the four population recovery criteria either as a single population or a group of interacting trans-watershed populations such as those that might exist in the Conception Coast and more southerly BPGs (Santa Monica Mountains and Santa Catalina Gulf Coast). Core 3 populations, because of their generally lower intrinsic potential, may function as part of an interacting trans-basin population, but do not meet all the population viability criteria as individual populations. Further research is needed to identify these interacting groups, and the population characteristics which they must exhibit to ensure viability of the DPS.

Table 7-1. Core 1, 2, and 3 *O. mykiss* populations within the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. Higher priority populations are highlighted in bold face.

BPG	POPULATION	FOCUS FOR RECOVERY
Monte Arido Highlands	**Santa Maria River**	**Core 1**
	Santa Ynez River	**Core 1**
	Ventura River	**Core 1**
	Santa Clara River	**Core 1**
Conception Coast*	Jalama Creek	Core 3
	Canada de Santa Anita	Core 3
	Canada de la Gaviota	**Core 2**
	Agua Caliente	Core 3
	Canada San Onofre	Core 3
	Arroyo Hondo	Core 3
	Arroyo Quemado	Core 3
	Tajiguas Creek	Core 3
	Canada del Refugio	Core 3
	Canada del Venadito	Core 3
	Canada del Corral	Core 3
	Canada del Capitan	Core 3
	Gato Canyon	Core 3
	Dos Pueblos Canyon	Core 3
	Eagle Canyon	Core 3
	Tecolote Canyon	Core 3
	Bell Canyon	Core 3
	Goleta Slough Complex	**Core 2**
	Arroyo Burro	Core 3
	Mission Creek	**Core 1**
	Montecito Creek	Core 3
	Oak Creek	Core 3
	San Ysidro Creek	Core 3
	Romero Creek	Core 3
	Arroyo Paredon	Core 3
	Carpinteria Salt Marsh Complex	Core 3
	Carpinteria Creek	**Core 1**
	Rincon Creek	**Core 1**
Santa Monica Mountains*	Big Sycamore Canyon	Core 3
	Arroyo Sequit	**Core 2**
	Malibu Creek	**Core 1**
	Topanga Canyon	**Core 1**
	Solstice Creek	Core 3

Mojave Rim**	Los Angeles River	Core 3
	San Gabriel River	**Core 1**
	Santa Ana River	**Core 2**
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast**	**San Juan Creek**	**Core 1**
	San Mateo Creek	**Core 1**
	San Onofre Creek	**Core 2**
	Santa Margarita River	**Core 1**
	San Luis Rey River	**Core 1**
	San Dieguito River	**Core 2**
	San Diego River	Core 3
	Sweetwater River	Core 3
	Otay River	Core 3
	Tijuana River	Core 3

**Note: If further research determines that individual populations are not viable, restoration of more closely spaced populations may be required to achieve the minimum number of viable populations for this BPG.*

*** Note: these BPGs may not have had consistent anadromy, which complicates the designation of populations that need to achieve viability, but may contribute to the over-all diversity (genetic, phenotypic, and behavioral) of the DPS.*

Public and private groups should not be dissuaded from undertaking actions that alleviate threats to the species in Core 3 watersheds because of their potential role in contributing to the overall abundance and diversity of the DPS, as well as promoting connectivity between populations. While sufficient information regarding threats and the biology and ecology of the species is available to define an overall recovery strategy, there still remain questions regarding the ecology of the species (*e.g.,* function of certain habitats in the life history of the species, relationship between the anadromous and resident forms, rate of dispersal between watersheds). In light of this uncertainty, a prudent approach is to define a recovery strategy based on the existing information on Core 1 and 2 watersheds while recovery opportunities in Core 3 watersheds continue to be actively pursued as a precaution to reduce the risk of extinction. Therefore, while the Core 1 and 2 watersheds form the foundation for recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS, recovery actions to alleviate threats should be undertaken in other watersheds to complement this recovery implementation strategy.

7.3 CRITICAL RECOVERY ACTIONS

The recovery actions in this recovery strategy represent the critical elements for alleviating major threats to endangered steelhead in core watersheds. Recovery actions are also specified to address limited knowledge regarding the biology and ecology of the species, as well as its changing status within individual core watersheds.

Critical recovery actions should have the highest priority across the DPS and within core watersheds to achieve recovery objectives and criteria. In the tables describing recommended recovery actions for populations within the DPS, these actions have received a priority ranking of 1. Opportunistically, other recovery actions may be implemented prior to these actions, but these actions are widely recognized in the scientific literature as addressing threats which have caused the wide-spread decline of steelhead throughout its natural range. See for, example,

Moyle *et al.* (2011, 2008), Johnson *et al.* (2008), Caudill *et al*. (2007), Gustafson *et al.* (2007), Cooke *et al. (*2006), Boughton *et al.* (2005), Brown *et al.* (2005a), Doyle *et al. (*2003), Williams and Bisson (2003), Hart *et al.* (2002), Bednarek (2001) Pejchar and Warner (2001).

Although a wide range of anthropogenic activities have contributed to the high extinction risk of the Southern California Steelhead DPS, two types of developments and activities pose the principal threats to the species: 1) impassable barriers, and 2) water storage and withdrawal, including groundwater extraction (see Chapter 4, Current DPS-Level Threats Assessment, Table 4-1). These threats affect basic life history phases of the species (egg-to-smolt survival and smolt-to-spawner survival) throughout the DPS and are key components of the risks posed to the species. Accordingly, this recovery strategy places a high priority on recovery actions that alleviate threats related to impassable barriers and water storage and withdrawal. Closely related to providing access to rearing habitats is the need to ensure that the ecological functions of those habitats are protected and, where impaired, are restored. The critical recovery actions to address these two threats within the Core 1 watersheds are listed below in Table 7-2. Additionally, land-use practices have severely degraded mainstem and estuarine habitats and are identified as high threat sources with corresponding high priority recovery actions in each BPG.

Regarding the effects of impassable anthropogenic barriers on endangered steelhead, the recovery objectives include restoring steelhead distribution to previously occupied areas and restoring genetic diversity and natural interchange within populations and metapopulations. One of the threats abatement criteria identified to meet these objectives is to allow the species sustainable natural access to historical spawning and rearing habitats. Historical habitats are often situated in protected areas such as U.S. National Forests, and exhibit essential characteristics such as suitable substrate, sustained base flows, and refugia such as pool habitats. Besides allowing access to historical habitats, dam modification provides additional ecological benefits that are essential to attaining the recovery objectives. Such benefits include maintaining genetic and ecological diversity, population abundance, growth rates, and buffering against natural and anthropogenic catastrophic disturbances (*e.g.,* wildfires, droughts, debris flows) though restoration of the natural spatial population structure of the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Mechanistic solutions to fish passage can be problematic for a variety of reasons, including: the limitations in the operations during high flows when fish are most likely to be migrating; periodic mechanical failures which result in migration delays, or lost migration opportunities; and the expense of personnel and equipment to maintain such operations. See for example, Keefer *et al*. 2008, Caudill *et al*. (2007), Pompeu and Martinez (2007), Oldani and Baigum (2002), Nemeth and Kiefer (1999), Cada *et al.* (1995, 1993), Colt and White (eds.) (1991), Fleming *et al. (*1991), Godinho *et al.* (1991), Lucas and Baras (2001). If barrier modification (including removal or breaching) is determined to be technically or otherwise infeasible, alternative approaches for providing effective passage of steelhead should be implemented. The selected alternatives should provide the full range of ecological benefits associated with barrier removal, breaching, or modification.

Water storage (including reservoirs and managed groundwater basins) and withdrawals (*e.g.,* groundwater pumping, surface-water diversions) can alter the pattern and magnitude of streamflow, with multiple adverse effects to steelhead habitats, including, but not limited to: reducing migratory conditions, degrading spawning and rearing habitat, facilitating the colonization by non-native species, and altering the physical and biotic habitat structure which supports the ecosystem upon which steelhead depend. See for example, Wegner *et al.* (2011, 2010), Marks *et al.* (2010), Olden and Naiman (2010), Poff and Zimmerman (2010), Poff *et al.*

(2010, 1997), Annear *et al*. (2009), Instream Flow Council (2009), Lytle and Poff (2004), Bunn and Arthington (2002), Gibbons *et al.* (2001), Hatfield and Bruce (2000), Vadas (2000), Kraft (1992), MacDonald *et al*. (1989).

Recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS requires the restoration of steelhead distribution to previously occupied areas and the restoration of suitable habitat conditions and characteristics for all life history stages of steelhead. Threats abatement criteria identified to meet these objectives include the restoration and protection of these habitat conditions and characteristics. The essential recovery actions involve either halting the alteration of the pattern and magnitude of streamflow when such an option is available, or implementing measures (*e.g.,* operating criteria) to ensure that a more natural (*i.e.,* timing, frequency, duration, magnitude, and rate-of-change) streamflow is restored. There are many sites within core watersheds where past and present anthropogenic activities continue to alter the pattern and magnitude of streamflow and for which essential recovery actions are identified. In some situations, other actions to address impassable barriers may fully or partially eliminate threats to the pattern and magnitude of streamflow, thereby addressing two principal threats to the species: physical blockage of fish passage, and reduction or elimination of surface flows. The restoration of a more natural flow regime will also contribute toward restoring rearing habitats.

Regarding rearing habitats, rapid juvenile growth is one of the most effective strategies for successfully completing the early life history stages (fertilized egg to smolt) of the anadromous life history form, and ensuring survival during the ocean phase prior to return as spawning adults. Studies have demonstrated high growth rates in some seasonal lagoons, and possibly other freshwater habitats that provide suitable over-summering habitat (Hayes *et al.* 2011b, 2008, Bond 2006, Smith 1990, Moore 1980a). The identification, protection, and where necessary, restoration of such habitats is therefore another critical recovery action.

The high priority recovery actions identified in the Recovery Plan do not diminish the importance of continuing to undertake actions that, while not the focus of this recovery strategy, promote the restoration and maintenance of essential habitat functions for individual populations within the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Resource managers and stakeholders should continue to implement recovery actions that: 1) curb unnatural inputs of fine sediments to waterways, 2) promote the establishment and maintenance of streamside vegetation and flood-plain connectivity and function, and 3) encourage the formation and preservation of complex instream habitat. To reduce further degradation of habitat characteristics and condition in watersheds throughout the entire range of the DPS, local stakeholders should continue to undertake those actions that complement the essential recovery actions in Core 1 watersheds.

Finally, conservation hatcheries may contribute to the recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS in a variety of ways, including: (1) providing a means to preserve local populations faced with immediate extirpation as a result of catastrophic events such as wildfires, toxic spills, dewatering of watercourses, etc.; 2) preserve the remaining genotypic and phenotypic characteristics that promote life history variability though captive broodstock, supplementation, and gene-bank programs to reduce short-term risk of extinction; and 3) reintroduction of populations in restored watersheds.

Issues that should be considered prior to implementing a conservation hatchery program include: 1) conditions under which rescue, reestablishment or supplementation could be used effectively in wild steelhead recovery, 2) methods for rescue, reestablishment or supplementation, and 3) protocols for evaluating the effectiveness of such conservation

hatchery functions over time. (See Chapter 8, Summary of DPS-Wide Recovery Actions, Sub-section 8.3 for additional discussion of the role of conservation hatcheries in steelhead recovery.)

Conservation hatcheries and species' establishment program should not serve as surrogates for establishing and preserving essential habitat functions for endangered steelhead particularly where anthropogenic activities have created threats that constrain or eliminate habitat functions and values.

Table 7-2. Critical recovery actions for Core 1 *O. mykiss* populations within the Southern California Steelhead DPS.

BPG	POPULATION	CRITICAL RECOVERY ACTION
Monte Arido Highlands	Santa Maria River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of groundwater extractions and water releases from Twitchell Dam provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify[2] Twitchell Dam to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
	Santa Ynez River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of groundwater extractions and water releases from Bradbury, Gibraltar, and Juncal dams provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Bradbury, Gibraltar, and Juncal dams to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
	Ventura River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of groundwater extractions and water releases, including bypass flows around diversions from Casitas, Matilija, and Robles Diversion dams provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Casitas, Matilija, and Robles Diversion[3] dams to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
	Santa Clara River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of groundwater extractions and water releases, including bypass flows around diversions, from Vern Freeman Diversion, Santa Felicia, Pyramid, and Castaic dams provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Vern Freeman Diversion, lower Santa Paula Creek flood control channel, Harvey Diversion, Santa Felicia, and Pyramid dams to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
Conception Coast	Mission Creek, Carpinteria Creek, and Rincon Creek	Halt the unnatural dry-season reduction in the amount and extent of surface water flow to restore natural or pre-impact over-summering habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify road crossings, highways, flood control channels, debris basins, and railway crossings to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean. Develop and implement a restoration and management plan for the Mission, Carpinteria, and Rincon Creek Estuaries.

Santa Monica Mountains	Malibu Creek	Remove Rindge and Malibu dams, and physically modify road crossings, to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
	Topanga Creek	Develop and implement plan to replace the U.S. 101 culvert over Topanga Creek with a full span bridge to remove fill from the Topanga Creek Estuary, and allow natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitat. Develop and implement a restoration and management plan for the Topanga Creek Estuary.
Mojave Rim	San Gabriel River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of groundwater extractions and water releases from Morris, San Gabriel, and Cogswell dams provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Morris, San Gabriel, Cogswell, and Santa Fe dams, and road, highway, and railway crossings to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	San Juan/Arroyo Trabuco Creeks	Physically modify road crossings, highways, and railways to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
	Santa Margarita River	Physically modify or remove the O'Neill Diversion Dam to allow natural rates of migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats. Review and modify the Rancho California Water District water release schedule program to provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Initiate an aquatic exotic species assessment and control program for the Santa Margarita River watershed. Initiate an aquatic exotic species assessment and control program for the Santa Margarita River watershed.
	San Mateo Creek	Develop and implement a groundwater and surface water management program to provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Initiate an aquatic exotic species assessment and control program for the San Mateo Creek watershed.
	San Luis Rey River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of water releases from Pilgram, Turner, Lower and Upper Stehly, Agua Tibia, Henshaw, Eagles Nest, and Escondido diversion dams (including groundwater extractions) provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify all dams, and road, highway, and railway crossings to allow natural rates of migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts to the estuary and ocean.

[1] "Pattern and magnitude" refers to timing, duration, frequency, magnitude, and rate-of-change.
[2] Physically modifying a dam may incidentally restore the natural or pre-dam pattern and magnitude of streamflow.
[3] Although Robles Diversion Dam currently possesses an existing fish-passage facility, the necessary studies to determine the degree to which steelhead may be delayed in detecting and subsequently migrating through the facility have not been completed. The findings may indicate that further modifications of the facility are necessary to ensure natural rates of migrations for steelhead.

7.4 RESTORING STEELHEAD ACCESS TO HISTORICAL HABITATS THAT ARE CURRENTLY INACCESSIBLE AND UNOCCUPIED BY THE SPECIES

Steelhead are a highly migratory species, allowing them to move between marine and freshwater habitats to gain access to spawning and rearing habitats, and productive marine foraging areas (Quinn 2005). Much of this movement within freshwater habitats has been restricted by a variety of barriers to migration (California Department of Fish and Game 2011b; see Figures 7-1 and 7-2). Restoring steelhead access to historical spawning and rearing habitats (*i.e.,* areas upstream of introduced barriers that are currently unoccupied by anadromous *O. mykiss*) is an essential action for recovering endangered steelhead.

The following discussion summarizes the ecological rationale for this specific recovery action. Central to the rationale is the historical steelhead population structure and distribution, and the necessity of historical habitats for reducing extinction risk and increasing population growth rate (*i.e.,* the productivity of a population).

Unoccupied areas are essential for conserving endangered steelhead (Boughton *et al.* 2007b, 2006). The characteristics and condition of historical habitats must remain functional to support their intended conservation role for the species. Implementing these essential recovery actions will require removing or physically modifying anthropogenic barriers, which NMFS expects will generate questions regarding the feasibility of undertaking such activities. In response to such questions, we summarize information here that indicates barrier removal and physical modification would be feasible and successful (*i.e.,* would increase population growth rates).

Native steelhead historically existed in areas that are currently inaccessible.

Knowing where the species existed prior to the construction of migration barriers is essential for identifying the watersheds where restoring access to historical spawning and rearing habitats would be appropriate.

A review of the scientific and historical literature on the distribution of steelhead within the SCS Recovery Planning Area indicates that the species was widespread up until the mid-20th century. See for example, Alagona *et al*. (2011), Becker *et al*. (2008), Boughton *et al.* (2007c), McEachron (2007), Boughton *et al.* (2005), Boughton and Fish (2003), California Department of Fish and Game (2000), Hovey (2000), Entrix, Inc. (2004b, 1995), Swift *et al.* (1993), Nehlsen, *et al.* (1991), Woelfel (1991), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (1998a), Bell (1978), Wells *et al.* (1975), Capelli (1974), Ventura County Fish and Game Commission (1974), Boydstun (1973), Fry (1973), Shapovalov *et al*. (1981), Combs (1972), Fry (1938, 1973), Kreider (1948), Hubbs (1946), Shapovalov (1945, 1944), Culver and Hubbs (1917), Jordan and Gilbert (1881), Jordan and Evermann (1896, 1923).

Investigation of the genetic structure of juvenile *O. mykiss* collected from freshwater habitats, including instream areas upstream of migration barriers within Core 1 populations, confirm that the present-day populations are dominated by ancestry of indigenous southern coastal steelhead (Clemento *et al.* 2009, Pearse and Garza 2008, Girman and Garza 2006, Greenwald *et. al.* 2005, Nielsen *et al.* 2005, 2003, 1997). Populations of *O. mykiss* that exist upstream of introduced barriers are largely or entirely descended from relic *O. mykiss* populations ascending the watersheds historically. These findings as well as the intrinsic potential of certain watershed-specific populations for recovering this species support the high priority of restoring steelhead access to upstream spawning and rearing areas, especially within

Core 1 populations (Boughton *et al*. 2007b, 2006, Boughton and Goslin 2006).

Restoring species access to historical habitats will reduce extinction risk and increase population growth rate.

Artificial migration barriers are a major cause of habitat loss and fragmentation within the SCS Recovery Area, and have resulted in a high risk of species' extinction (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Boughton *et al.* 2005). Restoring steelhead access to historical habitats is necessary to reduce extinction risk to a level that is considered negligible over a 100-year period. See Figures 7-2 and 7-3.

Population extinction risk is related to the numerical abundance of the population, which itself is related to the extent that the species is distributed over space (*i.e.,* population spatial structure) and the degree to which diversity of life history traits is not restricted. Small populations with limited spatial structure are particularly susceptible to extinction, owing to their increased susceptibility to demographic and environmental fluctuations, and loss of genetic variability. Steelhead exhibit a suite of traits, such as anadromy, timing of spawning, emigration, and immigration, fecundity, age-at-maturity, and other behavioral, physiological and genetic characteristics. The variable of these characteristics reflect their adaptation to their variable freshwater and marine environments. The more diverse these traits (or the more these traits are not restricted), the more likely the species is to survive a spatially and temporally fluctuating environment (Boughton *et al.* 2006, McElhany *et al*. 2009, 2000). Overall, the greater a species' geographic distribution and the less constrained the diversity of life history traits, the more likely the species' ability to withstand stochastic environmental variation and achieve and maintain a rate of population growth that is viable (*i.e.,* reduces the extinction risk to a negligible level).

Throughout the SCS Recovery Planning Area, anthropogenic activities have severely truncated population spatial structure through the construction of structures that have inhibited or blocked completely fish migration, and as a result eliminated certain life history traits, particularly the anadromous life history form which has been classified as endangered in the SCS Recovery Planning Area. See for example, California Department of Fish and Game (2011b), Francis (2011, 2010a, 2010b), Kajtaniak (2010, 2009), Llanos *et al*. (2009), Michael Love & Associates (2009), Stoecker (2009), Bunderson *et al.* (2008), CDM, Inc. (2007), Michael Love & Associates and Stoecker Ecological (2007), Tetra Tech, Inc. (2007), California Trout, Inc. 2006, Boughton *et al.* (2005), Cachuma Resource Conservation District and Carpinteria Creek Watershed Coalition (2005), Stoecker and Kelley (2005), Stoecker (2004), Stoecker and Stoecker (2003), Stoecker and Conception Coast Project (2002), Kuyper (1998).

While the species was historically widespread, artificial migration barriers have resulted in populations that are sparsely distributed over space and significantly reduced in both the size and number of populations. These barriers prevent steelhead from migrating within rivers and to and from the ocean, a critical part of the species' life cycle. Barriers preclude steelhead from accessing upstream spawning habitats and interacting with the freshwater form of *O. mykiss*, which can contribute to the diversity of the O. mykiss complex, and better withstand stochastic environmental fluctuations.

Because the limited and degraded habitat conditions within the DPS has reduced the abundance, diversity, spatial structure, and growth rate of the affected steelhead populations, the areas currently occupied by the species are inadequate for recovery of the species (Boughton *et al*. 2007b, 2005, Gustafson *et al*. 2007, Boughton *et al*. 2005, Good *et al.* 2005).

An effective recovery strategy for increasing population growth rate and reducing extinction risk to a level that is considered negligible over a 100-year period is to re-establish access to

habitats historically use by steelhead and restoring ecological traits that are necessary for the species to express its variable and complex life cycle.

Habitats within inaccessible areas are capable of supporting essential life history functions.

The available information describing the current abundance and distribution of *O. mykiss* indicates that habitats historically accessible to steelhead possess the capacity to support production of steelhead. Investigators commonly use information on the abundance or distribution of stream fish as a means to infer the existence of suitable habitat for a species (Boughton and Goslin 2006, Stoecker and Kelley 2005, Stoecker 2004, Stoecker and Stoecker, Stoecker 2003, Stoecker and Conception Coast 2002). Fishery investigations performed in selected coastal watersheds by state and federal resources agencies, as well a variety of academic and private investigators, report on the distribution of *O. mykiss* habitat, including in areas upstream of artificial barriers within Core 1 populations. These investigations indicate that the existing habitats are suitable for spawning and rearing of *O. mykiss*, as evident by the finding of young-of-the-year and older juvenile trout. Inferring the existence of suitable habitat for the anadromous form of *O. mykiss* based on the presence of the resident form is reasonable and ecologically appropriate given that the resident and anadromous forms represent different life history strategies of the same species. See for example, Normandeau (2011), Thomas R. Payne and Associates (2010, 2009, 2008, 2007), Titus *et al. (*2010), Boughton and Goslin (2006), California Department of Fish and Game (2006), Padres Associates (2005), Stoecker and Kelley (2005), Stoecker (2004), Dvorksy (2001), Los Padres National Forest (2000), Carpanzano (1996), Douglas (1995), Swift *et al.* (1993), Deinstadt *et al*. (1990), Keegan (1990a, 1990b), Moore (1980c), Bottroff and Deinstadt (1978).

With regard to the amount of suitable steelhead habitat, the findings of fishery investigations and habitat evaluations indicate the existence of hundreds of miles of stream network across the Core 1 populations. Numerous streams within Core 1 watersheds provide an extensive habitat that is capable of supporting spawning and rearing large numbers of steelhead when water and other environmental conditions are suitable. See for example, Francis (2011, 2010a, 2010b), Kajtaniak (2010, 2008), Stoecker and Kelley (2005), Stoecker (2004), Stoecker and Stoecker 2003, Thomas R. Payne and Associates (2004, 2003), Stoecker and Conception Coast (2002), Capelli (1997), Chubb (1997), Cardenas (1996), Carpanzano (1996), Douglas (1995), Deinstadt *et al*. (1990), Keegan (1990a, 1990b), Moore (1980a, 1980c), Franklin and Dobush (1978).

Restoring steelhead migration to historical habitats upstream of anthropogenic barriers is expected to be feasible and successful.

While implementing the barrier recovery actions will not be without logistical and technical challenges, NMFS' experience as well as the available information regarding fish passage at man-made structures indicate implementation is feasible and would be successful with adequately designed and operated facilities or programs.

Regarding the technical feasibility, physically modifying or partially or completely removing dams, diversions, grade-control structures, and highway crossings for the purpose of restoring upstream migration of steelhead, situations vary significantly and projects must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, usually with extensive site-specific investigations. However, over the last decade, the removal and modification of dams and other instream structures has accelerated, and the experienced gained in this effort has led to a growing understanding of the technical, logistical and regulatory issues of these types of projects to restore habitat characteristics and conditions for populations of stream fish. See for example, Service (2011), Downs *et al.* (2009), Bunderson *et al.* (2008), Johnson *et al.* (2008),

Keefer *et al.* (2008), Grant (2005), Love and Llanos (2005), Doyle *et al.* (2003), Graf (2003, 2002, 1999), Kondolf *et al*. (2003, 1997), Williams and Bisson (2003), American Rivers (2002), Aspen Institute (2002), Hart *et al.* (2002), Pizzuto (2002), Bednarek (2001), Dambacher *et al*. (2001), Pejchar and Warner (2001), Stanley and Doyle (2003), Smith *et al*. (2000).

Regionally, NMFS has collaborated with project proponents on a variety of fish-passage projects that have involved removal or modification of a highway structure, diversion, or dam for the purpose of either improving or restoring migration of steelhead to historical spawning and rearing habitats. NMFS is currently collaborating with stakeholders on the restoration of river ecosystems including the removal of dams on the Ventura River, Malibu Creek, and Carmel River in California, and on the Elwha River in Washington, which require the removal of these dams to allow anadromous salmonids natural access to historical habitats (Capelli 2007a, 2004, 1999, Wunderlich *et al*. 1994).

With regard to the expected success from restoring steelhead migration to historical habitats, the available information indicates that restoring steelhead access to historical spawning and rearing habitats would increase population growth rate and abundance. Making barriers passable for migratory species effectively increases breeding and living space for the species. Given the extensive amount spawning and rearing habitat upstream of the barriers within Core 1 populations it can be anticipated that steelhead productivity will increase substantially when access to this habitat is restored.

Significantly, historical habitats currently serves as a refuge freshwater habitat that likely contributes to the conservation of the anadromous form of the species., 2002, O. mykiss found above artificial barriers exhibit ancestral native steelhead genetics (Clemento *et al.* 2008, Nielsen *et al*. 2005, 2003, 1997). These fish possess the ability to transform into smolts and migrate to the ocean (Thrower *et al*. 2004a, 2004b, 2004c). Even today, large adult *O. mykiss* leave the freshwater lakes that have formed behind dams and undertake steelhead-like migrations during the wet season and spawn in upstream tributaries (Bloom 2005, M. Capelli, personal communication).

Besides increasing population growth rate, restoring steelhead access to historical spawning and rearing habitats within Core 1 populations is expected to produce four additional benefits for buffering the species against extirpation (these benefits further underscore the necessity and value of unoccupied areas for conserving endangered steelhead).

First, there would be an increase in population spatial structure. The spatial structure of a population is important because it can affect evolutionary processes and therefore alter the ability of a population to adapt to spatial or temporal changes in the species' environment. Populations that are thinly distributed over space are susceptible to experiencing poor population growth rate and loss of genetic diversity, and are more likely to be adversely effected by widely fluctuating environmental conditions.

Second, ecological interactions between the resident and anadromous form of *O. mykiss* would be restored, thereby contributing to the viability of the anadromous form. The two life history forms can be sympatric and genetically similar (McPhee *et al*. 2007, Narum *et al*. 2004, Docker and Heath 2003) and the resident form can produce anadromous progeny and vice versa (McPhee *et al*. 2007, Zimmerman and Reeves 2000). These findings underscore the survival advantage of the resident form to the anadromous form of *O. mykiss*, particularly under certain environmental conditions. For example, extended periods of no or low rainfall can limit migratory conditions and preclude steelhead from reaching freshwater spawning areas. Linked poor ocean conditions can inhibit

the growth and maturation of the anadromous form while not adversely affecting the freshwater form of O. mykiss (Mantua 2010, 2002, 1997). During such periods, resident *O. mykiss* may be the only life history form of *O. mykiss* spawning and producing progeny - with the innate ability to resume anadromy - that favors future persistence of the anadromous form. Conversely, the anadromous form can re-colonize watersheds following periods of extended drought and temporary extirpation of the resident form of *O. mykiss*.

Third, restoring steelhead access to historical spawning and rearing habitats upstream of artificial migration barriers would promote ecological traits (phenotypic and genotypic) that must be represented and maintained to promote long-term viability of the species (Boughton *et al*. 2007b). Some of these traits involve the capability to migrate long distances and tolerate elevated water temperatures. Many coastal watersheds supporting Core 1 populations extend considerably inland, which requires that steelhead have the physical ability to migrate long distances to access spawning areas in upper reaches of these watersheds. The ability to migrate long distance promotes population diversity. Because these same populations extend into areas that are dry and warm, populations are exposed to environmental conditions that promote formation of specific adaptations such as the ability to tolerate hot and dry climates. The ability to migrate long distances and occupy and use diverse habitats promotes genetic and ecological diversity by subjecting the species to a wide variety of selective pressures.

Fourth, the expected increase in population growth rate has the potential to increase abundance in neighboring Core 2 and Core 3 populations. When restored to an "unimpaired" condition, Core 1 populations are expected contribute steelhead to adjacent watersheds through natural dispersal. Contributing to the maintenance of populations in adjacent watersheds effectively increases the total numbers of individuals in the DPS. Given the risk of extinction that small populations face (Pimm *et al*. 1988, Primack 2004, Wilson 1971), a larger number of individuals decrease the risk of extinction.



Figure 7-1. Southern California Steelhead DPS Known and Potential Fish Passage Barriers (Northern Region).



Figure 7-2. Southern California Steelhead DPS Known and Potential Fish Passage Barriers (Southern Region).

7.5 RECOVERY STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE AND MARINE ENVIRONMENT VARIABILITY

Climate change and the conditions in the marine environment are driven by processes on a global scale and are generally not amenable to direct management on a regional scale such as the SCS Recovery Planning Area (Riggs, 2004, 2002). However, recognizing the potential challenges posed by climate change and related conditions within the marine environment is useful in designing a recovery strategy which has the greatest likelihood of achieving recovery of the species. Species can respond to climate change in three basic ways: 1) evolve or rely on existing adaptations; 2) colonize new locations with suitable habitat; and 3) go extinct. Given the uncertainties regarding climate change scenarios and localized responses, the most precautionary recovery strategy is to maximize the pathways for adapting and/or colonizing habitats. The two essential components that address the potential adverse effects of climate change on the species freshwater and marine environment are:

1. Protect habitat by ameliorating existing and future anthropogenic threats and improve current habitat conditions.

This component encompasses such restoration activities as removing passage barriers to prime upstream spawning and rearing habitats; restoring flow regimes that are essential for both adult and juvenile instream migration; regulating flood control and other instream activities that disrupt river and riparian habitats; and restoring and managing estuarine habitats to ensure that they provide acclimation and rearing opportunities.

2. Establish broadly distributed viable populations within each Biogeographic Population Group by protecting and restoring functional habitat conditions, and controlling and abating existing and future threats.

The over-arching recovery strategy of protecting and restoring multiple populations across the diverse landscape characteristic of the SCS Recovery Planning Area is intended to allow the species to continue to evolve adaptations to cope with a dynamic and challenging environment.

Within this basic framework, the Recovery Plan identified specific recovery actions within watersheds of each of the five Biogeographic Population Groups which are intended to address and ameliorate specific adverse effects from projected climate change and related oceanic conditions; most significantly, these include impacts on stream flows, wildfires, riparian habitats, and estuaries. The population and DPS-level biological recovery criteria are intended to establish a threshold for recovery that will ensure the species will persist over an extended period of time, and through long-term (decadal) marine cycles. Southern California steelhead have evolved a wide variety of life history patterns to exploit the diversity and range of habitat and habitat conditions characteristics of the vegetation, geology, hydrology, and climate characteristics across the SCS Recovery Planning Area. The preservation of such life history patterns is essential to the recovery and long-term conservation of the species.

7.6 CRITICAL RESEARCH NEEDS FOR RECOVERY

Successful implementation of the recovery plan and measurement of the species' progress towards recovery requires two critical elements of scientific research and monitoring: 1) population abundance monitoring (including rearing juveniles, smolts, and returning adults) within core watersheds and 2) other research efforts in core watersheds to develop more refined biological recovery criteria. As discussed in Chapter 6, Steelhead Recovery Goals, Objectives & Criteria, and Chapter 14, Southern California Steelhead Research, Monitoring and

Adaptive Management, long-term and consistent population abundance monitoring is necessary to further refine biological recovery criteria such as the mean annual run size. This monitoring can also measure the effectiveness of restoration and recovery efforts within particular watersheds and shed light on the influence of freshwater and marine environmental factors on the long term survival and recovery of steelhead in southern California.

Research efforts should be focused on developing a better understanding of the following topics: 1) reliability of migration corridors; 2) productivity of freshwater tributary nursery areas; 3) evaluation of role of seasonal lagoons, particularly for juvenile rearing; 4) productivity of freshwater mainstem habitats; 5) roles of intermittent freshwater habitats for both spawning and rearing; 6) spawner density as an indicator of individual population viability; 7) relationship between anadromous (steelhead) and non-anadromous (resident) forms and population structure and viability; and, 8) rates of dispersal between individual populations. With respect to topics 2 through 4, the aim is to identify, protect, and, where necessary, restore those habitats which specifically facilitate the anadromous life history form by, among other things, producing a high number of fast-growing and large smolts, and avoid inadvertently promoting only the freshwater life history form of *O. mykiss*. In addition to these biological research topics, research into basic habitat dynamics should be conducted to provide additional direction in habitat protection and restoration. Such research includes the effects of the wildland fire regime and climate change effects on freshwater habitat; environmental factors that affect freshwater temperatures; and factors producing freshwater refugia that sustain *O. mykiss* during seasonal or prolonged droughts. See Chapter 14, Southern California Steelhead Research and Monitoring and Adaptive Management, for a further discussion.

8. Summary of DPS-Wide Recovery Actions

"The basic recovery strategy . . . mimics the strategy that the species exhibits in its natural distribution among the various watersheds in their unaltered state, and provides the most effective strategy . . . to ensure the long-term viability of individual populations, and the listed species as a whole."

Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area: Recovery Actions
Hunt & Associates 2008

8.0 INTRODUCTION

The SCS Recovery Planning Area is characterized by severe to very severe degradation of habitat conditions along the lower mainstem river channels where development is concentrated, while the upper mainstem and tributaries, often situated within the four southern California U.S. National Forests, retain relatively high habitat values for anadromous *O. mykiss*. Dams, surface water diversions, and groundwater extractions have frequently disconnected the upper and lower portions of watersheds, as well as degraded instream and riparian habitats in both areas. Because the mainstem river channels are the conduits that connect upstream spawning and rearing habitats with the ocean, recovery actions in watersheds impaired in this manner focus on reducing the severity of anthropogenic impacts along the mainstems. Encroachment into riparian areas and flood control activities that degrade instream habitat or restrict fish passage should be avoided or minimized in order to promote connectivity between the ocean and upstream spawning and rearing habitats. Additionally, degraded estuarine conditions stemming from filling, artificial sandbar manipulation, and both point and non-point waste discharges are addressed by specific recovery actions for the SCS Recovery Planning Area.

This chapter describes DPS-wide recovery actions. DPS-wide recovery actions are recommendations that are designed to address widespread and often multiple threat sources across the SCS Recovery Planning Area such as the inadequate implementation and enforcement of local, state, and federal regulations. Subsequent chapters describe BPG-specific conditions, the results of threats assessments for component watersheds, and the recommended recovery actions for each component watershed.

An array of natural and anthropogenic conditions has reduced the population size and historical distribution of southern California steelhead. Many of these causes of decline are systemic and persistent, crossing numerous environmental and political boundaries. The sources and reasons for decline are identified in Federal Register Notices and this Recovery Plan. Effectively addressing these causes of decline involves multiple challenges and opportunities that include: 1) development of new and effective implementation of current laws, policies, and regulations at the local, state, and federal levels; 2) securing adequate funding for implementation of recovery actions; 3) developing strategic partnerships at the local,

state, and federal levels; (4) assuring effective prioritization of restoration, threats abatement, and monitoring actions; and (5) conducting education and outreach. (See Appendix E, Habitat Restoration References for Steelhead Recovery Planning, for a list of federal, state, and local funding sources available to support the implementation of recovery actions.)

8.1 DPS-WIDE RECOVERY ACTIONS

DPS-wide recovery actions addressing widespread threat sources include the following:

- Collaboration between water facility owners and operators, and local, state and federal agencies to ensure releases from water storage and diversion facilities (see Table 8-2 and the BPG recovery action tables) will maintain surface flows necessary to support all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration, spawning, incubation, and rearing habitat.
- Physically modify passage barriers (including the dams and diversion facilities listed in Table 8-2 and the BPG recovery action tables) to allow natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats.
- Finalize and implement the California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring Plan. Implementation of the California Coastal Monitoring Plan is essential for evaluating the long-term viability of southern California steelhead as well as other species of listed salmonids in California.
- Prioritize restoration funds, notably the Pacific Coast Salmon Restoration Fund and California's Fisheries Restoration Grant Program (FRGP), in Core 1 and 2 watersheds.
- Implement restoration projects to provide access to historic steelhead spawning and rearing habitats and increase egg-to-smolt life stage survival.
- Support agency actions to secure funding for, and engage in, full enforcement of relevant laws, codes, regulations and ordinances protective of steelhead and their habitats.
- Collaboration between CalTrans, counties, and others with oversight on road practices to reduce or remove transportation related barriers to upstream and downstream passage (including railroad bridges, abutments, and similar structures identified in BPG recovery action tables).
- Collaboration between U.S. Forest Service and the California Department of Forestry to ensure that fire-suppression and post-fire suppression activities are conducted in a manner which is protective of steelhead and steelhead habitats.
- Inventory and assess impediments to fish passage and identify and provide appropriate fish passage opportunities in the watersheds historically supporting anadromous runs within the southern range extension (Mojave Rim and Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPGs).
- Enhance protection of natural in-channel and riparian habitats, including appropriate management of flood-control activities (both routine maintenance and emergency measures), off-road vehicle use, and in-river sand and gravel mining practices commensurate with habitat and life history requirements of steelhead.
- Reduce water pollutants such as fine sediments, pesticides, herbicides, and other non-point and point source waste discharges (Total Maximum Daily Load) commensurate with habitat and life history requirements of steelhead. This should be accomplished through public education, watershed-management and management of public and private facilities releasing waste discharges.
- Close remaining areas currently open to angling below impassible barriers in all

anadromous waters; in non-anadromous waters (*i.e.*, those currently inaccessible to upstream-migrating steelhead because of anthropologic barriers) assess impacts of angling on native *O. mykiss* above barriers.

- Eliminate the stocking of hatchery-reared fish in anadromous waters; in waters where stocked fish may reach anadromous waters ensure that such fish are adequately controlled to prevent the introduction of hatchery-reared fish into anadromous waters.
- Convene a committee of agency personnel and scientists (*e.g.*, the DFG, NMFS' Fisheries Science Centers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) for the purpose of establishing a pilot conservation hatchery program for endangered steelhead consistent with the principles and purposes outlined in section 8.3 below.
- Assess the condition of and restore estuarine habitats through the control of fill, waste discharges, and establishment of buffers commensurate with the habitat and life history requirements of steelhead.
- Manage the artificial breaching and/or draining of coastal estuaries consistent with habitat and life history requirements of steelhead (including rearing juveniles and migrating adults).
- Evaluate and mitigate the effects of transportation corridors and facilities on estuarine fluvial processes. When vehicular, railroad, or utility crossings over estuaries are replaced, upgraded, retrofitted, or enlarged, reduce or eliminate existing approach-fill and maximize the clear spanning of upstream active channel(s), floodways, and floodplains to accommodate natural river and estuarine fluvial processes.
- Conduct research on the relationship between resident and anadromous forms of *O. mykiss*, and related population dynamics (*e.g.*, distribution, abundance, residualization, dispersal, and recolonization rates); extend genetic research and analysis to include the southern range extension (Mojave Rim and Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPGs).
- Provide for the permanent curation of deceased *O. mykiss* specimens for the purpose of making available specimens for examination and study by present and future scientific researchers.
- Survey and monitor the distribution and abundance of non-native species and plants and animals that degrade natural habitats or compete with native species within watersheds identified as core populations. Initiate efforts to eliminate, reduce, or control non-native and/or invasive species.
- Amend Army Corps Section 404 Clean Water Act (CWA) exemptions for farming, logging, and ranching activities; terminate Section 404(f) exemptions for discharges of dredged or fill material into U.S. waters (channelization) associated with agriculture, logging, ranching and farming; incorporate explicit steelhead habitat requirements into CWA Section 401 water certification permits and 303(d) listings to protect all life-history stages, including adult and juvenile steelhead migration, spawning, incubation and rearing.
- Incorporate appropriate elements of the SCS Recovery Plan into the state-sponsored and funded Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plans (IRWMP) being developed for major watersheds of southern California under the Integrated Regional Watershed Management Planning Act of 2002.
- Coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Game and the State Water Resources Control Board to ensure the effective implementation of California Fish and Game Code Sections 5935-5937 regarding the provision of fishways and fish flows associated with dams and diversions.

- Extend the California Water Code Section 1294.4 dealing with instream flows to protect instream beneficial uses, including native fishes, to southern California watersheds.

8.2 RECOVERY ACTION NARRATIVES

Table 8-1 contains a narrative description of the types of recovery actions which are intended to address systemic threats identified throughout the watersheds within the SCS Recovery Planning Area, based upon the DPS threats assessments conducted by NMFS technical consultants, and the intrinsic potential analysis conducted by NMFS TRT. These narratives describe the general nature and biological objectives of the recovery actions which must be implemented in order to achieve the goals, objectives, and meet the viability criteria, that are identified in Chapter 6, Steelhead Goals, Objectives and Criteria, and implement the recovery strategy in outlined in Chapter 7, Steelhead Recovery Strategy.

The Recovery Plan applies these recovery actions to individual watersheds (and in some cases individual facilities) to the extent information is available, in the recovery action tables for each watershed within the BPG Chapters 9 through 13. However, the general language of recovery actions does not dictate a specific means of achieving the biological objectives of the recovery actions (*e.g.*, assure effective fish passage, provide ecological effective flow regime, control nonpoint sources of pollution or non-native species, or restore estuarine functions).

While DPS threats assessments were identified at a watershed scale, and do not necessarily identify all specific threat sources in individual watersheds, particular recovery actions call for more detailed threats assessment and analysis (*e.g.,* fish passage barrier inventories and assessments in watersheds where complete systematic barrier inventories are not available). Some recovery actions may involve the review and modification of local general plans and local coastal plans (along with other regional plans) to address activities regulated under the plans and programs to restore and protect steelhead habitats, and a means of implementing recovery actions at the local and regional level.

Implementation of the recovery actions will require site-specific investigations to determine on a case-by-case basis the appropriate design details, and where appropriate, operational criteria for individual facilities. For example, the specific means of providing fish passage at a particular site or facility (*e.g.*, culvert, diversion, or dam), or the flow regime necessary to provide passage or sustain ecological effective rearing habitats, must be based on site-specific technical investigations such as those undertaken for recovery actions that have already been or are in the process of being implemented. Similarly, the recovery actions dealing with the control or elimination of non-native invasive species will require a watershed-wide, and in some cases, a reach-specific inventory and assessment of the species before the appropriate control measures can be identified and implemented.

Finally, recovery actions that involve development as defined by either the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the California Environmental Quality (CEQA) will require environmental review that could further refine individual recovery projects alternatives, identify mitigation measures, and/ or require project monitoring, as part of the project permitting process.

Table 8-1. Recovery Actions Glossary.

Threat Source	Recovery Action	Detailed Description
Agricultural Development	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	Develop, adopt, and implement land-use planning policies and development standards that restrict further agricultural encroachment within the active floodplain/riparian corridor to protect *all O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation, and rearing, and their associated habitats.
	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	Develop and implement plan to manage livestock grazing to restore and/or protect riparian functions (*e.g*., control stream bank and floodplain erosion, dissipate stream energy, capture sediment during high flows, *etc*.) to sustain aquatic habitat features (*e.g.,* physical diversity, cover, and water quality) essential for all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing.
	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	Develop and implement plan to manage agricultural development outside of the active floodplain (defined by 2-5 year frequency flood event) to create an effective riparian buffer; restore and re-vegetate a minimum riparian buffer to allow the channel to maintain natural structural diversity to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats. The extent of the floodplain and riparian buffer shall be determined on a case-by-case basis taking into account site specific conditions.
Agricultural Effluents	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	Develop and implement plan to reduce or eliminate nutrient and pesticide/herbicide runoff and sediment inputs into natural watercourses from agricultural activities to provide water quality suitable for all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitat.
Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	Develop and implement plan to prioritize, remove and/or modify anthropogenic fish passage barriers within the watershed to allow natural rates of adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration between the estuary and upstream spawning and rearing habitats, passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and the ocean, and to reduce intrusion into the riparian corridor and restore sediment transport.
	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment between the ocean and all upstream spawning and rearing areas (including above existing barriers). This passage barrier assessment should utilize the protocols identified in the California Department of Fish and Game's California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual (Flosi *et al*. 2010, or the most current version).
Dams and Surface Water Diversions	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	Develop and implement a water management plan to identify the appropriate diversion rates for all surface water diversions that will maintain surface flows necessary to support all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration, and suitable spawning, incubation, and rearing habitat.

Threat Source	Recovery Action	Detailed Description
	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations	Develop and implement operational plan to provide seasonal releases from dams to provide surface flows necessary to support all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration, spawning, incubation, and rearing habitats.
	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	Develop and implement plan to physically modify or remove fish passage barriers at dams, debris basins or diversions to allow natural rates of adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration between the estuary and upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
Flood Control Maintenance	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	Develop and implement flood control maintenance plan to minimize the frequency and intensity of disturbance of instream habitats and riparian vegetation (*e.g.*, modification of natural channel morphology and removal of native vegetation) of the mainstem and tributaries to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing, and their associated habitats.
Groundwater Extraction	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	Conduct hydrological analysis to identify groundwater extraction rates, effects on the natural pattern (timing, duration and magnitude) of surface flows in the mainstem, tributaries, and the estuary, and effects on all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring program to guide management of groundwater extractions to ensure surface flows provide essential support for all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
Levees and Channelization	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	Develop and implement plan to modify channelized or artificially stabilized portions of the mainstem and tributaries, wherever feasible, to restore natural channel features and habitat functions, including natural channel bottom morphology and riparian vegetation, to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees with native, naturally occurring vegetation, wherever feasible, and eliminate or minimize the use of herbicides to control native vegetation adjacent to existing levees to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan to reduce channel incision, sedimentation from bank erosion, and reduce or eliminate the need for artificial bank stabilization; wherever feasible, remove rip-rap and other artificial bank stabilization features on mainstem and tributaries and replace with bio-engineered bank stabilization, or an additional set-back, to allow the channel to maintain natural structural diversity to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.

Threat Source	Recovery Action	Detailed Description
Mining and Quarrying	Review and modify mining operations	Review aggregate and hard rock mining operations (past, current and future) for conformance with the National Marine Fisheries Services Guidelines for Removal of Sediment from Freshwater Salmonid Habitat (Cluer 2004). Modify current and future mining operations, where necessary to comply with the relevant provisions of the guidelines, and remediate past (including terminated operations to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Develop and implement plan to remove quarry and landslide debris from the channel	Develop and implement plan to remove quarry and landside debris from the channel, maintain the channel free from such debris, and establish a riparian buffer with native, locally occurring species to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration, and spawning and rearing habitats.
Non-Native Species	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to identify and determine the type, distribution and density of non-native species; assess their impacts on all *O. mykiss* life history stages; and eliminate or control non-native species of plants and animals (particularly fish and amphibians); restore riparian and upland areas with native, locally occurring plant species to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	Develop and implement on-going monitoring program to track the status and impacts of non-native species of plants and animals on all *O. mykiss* life history stages, particularly rearing juveniles.
	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	Develop and implement public education program (including signage at public access points) to inform the general public of the adverse effects of introducing non-native species into natural ecosystems.
Recreational Facilities	Manage off-road recreational vehicle activity in riparian floodplain corridors	Develop, adopt, and implement land-use policies and standards to manage off-road vehicular activity within the riparian/floodplain corridor of the mainstem and tributaries to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests	Review development and management plans for recreational areas and national forest lands and modify to provide specific provisions to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats. Provide specific provisions for the restoration and protection of creeks, rivers, estuaries, wetlands and riparian/floodplain areas, including an effective setback for all development from estuarine and riparian habitats. Regulate the use of day-use areas and other recreational facilities to minimize impacts to aquatic and wetland habitats to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	Develop and implement public education program (including signage at public access points) to promote public understanding of watershed processes (including the natural fire-cycle) and *O. mykiss* ecology to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.

Threat Source	Recovery Action	Detailed Description
Roads	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	Develop and implement plan to manage roadways adjacent to riparian/floodplain corridors to reduce sedimentation, or other non-point pollution sources, before it enters natural watercourses to protect all steelhead life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats. Restore and re-vegetate abandoned roadways with native, locally occurring species.
	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	Develop and implement plan to retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways to remove sediments and other non-point pollutants before it enters natural watercourses to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads and maximize the clear spanning of active channels, floodways, and estuaries to accommodate natural river and estuarine fluvial processes to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
Upslope/Upstream Activities	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	Develop and implement restoration and management plan for the relevant estuary. To the maximum extent feasible, the plan should include restoring the physical configuration, size and diversity of the wetland habitats, eliminating exotic species, controlling artificial breaching of the sand bar, and establishing an effective buffer to restore estuarine functions and promote *O. mykiss* use (including rearing and acclimation) of the estuary.
	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	Review applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans and modify to provide specific provisions for the protection of all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Review applicable Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans	Review the relevant Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) and modify to provide specific provisions for the protection and restoration of all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation, and rearing habitats.
Urban Development	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	Develop, adopt and implement land-use planning policies and development standards that restrict further development in the floodplain/riparian corridor to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing, habitats.
	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	Develop and implement plan to retrofit storm drains in urban areas to control sediments and other non-point pollutants in runoff from impervious surfaces before it enters natural watercourses to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan to replace artificial bank stabilization structures	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan throughout the mainstem and tributaries to replace artificial bank stabilization, structures wherever feasible, and provide an effective riparian buffer on either side of mainstem and tributaries, utilizing native, locally occurring species, to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.

Threat Source	Recovery Action	Detailed Description
Urban Effluents	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Boards Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Boards Regional Plans, and Stormwater Permits, and modify to include specific provisions for the protection of all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	Review and assess National Pollution Elimination Discharge System (NPDES) wastewater discharge permits to determine effects of discharge on adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* life stages, including migration, spawning, and rearing habits. Modify discharge requirements, where necessary, to ensure discharge is adequate to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
	Review, assess and modify residential and commercial wastewater septic treatment facilities	Review and assess residential and commercial wastewater septic treatment facilities to determine effects of discharge on all *O. mykiss* life stages, including migration, spawning, and rearing habits. Modify septic systems, where necessary, to ensure discharge is adequate to protect all *O. mykiss* life history stages, including adult and juvenile migration, spawning, incubation and rearing habitats.
Wildfires	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan, including monitoring, remediation and adaptive management, to reduce potentially catastrophic wildland fire effects to steelhead and their habitat and preserve natural ecosystem processes (including sediment transport and deposition).

8.3 CONSERVATION HATCHERIES

One potential recovery strategy involves the use of conservation hatcheries to preserve imminently threatened populations, or to accelerate restoration of steelhead runs by temporarily supplementing natural production. While a conservation hatchery program[1] can complement the overall recovery effort, the role of such a program cannot be reasonably expected to substitute for the extensive restoration of habitat function, value, and connectivity that is required to abate threats to southern California steelhead.

Conservation hatcheries can be used for a number of recovery related purposes, including: 1) providing a means to preserve local populations faced with immediate extirpation as a result of catastrophic events such as wildfires, toxic spills, dewatering of watercourses, *etc.*; 2) preserving the remaining genotypic and phenotypic characteristics that promote life history variability through captive broodstock, supplementation, and gene-bank programs to reduce short-term risk of extinction; 3) reintroduction of populations in restored watersheds; and 4) conducting research on southern California stocks relevant to the conservation of the species. (See the discussion of research issues in Chapter 14, Southern California Steelhead Research, Monitoring and Adaptive Management.)

Issues that should be considered prior to implementing a conservation hatchery program include: 1) conditions under which rescue, reestablishment or supplementation could be used in wild steelhead recovery; 2) methods for rescue, re-establishment or supplementation, and; 3) protocols for evaluating the effectiveness of such conservation hatchery functions over time. Conservation programs must be guided by scientific research and management strategies to meet program objectives recovering threatened

[1] A conservation hatchery is a program that conserves and propagates steelhead taken from the wild for conservation purposes, and returns the progeny to their native habitats to mature and reproduce naturally.

or endangered populations (Flagg and Nash 1999).

Genetic resources that represent the ecological and genetic diversity of the species can reside in hatchery fish as well as in wild fish (Waples 1991). As a consequence, NMFS has extended protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to certain hatchery fish programs which preserve the genetic legacy of the listed species and are managed as refugia populations (70 FR 37204, June 28, 2005).

8.3.1 Recovery Role of Conservation Hatcheries

The principal strategy of salmonid conservation and recovery is the protection and restoration of healthy ecosystems upon which they naturally rely, consistent with the ESA's stated purpose to conserve "the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend" (ESA section 2(b)). However, a natural recovery of local extinctions depends on one or more recolonization events, a process that operates on an indefinite timescale. Likewise, the viability of a depressed population, characterized by small size, fragmented structure, and impacted genetics (*e.g.,* bottlenecks, inbreeding, outbreeding depression, *etc.*), may be so compromised that its response to restored or increased availability of habitat is not sufficient to prevent imminent extinction (Araki *et al. 2009, 2008,* 2007a 2007b, Berejikian *et al*. 2011, 2009, 2008, 2005, Kuligowski *et al*. 2005, Hayes *et al.* 2004). Either case may require management intervention to attain self-sufficiency and sustainability in the wild.

There is considerable uncertainty regarding the ability of artificial propagation to increase population abundance over the long-term, and it cannot be assumed that artificial augmentation will reduce extinction risk. The artificial advantage given to hatchery fish during early life stages can result in a higher rate of return over that of natural fish escapement, and result in increasing hatchery fish representation in the natural population over time. There is a risk to natural recovery from increasing dependency on fish augmentation. Conservation hatcheries must therefore monitor the effects of the program on the natural population using criteria which would trigger modification to or cessation of the conservation program (Chilcote 2011, Paquet *et al*. 2011, Tatara *et al*. 2011a, 2011b, Fraser 2008, Ford 2007, Myers *et al.* 2004).

Conservation hatchery programs employing best management practices can reduce the likelihood of extinction by contributing to one or more of the viable salmonid population (VSP) parameters at the population and evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) or distinct population segment (DPS) levels (McElhany *et al*. 2000):

Abundance. Conservation hatchery fish may reduce extinction risk by increasing the total abundance of fish in a population in the short term, providing sufficient numbers to dampen deterministic density effects, environmental variation, genetic processes, demographic stochasticity, ecological feedback, and catastrophes.

Growth Rate. Conservation hatchery fish potentially increase the total abundance of successful natural spawners, thereby increasing productivity in the collective contribution of natural-origin and hatchery-origin spawners to productivity in the natural environment.

Spatial Structure. Small populations are at risk of local and regional extinctions because of ongoing habitat loss and fragmentation, as well as dysfunctional expression of species behavior undermining its sustainability. The introduction of conservation hatchery fish into suitable unoccupied habitat or for supplementing sparsely populated habitat concomitant with restoration projects that increase interconnected natural habitat may reestablish natural spatial population structure.

Diversity. To conserve the adaptive diversity of salmonid populations, the environment in which they co-evolved and the natural processes which select for population fitness should be allowed to continue without human impact or influence. Conservation hatcheries can conserve valuable genes and genotypes, and are managed to minimize ecological and domestication effects on natural populations, conserve and maximize genetic variability and life history diversity within and among stocks.

A conservation hatchery would provide an appropriate platform for undertaking appropriate research of the topics outlined above and could provide effective guidance in the use of a conservation hatchery program to protect the currently depressed steelhead stocks and recover the endangered steelhead populations of the SCS Recovery Planning Area.

8.3.2 Basic Elements of a Conservation Hatchery Program

A conservation hatchery program must be:

- Guided by a Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan, based on best available scientific knowledge, and/or testable assumptions where information is lacking
- Consistent with the overall strategy, goals, objectives and specific provisions of the Recovery Plan.
- Based on an adaptive management iterative process aimed at reducing uncertainty through monitoring and re-evaluation.
- Supported by a monitoring component to:
    a) Evaluate the short- and long-term goals and objectives of the program
    b) Determine if and when management protocols need to be revised
    c) Determine when the program should adapt to evolving recovery needs
    d) Determine when the conservation hatchery program is no longer needed.
- Supported by a research program to investigate issues such as:
    e) Fish culture problems that arise within the program
    f) Fish response to habitat, environmental challenges, pathogens, *etc*.
    g) Factors which contribute to reduced fitness and reproductive success of hatchery fish in the natural environment
    h) Behavioral changes of conservation hatchery reared fish released into their natal waters that may lead to changes in the expression of different life history strategies (*e.g.*, anadromous or freshwater resident forms).
- Contain criteria and a strategy for terminating the conservation hatchery program and re-directing resources to the rehabilitation of watershed processes and sustainable management of fish habitat.

8.3.3 Considerations for Establishing a Conservation Hatchery Program

An important consideration within the overall planning for recovery of endangered steelhead involves knowing when to start a conservation hatchery program (Flagg and Nash 1999).

The appropriate use for a conservation hatchery should be guided by several considerations: 1) the biological significance of the population; 2) genetic diversity; 3) population viability; and 4) the potential loss of populations exhibiting any

of the first three characteristics. Each of these is described below.

1. **Biological Significance of the subject population.** The biological significance of a population is expressed in the innate genetic and phenotypic characteristics, and other novel biological and ecological attributes, particularly those attributes that are not observed in other conspecific populations. With regard to the endangered Southern California steelhead DPS, the characterization of the historical steelhead population developed by the TRT provides evidence that certain watershed-specific populations possess a high likelihood of producing steelhead with genetic and phenotypic characteristics that favor survival in a spatially and temporally highly-variable environment. Because many of the inland populations (*e.g.*, Santa Maria River, Santa Ynez, Ventura, Santa Clara, San Gabriel, Santa Margarita, San Dieguito, and San Luis Rey Rivers) extend over a broad and geographically diverse area, these populations are able to withstand environmental stochasticity and possess ecologically significant attributes likely not found in most other populations.

2. **Genetic Diversity.** The amount of genetic diversity among individuals provides the foundation for a population to adapt to fluctuating environmental conditions, and contributes to its continued evolvability in response to longer-term changes such as projected climate changes. Generally, high genetic diversity favors growth and survival of individual populations. Genetic diversity of a population can be estimated quantitatively based on parameters, such as effective population size (N_e). The abundance of a population that falls below a specified N_e may be at risk of losing the necessary amount of genetic diversity that should be maintained over time, which does not favor survival in a stochastic environment. General guidelines or numerical values for N_e are specified in the literature for maintaining minimum N_e for individual populations, but may require further research specifically for populations of southern California steelhead.

3. **Population Viability.** Whether a population is likely to be viable is another key considering in determining the proper timing of a conservation hatchery. In particular, information about population size, population growth rate, spatial structure, and diversity provide an indication of the sort of extinction risk a species faces. Generally, small populations have a higher risk of extinction than larger populations. With regard to the endangered Southern California Steelhead DPS, evidence indicates the populations are at high risk of extinction and are not currently viable.

4. **Potential Population Loss.** Finally, a population exhibiting any of the characteristics noted above that is threatened with imminent extirpation as a result of anthropogenic activities, natural catastrophic events such as

wildfire or massive sedimentation, or a combination of the two, may be preserved by the temporary placement of representatives of such a population in a conservation hatchery, or other secure location.

8.4 ESTIMATED TIME TO RECOVERY AND DELISTING

NMFS's interim recovery planning guidance (2010a) provides that Recovery Plans "indicate the anticipated year that recovery would be achieved. Estimates should be carried through to the date of full recovery, *i.e.,* when recovery criteria could be met. There may be extreme cases in which estimating a date and cost to recovery is not possible due to uncertainty in what actions will need to be taken to recover the species." In those circumstances "an order of magnitude for cost and some indication of time in terms of decades, should be provided if at all possible."

Estimates of the time to recovery entails three basic elements: time to complete all major recovery actions + time for habitat to respond + time for the listed species to respond to recovery actions:

Regarding the time to complete all major recovery actions, this component should reflect:

- The longest time any recovery action would take to complete, assuming that all recovery actions began more or less immediately (or within 10 years) of completion of the Recovery Plan.
- Sufficient funding to complete recovery actions.

Regarding the time for habitat to respond to recovery actions, this component should reflect:

- The longest time the habitat recovery would take.
- The variation in the extent of needed habitat restoration (extremely degraded habitat could have longer restoration estimates).

Regarding the time for the species to respond to recovery actions, this component should reflect:

- The number of generations for which demographic targets must be met in order to delist.
- Or for southern CA steelhead the length of a complete ocean multi-decadal cycle, or 60 years).

The precision of any estimate of time to recover and delist a species is necessarily governed by the specificity with which any of these components can be estimated.

Completion of a majority of the recovery actions is estimated to vary from 5 to 10 years, though some of the larger, more complicated recovery actions such as the physical or operational modification of larger dams may take several decades. The recovery of habitat could vary depending on the type of habitat (e.g., migration, freshwater spawning and rearing, or estuarine habitat), with some migration and estuarine habitats taking less time, and some spawning and rearing habitats taking more time to respond to recovery actions. As with the completion of recovery actions, it is estimated that these time frames would vary in a majority of cases to from 5 to 10 years, though the response of some habitats may taking longer, depending of rainfall and runoff patterns. The time for the species to respond to recovery actions is the most challenging time component to estimate for a variety of reasons: these include the dependency of anadromous runs and spawning and rearing success upon rainfall and

runoff patterns, which can be cyclic, and may also be significantly influenced by projected climate changes, and uncertainties regarding aspects of the demographics of southern California steelhead (*e.g.*, rate of dispersal between populations, rate of switching between resident and anadromous life cycle strategies).

Given the above estimates, and the need to meet the DPS recovery run size criterion during poor ocean conditions (measured over a multi-decadal cycle of 60 years), the time to recovery can be provisionally estimated to vary from 80 to 100 years. A modification of the provisional population or DPS viability criteria resulting in smaller run-sizes, or the number or distribution of recovered populations could shorten the time to recovery. Delays in the completion of recovery actions, time for habitats to respond to recovery actions, or the species' to respond to recovery actions would extend the time to recovery.

9. Monte Arido Highlands Biogeographic Population Group

"Assessment at the group level indicates a priority for securing inland populations in southern Coast Ranges and Transverse Ranges, and a need to maintain not just the fluvial-anadromous life-history form, but also lagoon-anadromous and freshwater-resident forms in each population."

NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team, Viability Criteria for the South-Central and Southern California, 2007

9.1 LOCATION AND PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Monte Arido Highlands BPG region encompasses four medium to large coastal watersheds and eight sub-watersheds that drain the western half of the Transverse Range in southern San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura, and eastern Los Angeles counties.

Monte Arido Highlands Watersheds

The Santa Maria River is a relatively short coastal river formed by the confluence of two large interior watersheds: the Cuyama River and the Sisquoc River, which together drain most of the Sierra San Rafael, Sierra Madre, and Caliente mountain ranges.

Santa Maria River

The Santa Ynez River drains the south-facing slopes of the Sierra San Rafael and north-facing slopes of the Santa Ynez Mountains. The Ventura River drains the coastal slopes of the eastern end of the Santa Ynez Mountains and the western end of the Transverse Range. The Santa Clara River drains much of the western Transverse Range, including the northern slopes of the San Gabriel Mountains. The mainstems of the Santa Maria and Santa Ynez rivers are oriented east-to-west and discharge to the

Pacific Ocean in western Santa Barbara County, North of Point Conception. The Ventura and Santa Clara watersheds border the upper watersheds of the Santa Maria and Santa Ynez rivers, but their mainstems flow south and southwest into the Pacific Ocean in southern Ventura County (Figure 9-1).

Santa Ynez River

These watersheds are highly disparate in terms of slope, aspect, and size, but share one common feature: the interior portions are mountainous and include high peak elevations, ranging between 5,700 and 8,600 feet above sea level. Each of these watersheds flows across a coastal terrace, but the Santa Maria, Santa Ynez, and Santa Clara rivers traverse broad coastal plains before entering the Pacific Ocean. Overall, stream lengths tend to be very long, owing to high topographic relief in the interior watersheds. The Santa Maria River watershed (Cuyama River sub-watershed) extends the furthest inland—over 90 miles between the mouth and the limits of the upper watershed.

Ventura River

Average annual precipitation in the Santa Maria River and Santa Clara River watersheds is much lower than the other two because the former include extensive arid interior regions. Although rainfall amounts generally increase with elevation, such orographic (*i.e.,* lifting) effects are concentrated in the most coastal mountainous portions of these watersheds, and much of the interior portions lie in "rain shadows" of the coastal portions of the watersheds. For example, Old Man Mountain at 5,500 feet above sea level in the Ventura River watershed not only receives five to ten times the amount of precipitation that falls on lower coastal locations only a few miles away, but also receives much more rainfall than interior peaks of comparable elevation in this region. The drainages in these watersheds exhibit "flashy" flow patterns during and after storm events; peak winter and summer base flows can vary by several orders of magnitude.



Figure 9-1. The Monte Arido Highlands BGP region. Thirteen populations/watersheds were analyzed in this region: three in the Santa Maria River watershed; one in the Santa Ynez River watershed, five in the Ventura River watershed, and four in the Santa Clara River watershed.

Santa Clara River

Extensive portions of the mainstems of all four major watersheds in the Monte Arido Highlands BPG region exhibit intermittent flows (with isolated pools) in summer because of a combination of strong seasonal variation in rainfall and anthropogenic factors. However, the tributaries in these watersheds exhibit perennial flow along significant reaches supported by groundwater and flow through fractured rock along geologic fault lines.

9.2 LAND USE

Table 9-1 summarizes land use and population density in Monte Arido Highlands BPG region. The coastal terrace and floodplains of these watersheds are subjected to the most intensive land use. The interiors are largely uninhabited and include several federally-designated wilderness areas within the Los Padres National Forest: San Rafael, Dick Smith, Matilija, Chumash, and Sespe. Additionally, there are two federally-designated Wild and Scenic rivers within the Los Padres National Forest: the Sisquoc River (Wild) in the Santa Maria River watershed, and Sespe Creek (Wild and Scenic) in the Santa Clara River watershed. A number of additional river and stream reaches have been evaluated and may be eligible for inclusion in the federal Wild and Scenic rivers program. Human population density increases steadily to the south, and averages about 129 persons per square mile over the BPG region. The Santa Maria River watershed has the lowest population density (66 persons/square mile), while the Santa Clara River watershed, which extends into northeastern Los Angeles County, has the highest population density (216 persons/square mile).

Ventura County Coastline

In most of these watersheds, the first land-use change was livestock ranching and dry farming, followed by irrigated row-crop agriculture. Urbanization followed this trend on the coastal plain, with current coastal population centers at Santa Maria, Lompoc, Buellton, Ventura, and Oxnard. More recently (decades ago), interior portions of the floodplain of the Santa Clara River that were converted to agriculture (primarily orchards), have experience strong urban growth and now include population centers at Santa Paula, Fillmore, and, most recently, the Santa Clarita-Castaic-Newhall area in Los Angeles County. The upper watersheds throughout this region are in the Los Padres and Angeles national forests; the coastal and middle watersheds are mostly privately owned. Semi-developed rural land, used for livestock ranching and orchard production covers extensive portions of the coastal and middle portions of these watersheds (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Table 9-1. Physical and Land-Use Characteristics of Major Watersheds in the Monte Arido Highlands BPG.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS					LAND USE				
WATERSHEDS (north to south)	**Area** (acres)[1]	**Area** (sq. miles)[1]	**Stream Length**[2] (miles)	**Ave. Ann. Rainfall**[3] (inches)	**Total Human Population**[4]	**Public Ownership***	**Urban Area**[5]	**Agriculture/ Barren**[5]	**Open Space**[5]
Santa Maria River**	1,187,491	1,855	2,941	17.2	123,043	49%	10%	3%	87%
Santa Ynez River	576,717	901	1,543	18.3	74,900	39%	7%	3%	90%
Ventura River	144,967	227	409	18.8	44,550	48%	6%	9%	85%
Santa Clara River	1,040,223	1,625	2,485	16.7	350,363	54%	6%	7%	87%
TOTAL or AVERAGE	**2,949,398**	**4,608**	**7,378**	**17.7**	**592,856**	**48%**	**7%**	**6%**	**87%**

[1] From: CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999 (www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/features/calwater/)
[2] From: CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003 (www.calfish.org/)
[3] From: USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1 km grid cells)
[4] From: CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003; preliminary analysis of the Census 2010 indicates the population in in the BPG has increased to 713,913
[5] From: CDFFP Multi-source land cover data (v02_2), 2002 (100 m grid cells) (http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgisdata/select.asp)
** Includes National Forest Lands only; does not include State or County Parks or Military Reservations (from: http://old.casil.ucdavis.edu/casil/gis.ca.gov/teale/govtowna/)*
*** The Santa Maria River watershed includes the Cuyama River and Sisquoc River sub-watersheds*



Figure 9-2. Santa Maria River Watershed.



Figure 9-3. Santa Ynez River Watershed.



Figure 9-4. Ventura River Watershed.



Figure 9-5. Santa Clara River Watershed.

Ventura River Valley Agriculture

Agricultural uses (orchard production, row crops, and livestock ranching), are important land uses that directly or indirectly impact watershed processes throughout these watersheds. Particularly in the lower Santa Maria, Santa Ynez, and Santa Clara River watersheds, transverse broad coastal watersheds or plains have mostly been converted to agriculture. The Santa Ynez River and the Ventura River watersheds have been transformed by a series of dams constructed to serve municipal water needs for the cities of Goleta, Santa Barbara, Montecito, Summerland, Carpinteria, and Ventura. A major diversion on the lower mainstem and three large dams in the upper watershed on Piru and Castaic creeks has similarly affected habitat and accessibility for anadromous *O. mykiss* in the Santa Clara River drainage. Municipal and agricultural water sources also include numerous groundwater wells located throughout the floodplains of these watersheds.

9.3 CURRENT WATERSHED CONDITIONS

Watershed conditions were assessed for the mainstems of the four major rivers and for nine sub-watersheds in the Monte Arido Highlands BPG region. The lower mainstem of most of the drainages in this BPG region offer fair to poor habitat conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss*. Some tributaries to the Santa Maria River (*e.g.,* Sisquoc River, Manzana Creek), Santa Ynez River (e.g., Cachuma, Indian, and Juncal Creeks), Ventura River (*e.g.,* upper Coyote and Santa Ana Creeks, Matilija Creek), and the Santa Clara River (*e.g.,* upper Santa Paula, Sespe Creek, Hopper, and upper Piru and Reyes Creeks) afford better habitat quality. Indicator ratings for the watersheds were typically downgraded during the threats assessment due to the presence of fish-passage barriers (see below).

Santa Ana Creek – Ventura River Tributary

Good-quality to excellent-quality habitat is generally found in the upper watersheds above these barriers, particularly in the Sisquoc River, Matilija Creek mainstem, North Fork Matilija Creek, San Antonio Creek, Santa Paula Creek, and Sespe Creek drainages.

Sespe Creek – Santa Clara River Tributary

Sespe Creek probably supports the highest-quality and most extensive spawning and

rearing habitat for anadromous *O. mykiss* in this BPG region, but is frequently isolated from the estuary and ocean by water management activities elsewhere in the watershed that reduce or eliminate surface flows along extensive reaches of the mainstem (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Twitchell Dam – Cuyama River

Twitchell Dam on the Cuyama River is located near the Sisquoc River confluence and blocks passage to the very large Cuyama River watershed, including several tributaries (*e.g.*, Pine Creek). Surface flows in the Cuyama River disappear for most of the year because of groundwater pumping throughout the arid Cuyama Valley to water row crops that have been extensively planted on the floodplain. Access to the equally large Sisquoc River watershed for anadromous *O. mykiss* is severely limited because Twitchell Dam is managed for aquifer recharge in the Santa Maria Valley with the aim of minimizing surface flows to the ocean. Consequently, the Santa Maria River, which is the access corridor for both the Cuyama and Sisquoc rivers, only flows to the ocean during high rainfall years. The substantial increase of impermeable surfaces as a result of urbanization (including roads) along the coastal terraces, and in the several of the inland valleys (*e.g.*, Ventura and Santa Clara) has altered the natural flow regimes of rivers and streams, particularly in the lower reaches, increasing the frequency and intensity of flood flows.

Estuarine habitats at the mouths of these watersheds in this BPG region have been reduced in size by 19 percent to 85 percent by the development of roads and railroads, urbanization, and development of recreational facilities. Historically, these estuaries were large and complex, with extensive distributary and backwater channels, encompassing thousands of acres. The remaining estuarine habitats are subject to constriction and isolation by development, surface runoff from roads and other impervious surfaces, as well as a reduction in the amount and quality of surface flows resulting from groundwater extraction. The occurrence of non-native invasive species in these highly regulated watersheds has spread and increased since this initial threats assessment, and will likely continue to do so unless recovery actions identified in this Recovery Plan are implemented. Bradbury Dam, Gibraltar Dam, and Juncal Dam on the middle and upper mainstem of the Santa Ynez River and the Mono Debris Watershed Dam on Mono Creek, an upper tributary the Santa Ynez River, block access to at least 70% of the highest quality spawning and rearing habitat within this watershed. There are also a number of smaller debris dams built on smaller tributaries within the major watersheds which remove sediment from the fluvial system and block the seasonal movement of fish. Union Pacific Railroad tracks traverse the mainstem of each of the rivers and streams near their mouths, which has damaged estuarine habitat and created additional passage impediments for anadromous *O. mykiss*.



Bradbury Dam – Santa Ynez River

Matilija Dam and Casitas Dam on the mainstem of Matilija Creek and Coyote Creek, respectively, have eliminated access to 90% of the highest quality spawning habitat in the Ventura River watershed. The planning and implementation of a project to remove Matilija Dam is underway. The Robles Diversion Dam on the mainstem has recently been retrofitted with a fish-passage facility, but operational limitations still limit pre-project fish passage below and above the facilities as a result of modification to downstream flows during the migration window and periodic malfunctions of the fish screening mechanism (Casitas Municipal Water District 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009, National Marine Fisheries Service 2003).

Matilija Dam – Matilija Creek

The Vern Freeman Diversion, Santa Felicia Dam and Pyramid Dam on Piru Creek effectively impeded or block fish passage to spawning and rearing habitat in the major tributaries of the Santa Clara River. The fish passage and flow restrictions associated with the Vern Freeman Diversion and Santa Felicia Dam has been addressed in two Biological Opinions issued by NMFS for the operation of these facilities (National Marine Fisheries Service 2008a, 2008b.) Additionally, the operation of these two dams restricts access to all of the major tributaries below Piru Creek by the reduction of surface flows (including magnitude and duration) in the mainstem of the Santa Clara River and to the estuary. Fish passage is further impacted by the operation of Castaic Dam on Castaic Creek, an upper tributary of the Santa Clara River. Additionally there are a number of smaller passage barriers that impede fish passage to important steelhead spawning and rearing tributaries such as Santa Paula, Sisar, Pole, and Hopper, Creeks (Francis 2010a, Kajtaniak 2008, Stoecker and Kelley 2005).

Santa Felicia Dam – Piru Creek

Agricultural and urban development has severely constrained floodplain connectivity between sections of the floodplains of the Santa Maria River, lower Sisquoc River, Santa Ynez River, Ventura River, Coyote Creek, San Antonio Creek, Santa Clara River, and lower Sespe Creek. Levees, channelization, and other flood control structures and activities, including related flood control activities (levee and vegetation management, *etc.*), constrict the floodplain and alter natural channel morphology (and

affect sediment transport processes), which limits instream habitat diversity and riparian corridor structure.

Non-native species are a widespread threat source in the Monte Arido Highlands BPG. Most or all of the reservoirs formed by these dams support sport fishing that has intentionally or accidentally introduced non-native fishes that prey on or compete with *O. mykiss*. These species have moved out of the reservoirs into the mainstem and tributaries, including reaches above and below the dams and established reproducing populations (*e.g.*, crayfish, large and smallmouth bass, sunfish, bullhead catfish, carp, western mosquitofish, bullfrogs, *etc.*). Bullfrogs and carp are common throughout the mainstem of the Santa Ynez and Ventura rivers. The African clawed frog (*Xenopus laevis*), a significant predator of native amphibians and fish, infests much of the mainstem of the Santa Clara River from the estuary upstream to Fillmore, including large tributaries such as Santa Paula Creek and Hopper Canyon Creek. Additionally, the highly invasive non-native giant reed (*Arundo donax*) has displaced large areas of native riparian vegetation in the Ventura River and Santa Clara River watersheds, and continues to spread to other areas.

Because of the chaparral-dominated upland areas, fire is an important factor in slope erosion and sediment inputs to watersheds throughout this region. Increased fire frequency can increase slope erosion and sediment input to streams, resulting in long-term changes to substrate texture and embeddedness, water quality (*e.g.*, turbidity), and water temperature (loss of riparian canopy cover). The Sisquoc River, North Fork Matilija Creek, and Piru Creek watersheds were identified as potentially severely threatened by mass wasting of slopes and loss of riparian canopy cover due to fires that occurred in 2006 and 2007 that covered most of their watersheds, but substantial portions of each of these watersheds have burned in the past 50 years. All of the watersheds in this BPG region are naturally susceptible to wildfires, but have experienced larger and more intense fires because of the development and management of these watersheds (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Santa Maria River Estuary

The estuaries at the mouth of the Santa Maria River and Santa Ynez River are relatively physically intact, retaining 81% to 94% of their historic size, respectively, although both are impacted by agricultural and urban effluent discharge. The Ventura River estuary has been reduced by approximately 68% due to urban and agricultural encroachment (*e.g.*, Ventura County Fairgrounds, Emma Wood State Beach, Union Pacific Railroad Bridge, and Highway 101 Bridge). The Santa Clara River estuary has been reduced by approximately 85% due to agricultural and oil development, levee construction, and the development of the Ventura Marina and McGrath State Beach. Because estuaries are the gateway used by both immigrating adults and emigrating juveniles moving between the marine and freshwater environments, estuarine loss affects anadromous *O. mykiss* throughout the entire watershed. The remaining estuarine habitats

are subject to degradation from urban, agricultural, and/or recreational development and loss of freshwater inflows. Surface flows diverted from the mainstem for urban and agricultural use adversely affect both water quality and the seasonal breaching pattern of the sandbar at the mouth of the estuary.

Despite widespread and varied habitat degradation to the coastal and middle mainstems of all four major river systems, native rainbow trout populations still inhabit the relatively high-quality habitat upstream of the dams in this region, and small numbers of steelhead attempt to enter and spawn in each of the watersheds of the Monte Arido Highlands BPG region when flow conditions are suitable.

9.4 THREATS AND THREAT SOURCES

Varying numbers and intensities of habitat impairments (sources of threats) were identified in the CAP Workbooks analyses, ranging from seven sources in the North Fork Matilija Creek watershed to 21 in the Cuyama River watershed. "High" and "Very High" sources of threats involving fish-passage barriers created by dams and lack of surface flows caused by groundwater extraction or surface flow diversions disproportionately impact habitat conditions in all of the watersheds in this BPG region. For example, Sespe Creek, which is relatively undisturbed and supports some of the best spawning habitat in the BPG region, is nevertheless threatened by urban development occurring downstream along the mainstem of the Santa Clara River watershed. This development includes water management activities, such as the Vern Freeman Diversion, that interrupt the connection between this sub-watershed, the mainstem, estuary, and ocean (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Fourteen anthropogenic activities ranked as the top sources of stress to steelhead within each watershed in the Monte Arido BPG and are strongly associated with urban and agricultural development (and the water diversion and consumption associated with them) (Table 9-2).

Table 9-2. Threat source rankings in each watershed in the Monte Arido Highlands BPG (see CAP Workbooks for details).

Monte Arido Highlands BPG Component Watersheds (north to south)													
Threat Sources	Santa Maria River	Cuyama River	Sisquoc River	Santa Ynez River	Ventura River	Coyote Creek	Matilija Creek mainstem	North Fork Matilija Creek	San Antonio Creek	Santa Clara River*	Santa Paula Creek	Sespe Creek	Piru Creek
Dams and Surface Water Diversions													
Groundwater Extraction													
Agricultural Development													
Urban Development													
Recreational Facilities													
Non-Native Species													
Levees and Channelization													
Flood Control Maintenance													
Wildfires													
Mining and Quarrying													
Roads													
Urban Effluents													
Agricultural Effluents													
Culverts & Road Crossings													

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

**Wildfires were not identified during the CAP Workbook analyses as one of the top five threats in several of these watersheds, but recent fires in coastal watersheds since 2007 could result in significant habitats impacts.*

9.5 SUMMARY

Dams, surface water diversions (including groundwater extraction) driven by agricultural and urban development on the major rivers of the Monte Arido Highlands BPG region (Santa Maria River, Santa Ynez River, Ventura River, and Santa Clara River) have had the most severe impacts on the steelhead populations in this BPG region, cutting off access to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and reducing both the magnitude and duration of flows, as well as altering the timing of flows necessary for immigration of adults and emigration of juveniles. Non-point sources of pollutants, including fine sediments and pesticides/herbicides, from agricultural, commercial, and residential development have also impacted steelhead habitats, particularly spawning and rearing habitats by degrading water quality and covering rocky cobble substrate important to steelhead reproduction and growth. Additionally, impacts associated with wildland fires, including fire-fighting measures to control or extinguish them, and the post-fire measures to repair damages incurred in fighting wildland fires, poses a potential threat to watersheds in this BPG. Table 9-3 summarizes the critical recovery actions needed within the Core 1 populations of this BPG.

Restoring conditions for steelhead passage, spawning, and/or rearing in these watersheds will require multiple, long-term, measures related to water management, recreation, and fish passage past large dams. Impediments to fish passage, stemming from the construction and operation of dams and groundwater extraction, or modification of channel morphology and adjacent riparian habitats through flood control, or other instream activities (such as sand gravel mining) should be further evaluated. Additionally loss of estuarine functions caused by filling and point and non-point water discharges from agriculture and other anthropogenic activities, should be further investigated.

Ventura River Steelhead – 1918.

The threat sources discussed in this section should be the focus of a variety of recovery actions to address specific risks to anadromous *O. mykiss* viability. Spatial and temporal data, for water temperature, pH, nutrients, *etc*., are not uniformly available, and should be further developed, along with general habitat typing assessments, to better identify natural as well as anthropogenic limiting factors. This type of data acquisition should be the subject of site-specific investigation in order to refine the primary recovery actions or to target additional recovery actions as part of any recovery strategy for the Monte Arido Highlands BPG. Tables 9-4 through 9-7, below, rank and describe proposed recovery actions for each sub-watershed in the Monte Arido BPG, including the estimated cost for implementing the actions in five year increments over the first 25 years, and where applicable extended out to 100 years, though many recovery actions can be achieved within a shorter period.

Table 9-3. Critical recovery actions for Core 1 populations within the Monte Arido Highlands BPG.

POPULATION	CRITICAL RECOVERY ACTION
Santa Maria River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of water releases from Twitchell Dam provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Twitchell Dam to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
Santa Ynez River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of water releases from Bradbury, Gibraltar, and Juncal dams provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Bradbury, Gibraltar, Mono, and Juncal dams to allow steelhead natural rates of migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean. Identify, protect, and where necessary restore estuarine and freshwater rearing habitats.
Ventura River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of water releases, including bypass flows from diversions from Casitas, Matilija, and Robles Diversion dams provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Casitas, Matilija, and Robles Diversion dams to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.
Santa Clara River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of water releases, including bypass flows from diversions from Vern Freeman Diversion, Santa Felicia, Pyramid and Castaic dams provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Vern Freeman Diversion, Harvey Diversion, Santa Felicia, and Pyramid dams, and the lower Santa Paula Creek flood control channel to allow steelhead natural rates of migration to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.

Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Tables Identification Key, Monte Arido Highlands BPG (Tables 9-4 – 9-7).

Recovery Action Number Key: XXXX – SCS – 1.2	
XXXX	Watershed
SCS	Species Identifier – Southern California Steelhead
1	Threat Source
2	Action Identity Number
Action Rank	
A	Action addresses the first listing factor regarding the destruction or curtailment of the species' habitat
B	Action addresses one of the other four listing factors

XXXX ID Table	
SMM	Santa Maria Mainstem
CR	Cuyama River
Sis	Sisquoc River
SYR	Santa Ynez River
VenR	Ventura River
CC	Coyote Creek
MC	Matilija Creek
NFMC	North Fork Matilija Creek
SAC	San Antonio Creek
SCR	Santa Clara River
SP	Santa Paula
SesC	Sespe Creek
PC	Piru Creek

Threat Source Legend	
1	Agricultural Development
2	Agricultural Effluents
3	Culverts and Road Crossings
4	Dams and Surface Water Diversions
5	Flood Control Maintenance
6	Groundwater Extraction
7	Levees and Channelization
8	Mining and Quarrying
9	Non-Native Species
10	Recreational Facilities
11	Roads
12	Upslope/Upstream Activities
13	Urban Development
14	Urban Effluents
15	Wildfires

See Chapter 8, Table 8.1 for Detailed Description of Recovery Actions

Table 9-4. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for Santa Maria River Sub-Watersheds (Monte Arido Highlands BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Santa Maria Mainstem												
SMM-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	BLM,CCC, NRCS,,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMM-SCS-1.2	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	USGS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Agricultural Effluent	1, 4	3B	20	128464	51783424	51783424	51783424	0	155478736
SMM-SCS-1.3	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	BLM,,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
SMM-SCS-1.4	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement a plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	SWRCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement a plan to remove or modify all fish passage barriers within the watershed (See	ACOE,BLM, USFS,DWR, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20- refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	Steelhead Migration Assessment and Recovery Opportunities for the Sisquoc River, California 2003.)											
SMM-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement a water management plan dam operations	BOR, CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	TBD	0	0	0	0	91850
SMM=SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	CDFG, CT, SCHR, EII, TCFT,SBC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1,3, 4	1A	5	91850	0	0	0	0	TBD
SMM-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-5.2	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SMM-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT.SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMM-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement a plan to restore natural channel features	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SMM-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS, CDFG,CDMG CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	2B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
SMM-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement a watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement a non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement a public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMM-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests	NRCS,CCC, CDFG,ACOE, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement a public education program on watershed processes	CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SMM-SCS-10.3	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS, CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-11.1	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	NMFS,DOT, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SMM-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	DOT,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMM-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan for the Santa Maria River Estuary	CDFG,EPA, NFWF,NMFS, ACOE,FWS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	13234570	0	0	0	0	13234570
SMM-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMM-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	BLM,CT, SCHR, EII,TCFT,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMM-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,DOT, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CT,SC HR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMM-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.*, Santa Maria Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMM-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	CDFFP,BLM, USFS,LPFW, CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Cuyama River												
CR-SCS-1.1	Develop and implement a watershed-wide sediment management plan	NRCS, USGS, NMFS, CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	20	7440	2999040	2999040	2999040	0	9004560
CR-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT, SBC,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
CR-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	BLM,NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT, SBC,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-1.4	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT, SBC,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement a plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS, USFS,USGS, NMFS, CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement a plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers in the watershed (See Steelhead Migration Assessment and Recovery Opportunities for the Sisquoc River, California, 2003)	NMFS, CDFG, USFS, ACOE,BLM, DWR, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.*, Twitchell Dam)	BOR,CDFG, NMFS, USFWS, USFS,DWR, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
CR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.*, Twitchell Dam)	BOR, CDFG, NMFS, USGS,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
CR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT, SBC,VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CR-SCS-5.2	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, CDFG, CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
CR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, CDFG, CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
CR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement a plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
CR-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMGCT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	3B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
CR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement a non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
CR-SCS-10.1	Develop and implement a public education program on watershed processes	CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
CR-SCS-10.2	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,BLM,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
CR-SCS-10.3	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG CDFFP,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CR-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	DOT, NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	DOT, NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	312000	0	0	0	0	312000
CR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
CR-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,DOT, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Region Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CR-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.*, Cuyama Community Sanitation District Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, SWRCB,DOT, NMFS,CDFG, CDOT,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, LPFW,CDFG, USGS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC,VC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sisquoc River												
Sis-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
Sis-SCS-1.2	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	BLM,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-1.3	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS, BLM,NMFS, CDFG.CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
Sis-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement a plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, NMFS,SWRCB, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed (See Steelhead Migration Assessment and Recovery Opportunities for the Sisquoc River, California 2003.)	NMFS,USFS, UACOE,BLM, USFS,CDOT,C DFG,DWR,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 – refer to Santa Maria main-stem, costs are aggreg ated	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sis-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3B	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
Sis-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-5.2	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
Sis-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,USFS,USF WS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
Sis-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement a plan to restore natural channel features	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sis-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMGCT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	3B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
Sis-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement a non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
Sis-SCS-10.1	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS, USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Recreational Facilities	1,2,3,4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
Sis-SCS-10.2	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDPR,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sis-SCS-10.3	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,SBC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	DOT,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	NMFS,DOT, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Roads	1, 4		20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
Sis-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	312000	0	0	0	0	312000
Sis-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
Sis-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,DOT, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sis-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify if necessary all NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sis-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9-5. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for Santa Ynez River Watershed (Monte Arido Highlands BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Santa Ynez River												
SYR-SCS-1.1	Develop adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS, USGS,USFWS, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20	114800	46285184	46285184	46285184	0	138970352
SYR-SCS-1.2	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-1.3	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	BLM,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
SYR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS, FEMA NMFS,SWRCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SYR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed (See Steelhead Migration Assessment and Recovery Opportunities for the Santa Ynez River, California 2003; and Lower Santa Ynez River Fish Management Plan, 2009.)	USFS, NMFS, USFWS,ACOE, BLM,CDFG, DWR,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	20-refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.*, Bradbury, Gibraltar, and Juncal dams)	BOR, NMFS, ACOE,BLM, USFS,CDFG, DWR,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,SBC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SYR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NRCS,NMFS, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SYR-SCS-4.3	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.*, Bradbury, Gibraltar, and Juncal dams)	BOR, SWRCB, NMFS,CDFG, USGS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	100	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SYR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USCOE, RWQCB,NMF, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SYR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SYR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SYR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement a plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS, FEMA, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,ACOE, BLM,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1,4	2B	20	4717625	4717625	4717625	4717625		16870500
SYR-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMG,CT,SC HR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	2B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SYR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement a watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement a non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement a public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SYR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* U.S. Forest Service Los Padres National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,AC, SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SYR-SCS-10.2	Manage off-road recreational vehicle activity in riparian floodplain corridors	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-10.3	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SYR-SCS-11.1	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	NRCS,NMFS, DOT,CDOT, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SYR-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	DOT,USFS, NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	312000	0	0	0	0	312000
SYR-SCS-12.2	Review and modify the Vandenberg Air Force Base Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan	USAF, USFWS, NMFS,CCC, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	CDB	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SYR-SCS-12.3	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	VAFB,NMFS, CCC, AC, BLM,USFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	38133615	0	0	0	0	38133615
SYR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,BLM, RWQCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SYR-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,DOT, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.*, Lompoc Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility and Santa Ynez Band Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB,CDFG NMFS, CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9-6. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for Ventura River Sub-Watersheds (Monte Arido Highlands BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Mainstem Ventura River												
VenR-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
VenR-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT,SC HR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	2 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement a plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,NMFS,R WQCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	USFS,USFWS, USDOT,NMFS, CDFG,CDOT DWR,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
VenR-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.*, Foster Park, Robles diversions)	BOR,NMFS, USFWS, SWRCB, CDFG,DWR, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
VenR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement a water management plan for diversion operations (*e.g.*, Foster Park, Robles diversions, *etc*.)	BOR,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
VenR-SCS-4.3	Develop and implement a water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.*, Casitas and Matilija)	BOR,NMFS, USGS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	100	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
VenR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,ACOE, USFWS,NMF, CCC,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1A	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
VenR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1A	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
VenR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS,USGS,ACOE,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement a plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS,USGS,USFWS, ACOE,BLM,NMFS,CCC, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
VenR-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMG,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	3B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
VenR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement a non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,USFW, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
VenR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
VenR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CCC,NMFS, BLM,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement a public education program on watershed processes	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
VenR-SCS-10.3	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, U.S. Forest Service Los Padres National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria	USFS,USFWS, CDPR,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
VenR-SCS-10.4	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,OVLC, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1,2,3, 4,5	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
VenR-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USDOT, USFWS, NRCS,NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	NRCS,NMFS,U SDOT,USFS, USFWS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
VenR-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	312000	0	0	0	0	312000
VenR-SCS-12.2	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CCC, AC,BLM,USFS, CT,SCHR,EII,T CFT,VC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	4606250	0	0	0	0	4606250
VenR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
VenR-SCS-13.2	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
VenR-SCS-13.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,USDOT, CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, NMFS, SWRCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify if necessary all NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.*, Ojai Valley Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
VenR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,NMFS, USGS,CDFG, LPFW,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Coyote Creek												
CC-SCS-1.1	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	BLM,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
CC-SCS-1.3	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20	12400	4998400	4998400	4998400	0	15007600
CC-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement a plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,SWRCB, RWQCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,BOR, CDFG,CDOT, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.*, Casitas dam)	BOR,NMFS, USFWS, SWRCB,CDFG, DWR,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
CC-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.*,	BOR,NMFS, USFWS, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	Casitas dam)											
CC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,ACOE,NMFS, CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
CC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
CC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
CC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,NRCS, ACOE,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, NMFS,USFWS, USFS,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, NMFS,USFWS, USFS,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
CC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.* E.P. Foster Memorial Park, Casitas Recreational Area, Charles M. Teague Memorial Watershed, Los Padres National Forest, Ojai Ranger District)	BOR,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 3,5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
CC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	NRCS,USDOT, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	NMFS,USDOT, CDOT,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
CC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,CCC, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
CC-SCS-13.2	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
CC-SCS-13.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,USDOT, CDOT,CDFG, USFWS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	SWRCB, RWQCB, NMFS CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Matilija Creek												
MC-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and	NRCS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20	13640	5498240	5498240	5498240	0	16508360
MC-SCS-2.1	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.*, remove Matilija dam)	ACOE,BOR, NMFS,USFS, USFWS,CCC CDFG, RWQCB,MC, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
MC-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	ACOE,BOR, NMFS,CDFG, SWRCB,CT,MC SCHR,EII,TCFT	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
MC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, SWRCB,CDFG CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
MC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
MC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS,USFS,USF WS,USGS, ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
MC-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS, CDFG,CDMG CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	3B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
MC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,NMFS, UFWS,USFS CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,USFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,USFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
MC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, MC,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-10.2	Manage off-road recreational vehicle activity in riparian floodplain corridors	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USDOT,CDOT, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USDOT,NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,USFWS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
MC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, MC,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify residential and commercial wastewater septic treatment facilities	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, MC,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-14.3	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, LPFW,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
North Fork Matilija Creek												
NFMC-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
NFMC-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFMC-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFWS,USFWS,NMFS, SWRCB, REWQCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFMC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	USFS,USFWS,NMFS,CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFMC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2B	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
NFMC-SCS-4.2	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	91850	0	0	0		91850

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
NFMC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDOT,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFMC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
NFMC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
NFMC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NMFS,USFWS, ACOE, CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFMC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NMFS, USFWS,ACOE, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
NFMC-SCS-8.1	Develop and implement plan to remove and maintain quarry and landslide debris from the channel	USGS,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, CDFG,CDMG, MC,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	1A	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
NFMC-SCS-8.2	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMG,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	2B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
NFMC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFMC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFMC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
NFMC-SCS-10.1	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 3,5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
NFMC-SCS-10.2	Review and modify develop and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, U.S. Forest Service Los Padres National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	Strategy, and Design Criteria)											
NFMC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCF, VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFMC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT,SCH R,EII, TCFT,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
NFMC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, USGS,NMFS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
San Antonio Creek												
SAC-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1,4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SAC-SCS-1.2	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-1.3	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
SAC-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,UWFWS, NMFS, RWQCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-2.2	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	USSC,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, SWRCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USFWS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SAC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,USFWS, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 4	1A	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SAC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NMFS,NRCS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS,US FWS,CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SAC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS,US FWS,CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SAC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS,ACOE,N MFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SAC-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,NRCS, NMFS,ACOE, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SAC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SAC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* Camp Comfort)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 3, 5	2B	ongoing – doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-10.2	Develop, adopt, and implement recreational land-use planning policies	USFS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SAC-SCS-10.3	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SAC-SCS-11.1	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,RWQC, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,SCHR, EII,TCFT,VC	Road	1, 4	2B	20-regional costs	0	0	0		0	0
SAC-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,NRCSUSFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,USFWS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SAC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	CDOT,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB,CDFG SWRCB,NMFS, USFWS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9-7. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for Santa Clara River Sub-Watersheds (Monte Arido Highlands BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Mainstem Santa Clara River												
SCR-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC,LAC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	20	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SCR-SCS-1.2	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USFWS,NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SCR-SCS-1.3	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USFWS,NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Agricultural Development	1,4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SCR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFWS SWRCB, RWQCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SCR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed (See Santa Clara River Steelhead Trout Assessment and Recovery Opportunities, 2005.)	NMFS,USFWS, ACOE,CDFG, DWR,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,VC, LAC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCR-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.,* Vern Freeman Diversion)	NMFS,BOR, ACOE, USFWS, SWRCB,CDFG, DWR,CT,SCHR, EII,TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SCR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations (*e.g.*, Vern Freeman Diversion)	NMFS,BOR, SWRCB,USGS, USFWS,CDFG, CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	50440	0	0	0	0	50440
SCR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,USFWS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC,LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, SWRB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC,LAC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1A	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SCR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,SWRCB, NMFS,CDFG, CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC,LAC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SCR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SCR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCR-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMGCT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	2B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
SCR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SCR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	USFS,UFWS,NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SCR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans recreational areas and national forests	CCC,NMFS, BLM,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC,LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	1	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
SCR-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	NMFS,USFS, USFWS,CCC, CDFG,FOSCR, CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC,LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	156333335	0	0	0	0	156333335
SCR-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	312000	0	0	0	0	312000
SCR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, USGS,NMFS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,VC,LAC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Santa Paula Creek												
SP-SCS-1.1	Manage Livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USFWS,NMFS,CDFG,CT,SCHR,EII,TCFT,KSW,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20	12400	4998400	4998400	4998400	0	4998400
SP-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USFWS,NMFS,CDFG,CT,SCHR,EII,TCFT,KSW,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SP-SCS-1-3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USFWS,NMFS,CDFG,CT,SCHR,EII,TCFT,KSW,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20	12400	4998400	4998400	4998400	0	4998400
SP-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,NMFS,USFWS,SWRCB,RWQCB,CDFGCT,SCHR,EII,TCFT,VC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plant to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed (See Santa Clara River Steelhead Trout Assessment and Recovery Opportunities, 2005.)	NMFS,USFS,USFWS,ACOE,CDFG,CT,SCHR,EII,TCFT,KSW,VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SP-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.,* Harvey Diversion)	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,DWR, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SP-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	USGS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SP-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NRCS BLM,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, SWRCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SP-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, SWRCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	3	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SP-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NMFS,NRCS, USFWS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SP-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,NRCS, USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	16870500
SP-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,USFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SP-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, Steckel Park)											
SP-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,USFWS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SP-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB,CDFG NMFS,USFWS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan,	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sespe Creek												
SesC-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20	62000	24992000	24992000	24992000	0	75038000
SesC-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, BLM,CDFG, RWQCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SesC-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed (See Santa Clara River Steelhead Trout Assessment and Recovery Opportunities, 2005.)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,USFWS,S WRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
SESC-SCS-4.2	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,USFWS,S WRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SesC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SesC-SCS-5.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SesC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,ACOE, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SesC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,NRCS, USGS,USFWS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMGCT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	2B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
SesC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SesC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SesC-SCS-10.1	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SesC-SCS-10.2	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* U.S. Forest Service Los Padres National Forest Land Management Plan Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SesC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDOT,CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USFS,USFWS,NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SesC-SCS-13.1	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan to replace artificial bank stabilization structures	NRCS,NMFS, FEMA,AOEC, BLM,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SesC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.*, Cuyama Community Sanitation District Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SesC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and	USFS,USFWS, USGS,NMFS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII,	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	hazardous fuels management plan	TCFT,KSW,VC										

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Piru Creek												
PC-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, BLM,CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
PC-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, BLM,CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
PC-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, BLM,CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, RWQCB,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed (See Santa Clara River Steelhead Trout Assessment and Recovery Opportunities, 2005.)	NMFS,USFS, USFWS,ACOE, BLM,CDFG, DWR,CTS,CHR, EII,TCFT,KSW, VC,LAC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
PC-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.,* Santa Felicia and Pyramid dams)	FERC,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,DWR, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
PC-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations	U FERC,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,DWR, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
PC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,USGS, ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	1A	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-5.2	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,USFWS, NMFS, CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC, LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,SWRCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
PC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,SWRCB, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
PC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide	FEMA,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1A	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	use near levees											
PC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,SW,VC, LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
PC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
PC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, U.S. Forest Service Los Padres National Forest Land Management Plan Southern California National Forest	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, DWR,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5		ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)											
PC-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, DWR,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, VC,LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140		304560
PC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	NRCS,NMFS,C DOT,CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
PC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,USFWS, CDFG,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
PC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	CDOT,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC, LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC, LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
PC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CT, SCHR,EII,TCFT, KSW,VC,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	33	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
PC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,LPFW, CT,SCHR,EII, TCFT,KSW,VC, LAC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

10. Conception Coast Biogeographic Population Group

"To the degree that trout are numerous and that they can give rise to anadromous fish, the viability of the steelhead population may be enhanced: by contributions to abundance and productivity, and by allowing the population to persist through multi-year droughts that interfere with steelhead migration from the ocean."

NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team
Steelhead of the South-Central and Southern California Coast, 2006

10.1 LOCATION AND PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Conception Coast BPG region encompasses eight small, coastal watersheds that drain a 50-mile long stretch of the south-facing slopes of the Santa Ynez Mountains in southern Santa Barbara County and extreme southwestern Ventura County (Figure 10-1). The Santa Ynez Mountains are an east-west trending spur of the Transverse Range that creates some of the steepest watersheds in any of the five BPG regions in the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Peak elevations reach 4,300 feet within a few miles of the Pacific Ocean. These watersheds are relatively homogeneous in slope, aspect, and size, with steep upper watersheds and lower watersheds that cut across a relatively narrow coastal terrace.

Conception Coast Watersheds

Stream lengths are relatively short in this BPG region. The Gaviota Creek watershed penetrates the furthest inland (about seven miles). Goleta Slough, the largest estuary in this BPG region, is formed by the confluence of several sub-watersheds: Tecolotito Creek, Los Carneros Creek, San Pedro Creek, Las Vegas Creek, Maria Ygnacio Creek, San Jose Creek, and Atascadero Creek. Of these, the latter three watersheds were evaluated using the CAP analyses. The majority of the watersheds within this BPG maintain perennial flow in their upper reaches, often in association with deep bed-rock pools, and supported by groundwater and flow



Figure 10-1. The Conception Coast BPG region. Ten populations/watersheds were analyzed in this region: Jalama, Santa Anita, Gaviota, Arroyo Hondo, Tecolote, Mission, Montecito, Carpinteria, and Rincon Creeks, and four sub-watersheds in the Goleta Slough watershed.

through fractured rock along geologic fault lines.

Maria Ygnacio Creek

The second largest estuary in this BPG region, Carpinteria Slough, is formed by a synclinal Watershed fed by Santa Monica Creek and several minor drainages that are not included in the basin covered in the Conception Coast BPG region.

Carpinteria Creek

Precipitation in this region increases strongly with increasing elevation. Rainfall amounts in the upper watersheds can be five to six times higher than on the coastal terrace of these watersheds during the same storm event, and the steep topography creates extremely "flashy" flows.

Gaviota Creek

In addition to the watersheds considered here, there are a number of smaller watersheds within this BPG (*e.g.*, San Antonio, Los Carneros, Glen Annie, and McCloy Creeks) which may also be used by steelhead when water conditions are favorable (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

10.2 LAND USE

Table 10-1 summarizes land use and population density in this region. The coastal terrace and middle portions of these watersheds receive the most intensive land use. Human population density varies widely between the component watersheds, averaging about 605 persons per square mile over the entire BPG region. The western half of the BPG region has very low population density (1 - 59 persons/square mile), while the Goleta Slough and Mission Creek watersheds average 1,201 and 3,491 persons per square mile, respectively (see Table 10-1 for additional comparisons).

In most of the watersheds in this BPG region, the first land use change was livestock ranching and dry farming, followed by irrigated row-crop agriculture, particularly orchard crops such as avocados, lemons, and walnuts. Most recently, steeper slopes in the middle reaches of some watersheds have been developed with

avocado and other orchard crops. Urbanization followed this trend on the coastal plain in the eastern half of this BPG region then moved up into the more mountainous portions of the watersheds as cities grew in size. The upper watersheds throughout this region are located within the Los Padres National Forest, whereas the coastal and middle watersheds are mostly privately owned. Semi-developed rural land and orchards cover extensive portions of the coastal and middle portions of the western watersheds. Most of the Arroyo Hondo watershed has recently been put under a conservation easement and is managed by the Land Trust of Santa Barbara County.

A number of coastal areas in this region have been developed as County and State Parks, including Jalama Beach County Park (Jalama Creek), Gaviota State Beach (Gaviota Creek), Refugio State Beach (Refugio Creek), El Capitan State Beach (El Capitan Creek), Goleta Beach County Park (mouth of Goleta Slough), Arroyo Burro Beach County Park (Arroyo Burro Creek), City of Santa Barbara beaches (east and west of mouth of Mission Creek), Carpinteria State Beach (Carpinteria Creek), and Rincon Beach County Park (Rincon Creek). Each of these parks is situated along lower reaches of these drainages, including the estuary.

Carpinteria Valley Agriculture

Agriculture (orchard cultivation and livestock ranching), are important land uses that directly or indirectly impact watershed processes throughout these watersheds. Most of the municipal water for Goleta, Santa Barbara, Montecito, Summerland, and Carpinteria is supplied by reservoirs on the middle and upper mainstem of the Santa Ynez River on the north side of the Santa Ynez Range. This municipal water source is supplemented by groundwater wells located throughout the coastal terrace. The ranches that support irrigated orchard crops in these watersheds also depend heavily on groundwater as their source for agricultural water. Some large ranches have diversions and dams on their property to create reservoirs for agricultural use (*e.g.*, Glen Annie Canyon, an unnamed tributary of Dos Pueblos Creek, and Gato Creek).

Some of these reservoirs support small populations of bullfrogs and non-native predatory fish (*e.g.*, Dos Pueblos Creek tributary reservoir), but the majority of the drainages in these watersheds are relatively free from these predators. Non-native crayfish and western mosquitofish, which may prey on *O. mykiss* eggs, occur in many urbanized drainages. Tecolotito Creek in the Goleta Slough watershed supports a reproducing population of African clawed frogs (*Xenopus laevis*), which may be a predator on certain *O. mykiss* life stages.

10.3 CURRENT WATERSHED CONDITIONS

Watershed conditions were assessed for ten watersheds in the Conception Coast BPG region. In general, instream, riparian, and floodplain conditions for steelhead in these watersheds offer fair to good habitat conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss*, although conditions vary widely within and between watersheds, depending on land uses. The upper watersheds consistently

Table 10-1. Physical and Land-Use Characteristics of Major Watersheds in the Conception Coast BPG region.

	PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS					LAND USE			
WATERSHEDS (west to east)	**Area** (acres)[1]	**Area** (sq. miles)[1]	**Stream Length**[2] (miles)	**Ave. Ann. Rainfall**[3] (inches)	**Total Human Population**[4]	**Public Ownership***	**Urban Area**[5]	**Agriculture/ Barren**[5]	**Open Space**[5]
Jalama Creek	15800	25	45	17.4	59			< 1%	
Canada de Santa Anita	2067	3	5	17.4	16			< 1%	
Gaviota Creek	12912	20	39	17.5	40			1%	
Arroyo Hondo	2796	4	6	17.8	1			< 1%	
Tecolote Creek	3726	6	11	19	339			18%	
Goleta Slough**	30410	48	92	19.2	57,664			16%	
Mission Creek	7760	12	16	19.6	41,890			3%	
Montecito Creek	3970	6	11	19.5	2,453			< 1%	
Carpinteria Creek	10712	17	25	19.8	3,493			20%	
Rincon Creek	9422	15	25	19.3	324			23%	
TOTAL or AVERAGE	**213099**	**333**	**560*** **	**18.6**	**201,459*** **		**16%**	**8%**	**74%**

[1] From: CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999 (www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/features/calwater/)
[2] From: CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003 (www.calfish.org/)
[3] From: USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1 km grid cells)
[4] From: CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003; preliminary analysis of Census 2010 indicates the population in component watersheds is 122,787
[5] From: CDFFP Multi-source land cover data (v02_2), 2002 (100 m grid cells) (http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgisdata/select.asp)
** Includes National Forest Lands only; does not include State or County Parks or Military Reservations (from: http://old.casil.ucdavis.edu/casil/gis.ca.gov/teale/govtowna/)*
** Goleta Slough" includes analyses only for San Jose, San Pedro, Maria Ygnacio, and Atascadero creeks
**** Total for entire BPG region, not component watersheds*



Figure 10-2. Conception Coast BPG Watersheds.

support good to excellent quality spawning and rearing habitat; however, conditions in each of these watersheds deteriorate downstream on the coastal plain. Highway 101 and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and U.S. Highway 101 traverse the mainstem of each of these watersheds at or in close proximity to their mouths, which has damaged estuarine habitat and created passage impediments for anadromous *O. mykiss*.

Arroyo Hondo Creek Estuary

Agricultural activities, such as groundwater extraction, have reduced surface flows and degraded habitat conditions in the lower and middle portions of these watersheds. Urban development dominates the lower reaches of the Goleta Slough, Mission Creek, Montecito Creek, and Carpinteria Creek watersheds (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Rincon Creek

Most of these watersheds also exhibit high road densities. The Arroyo Hondo watershed provides the least disturbed conditions for steelhead in this BPG because of low-intensity land use and its inclusion in a natural reserve system managed by the Land Trust of Santa Barbara County. The Goleta Slough watershed (San Jose, San Pedro, Maria Ygnacio, and Atascadero creeks) and the Mission Creek and Rincon Creek watersheds exhibit the least favorable conditions; however, their upper watersheds sustain reproducing populations of non-anadromous *O. mykiss* and occasionally anadromous forms despite urbanization, channelization, channel maintenance, and other urban land uses throughout their lower reaches.

Mission Creek

The terrain of the Santa Ynez Mountains results in development on steep slopes, often accompanied by road cuts to provide access, thus affecting watershed processes such as erosion and sedimentation. Development has also occurred along narrow riparian corridors, which encourages bank stabilization, levee construction, and other flood control activities that physically constrain the ability of streams to maintain natural channel morphology and riparian vegetation.

Montecito Creek

The increase of impermeable surfaces as a result of urbanization (including roads) along the coastal terraces, and the development of agricultural homes on steep slopes, has altered the natural flow regime of streams, particularly in the lower reaches, increasing the frequency and intensity of flood flows.

Rincon Creek Estuary (Courtesy California Coastal Commission)

Estuarine habitats at the mouths of these watersheds in this BPG region have been reduced in size by 70 to 95 percent by the development of roads and railroads, urbanization, and development of recreational facilities. Historically, these estuaries were relatively small with two notable exceptions: Goleta Slough, formed by the confluence of several watersheds, and the estuary associated with Mission Creek, comprised extensive wetland habitats in this BPG region that encompassed thousands of acres. The remaining estuarine habitats are subject to constriction and isolation by development, surface runoff from roads and other impervious surfaces, as well as a reduction in the amount and quality of surface flows resulting from groundwater extraction.

10.4 THREATS AND THREAT SOURCES

Varying numbers and intensity of habitat impairments (sources of threats) were identified in the CAP Workbooks analyses, ranging from 10 in the Gaviota Creek and Arroyo Hondo watersheds to 17 in the Rincon Creek watershed. "Severe" and "Very Severe" sources of threats exist in all of the watersheds in this BPG region, but the Arroyo Hondo watershed has the least number and severity of threats for anadromous *O. mykiss*. Threat sources are concentrated in the middle and lower portions of the watersheds and are associated with urban and agricultural development. The number and severity of threats generally diminishes in the upper, undeveloped portion of these watersheds. Anadromous and non-anadromous *O. mykiss* spawn in the upper reaches of most, even in the degraded lower reaches, of some of these drainages, such as Maria Ygnacio, Mission, and Carpinteria creeks (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Thirteen anthropogenic activities, all strongly associated with urban and agricultural development, ranked as the top sources of stress to *O. mykiss* in the Conception Coast BPG watersheds (Table 10-2). Road density, including roads in close proximity to stream riparian zones, and passage barriers associated with transportation corridors, consistently ranked as "Severe" to "Very Severe" threat sources. Proximal stressors associated with increased road density, especially roads near the drainage, include increased non-point

pollution, sedimentation, substrate embeddedness, floodplain encroachment and constriction, channel incision, and loss of channel structural complexity.

Increased road density also leads to increased frequency of road crossings, culverts, and other structures that can form passage barriers, preventing anadromous *O. mykiss* from accessing spawning and rearing habitat. As previously stated, Highway 101 and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks cross the mainstem of each of these watersheds near their mouths, in most cases through culverts. Highway 101 and the railroad tracks typically crossed these drainages by filling streambeds with earthen berms and forcing streams to flow through culverts of varying lengths. In some cases, construction of these transportation corridors reduced the extent of estuarine habitat. The Highway 101 culvert on Rincon Creek and a number of other creeks is an impassable barrier preventing anadromous *O. mykiss* from reaching spawning and rearing habitat and isolating formerly anadromous populations in the upper watershed.

Groundwater extraction for municipal and agricultural use also is a pervasive threat source among these watersheds. Widespread pumping of groundwater routinely eliminates surface flows and de-waters pools in portions of most of these drainages. The magnitude of loss of surface flows and the severity of passage barriers is exacerbated during years of below-average precipitation. Numerous diversions (*e.g.*, McCloy, Glen Annie, Carneros, San Pedro, Fremont, an unnamed tributary to San Jose, Maria Ygnacio, and San Antonio Creeks) and debris basins have further altered natural flow and sediment regimes, impeding access to and degrading spawning and rearing habitats, including estuarine habitats. These effects negatively impact multiple *O. mykiss* life stages (*e.g.*, development of eggs, alevins, fry, and parr).

Increasing urbanization of the Tecolote Creek, Goleta Slough, Mission Creek, Montecito Creek, and Carpinteria Creek watersheds creates a number of threat sources ranging from increased road density to floodplain encroachment and the heightened need for flood control structures, such as levees and channelization, and greater channel maintenance.

Six other threat sources are specific to one or two watersheds and have seriously degraded habitat conditions for steelhead there. For example, past quarrying activities in Rincon Creek have created a rock barrier that completely blocks upstream migration of anadromous *O. mykiss* and severely impedes downstream migration of resident non-anadromous *O. mykiss* above this barrier. Fire has recently burned much of the Gaviota Creek watershed and erosion of burned slopes in the watershed is a significant, though diminishing source of sediment. Recently non-native species of sunfish have been observed in upper Rattlesnake Creek, an important steelhead spawning and rearing tributary to Mission Creek. Gaviota State Beach campground was developed along the margins of the estuary at the mouth of the Gaviota Creek watershed and has substantially reduced the size and complexity of the estuary, degraded water quality, and created a severe passage impediment at a road crossing that provides access to Gaviota State Beach campground and Hollister Ranch. Jalama Creek and Canada de Santa Anita also have dams or other severe passage impediments on their mainstems and tributaries (Hunt & Associates 2008b, Kier Associates 2008b).

Table 10-2. Threat source rankings in component watersheds in the Conception Coast BPG region (see CAP Workbooks for individual watersheds for details).

Conception Coast BPG Component Watersheds (north to south)										
Threat Source	Jalama Creek	Canada de Santa Anita	Gaviota Creek	Arroyo Hondo	Tecolote Creek	Goleta Slough*	Mission Creek	Montecito Creek	Carpinteria Creek	Rincon Creek
Roads	Light green	Dark green	Red	Dark green	Light green					Red
Culverts & Crossings (passage barrier)	Light green		Red	Light green			Red	Yellow		Red
Groundwater Extraction				Dark green			Red	Yellow		Red
Levees and Channelization		Dark green	Red		Dark green	Yellow			Red	Light green
Urban Development					Dark green				Red	Dark green
Wildfires	Light green	Dark green	Red			Light green				Yellow
Recreational Facilities	Light green	Dark green	Red	Dark green	Light green	Yellow	Light green	Dark green	Yellow	Light green
Upslope/ Upstream Activities		Dark green			Light green		Yellow	Light green		Yellow
Flood Control Maintenance		Dark green	Light green		Dark green	Red		Light green		Yellow
Mining and Quarrying									Dark green	Red
Agricultural Development		Dark green	Light green	Dark green		Red		Dark green		Red
Dams and Surface Water Diversions	Yellow	Red			Dark green	Light green	Dark green	Light green	Yellow	Dark green

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

**Wildfires were not identified during the CAP Workbook analyses as one of the top five threats in several of these watersheds, but recent fires in coastal watersheds since 2007 could result in significant habitats impacts. A number of diversions to stream tributaries to the Goleta Slough Complex have been identified, along with recent reports of non-native species in several watersheds; these threats should be further evaluated, and if necessary, addressed to protect affected steelhead habitats.*

10.5 SUMMARY

Culverts and road crossings (along with other fish passage barriers such as small dams) are widespread throughout the Conception Coast BPG region, cutting off or severely reducing access to upstream spawning and rearing habitats for anadromous *O. mykiss*. Groundwater extraction and numerous small surface diversions have significantly altered flow regimes, particularly in the lower stream reaches, and thus adversely affected both upstream and downstream fish passage and spawning and rearing opportunities. Levees and channelization associated with urban encroachment have restricted or eliminated riparian habitat, and urban and agricultural development (particularly on steep slopes) has altered run-off patterns and increased erosion and sedimentation, particularly in lower stream reaches. Additionally, impacts associated with wildland fires, including fire-fighting measures to control or extinguish them, and the post-fire measures to repair damages incurred in fighting wildland fires, pose potential threats to watersheds in this BPG. Table 10-3 summarizes the critical recovery actions needed within the Core 1 populations of this BPG, including the estimated cost for implementing such actions in five year increments over the first 25 years, and where applicable extended out to 100 years, though most recovery actions can be achieved within a shorter period.

Restoring conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss* passage, spawning, and/or rearing in these watersheds will require multiple, long-term, measures related to water management, and barrier removal or improvements. Impediments to fish passage stemming from the construction and maintenance of roads and other transportation corridors, privately-owned dams and other passage barriers on some drainages, groundwater extraction, modification of channel morphology and adjacent riparian habitats for flood control, and other instream activities need to be further evaluated for this BPG. Additionally, the loss of estuarine functions caused by filling and pollution from point and non-point agricultural and other anthropogenic waste discharges need to be addressed further in this region.

Carpinteria Creek Steelhead –1942

The threat sources discussed in this section should be the focus of a variety of recovery actions to address addresses specific risks to anadromous *O. mykiss* viability. Spatial and temporal data, for water temperature, pH, nutrients, *etc*., are not uniformly available, and should be further developed, along with general habitat typing assessments, to better identify natural as well as anthropogenic limiting factors. This type of data acquisition should be the subject of site-specific investigation in order to refine the primary recovery actions or to target additional recovery actions as part of any recovery strategy for the This type of data acquisition should be the subject of site-specific investigation in order to refine the primary recovery actions or to target additional recovery actions as part of any recovery strategy for the Conception Coast.

Tables 9-4 through 9-13 below rank and describe proposed recovery actions for each sub-watershed in the Conception Coast BPG, including the estimated cost for implementing the actions in five year increments over the first 25 years, and where applicable extended out to 100 years, though many recovery actions can be achieved within a shorter period.

Table 10-3. Critical recovery actions for Core 1 populations within the Conception Coast BPG.

POPULATION	CRITICAL RECOVERY ACTION
Goleta Slough Complex	Modify road and railroad crossings and, remove or modify flood control channels and grade control structures to allow natural migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and the ocean. Identify, protect, and where necessary restore estuarine and freshwater rearing habitats. Develop restoration and management for the Goleta Slough Estuary to restore estuarine functions
Mission Creek	Halt the unnatural dry-season reduction in the amount and extent of surface water to restore natural or pre-impact over-summering habitat characteristics and condition for steelhead. Physically modify channelized reaches of lower Mission Creek, and upstream road crossings, to allow natural migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and the ocean. Identify, protect, and where necessary restore estuarine and freshwater rearing habitats. Develop restoration and management for the Mission Creek Estuary to restore estuarine functions.
Carpinteria Creek	Halt the unnatural dry-season reduction in the amount and extent of surface water to restore natural or pre-impact over-summering habitat characteristics and condition for steelhead. Physically modify upstream debris basins to allow natural migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and the ocean. Identify, protect, and where necessary restore estuarine and freshwater rearing habitats. Develop restoration and management for the Carpinteria Creek Estuary to restore estuarine functions.
Rincon Creek	Halt the unnatural dry-season reduction in the amount and extent of surface water to restore natural or pre-impact over-summering habitat characteristics and condition for steelhead. Physically modify Highway I and railroad culvert in lower Rincon Creek, and upstream road crossings to allow natural migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and the ocean. Identify, protect, and where necessary restore estuarine and freshwater rearing habitats. Develop restoration and management for the Rincon Creek Estuary to restore estuarine functions.

Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Tables Identification Key, Conception Coast BPG (Tables 10-4 – 10-13).

Recovery Action Number Key: XXXX – SCS – 1.2		XXXX ID Table		Threat Source Legend	
XXXX	Watershed	JC	Jalama Creek	1	Agricultural Development
SCS	Species Identifier – Southern California Steelhead	Sac	Santa Anita Creek	2	Agricultural Effluents
1	Threat Source	GC	Gaviota Creek	3	Culverts and Road Crossings
2	Action Identity Number	AHC	Arroyo Honda Creek	4	Dams and Surface Water Diversions
Action Rank		TC	Tecolote Creek	5	Flood Control Maintenance
A	Action addresses the first listing factor regarding the destruction or curtailment of the species' habitat	GS	Goleta Slough	6	Groundwater Extraction
B	Action addresses one of the other four listing factors	MisC	Mission Creek	7	Levees and Channelization
		MonC	Montecito Creek	8	Mining and Quarrying
		CarC	Carpinteria Creek	9	Non-Native Species
		RC	Rincon Creek	10	Recreational Facilities
				11	Roads
				12	Upslope/Upstream Activities
				13	Urban Development
				14	Urban Effluents
				15	Wildfires

See Chapter 8, Table 8.1 for Detailed Description of Recovery Actions

Table 10-4. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Jalama Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Jalama Creek												
JC-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USGS, NMFS,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM,USF WS,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
JC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USFWS, DWR,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,DWR, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
JC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS,US FWS,SWRCB, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
JC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement a stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
JC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement a watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
JC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFTS,CHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,NMFS, USFWS.CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
JC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	NMFS,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	100500	0	0	0	0	100500
JC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, USFWS,CT,TCFT , SCHR,EII, SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
JC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CSCC,CDFG, CT,TCF,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
JC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	CDOT,CSCC, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
JC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS,N MFS,USGS, CDFG, CT,TCFT,LPFW SCHR,EII, SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-5. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Canada de Santa Anita Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Santa Anita Creek												
Sac-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USGS, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	ongoing –cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sac-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
Sac-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	20	6200	499840	499840	499840	499840	1505720
Sac-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE,U SFWS,BLM, DWR,CSCC, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sac-SCS-3.2	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,ACOE,U SFWS,BLM, DWR,CSCC, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1,4	1A	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sac-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sac-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,DWR, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
Sac-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, CDFG,DWR, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
Sac-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USGS,ACOE, BLM,CSCC, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
Sac-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sac-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sac-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
Sac-SCS-11.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and road (*e.g.*, Union Pacific Railroad line and Hollister Ranch Road)	USDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDOT, CSCC,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sac-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CSCC, CDFG,CT,TCFS CHR,EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sac-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	NMFS,USFWS, CSCC,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	4628920	0	0	0	0	4628920
Sac-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
Sac-SCS-13.1	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	CDOT,CDFG,N MFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sac-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1,4,5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sac-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,LPFW, SCHR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-6. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Gaviota Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Gaviota Creek												
GC-SCS-1.1	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USGS, NMFS,USFWS, BLMCDFG,CSCC,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	20	48360	3898752	3898752	3898752	0	11744616
GC-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
GC-SCS-1.3	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
GC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	CDOT,CDPR, CDFG,CSCC, USDOT,ACOE, BLM,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
GC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, SWRCB,CDFG CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
GC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and monitoring program	USGS,SWRCB, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
GC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG,CSCC,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
GC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
GC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways (*e.g.,* Gaviota State Beach/Hollister Ranch access road)	NRCS,USDOT, CDOT,ACOE, BLM,CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways (*e.g.*, U.S. Highway 101)	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
GC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement estuary restoration and management plan	CSCS,CDFG, NMFS,BLM, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	911200	0	0	0	0	911200
GC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
GC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,BLM, USFWS,CDFG, CCC,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
GC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
GC-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan to replace artificial bank stabilization structures	NMFS,USFWS, USDOT,CDFG, CSCC,CDPR, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
GC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
GC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
GC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, USGS,CDFG, CT,TCF,LPFW, SCHR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-7. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Arroyo Hondo Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Arroyo Hondo												
AHC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,BLM, USFS,DWR,CDFG,CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CT,TCF, SCHR,EII, SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
AHC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways.	USDOT,CDOT, NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
AHC-SCS-11.2	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.,* U.S. Highway 1, Union Pacific Railroad)	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHC-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USDOT,NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
AHC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement estuary restoration and management plan	NMFS,USFWS, CSCC,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	67000	0	0	0	0	67000
AHC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
AHC-SCS-13.1	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	CDOT,CDFG, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,LPFW, SCHR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-8. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Tecolote Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Tecolote Creek												
TC-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCF,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
TC-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USFWS,USFS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
TC-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,		10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USFWS, ACOE,BLM, USFS,CDFG, CSCC,DWR, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
TC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,DWR, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
TC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,DWR, SWRCB,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS,USGS, ACOE,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
TC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,UNMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
TC-SCS-11.1	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
TC-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0		0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TC-SCS-11.3	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.,* U.S. Highway 101, Union Pacific Railroad)	USDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	ongoing - costs of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
TC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CSCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, BLM,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	268000	0	0	0	0	268000
TC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
TC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
TC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
TC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4,5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan,	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,LPFW, SCHR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-9. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Goleta Slough Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Goleta Slough												
GS-SCS-1.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USGS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	114080	9197056	9197056	9197056	0	27705248
GS-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
GS-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, BLM,USFS, DWR,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, BLM,USFS, DWR,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Dams and surface water diversions	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
GS-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,DWR, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
GS-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,DWR, NMFS,USFWS, CT,CDFG TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
GS-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
GS-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CSCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
GS-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
GS-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, BLM,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	53383870	0	0	0	0	53383870
GS-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
GS-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,BLM, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
GS-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan to replace artificial bank stabilization structures	ACOE,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CSCC,CDFG, DWR,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
GS-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* Goleta Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,LPFW, SCHR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-10. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Mission Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Mission Creek												
MisC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, BLM,USFWS, USFS,DWR, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, BLM,USFWS, USFS,DWR, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Dams and surface water diversions	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,DWR, SWRCB,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
MisC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,DWR,SW RCB,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
MisC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement a stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NMFS,USFWS, USGS,ACOE, BLM,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MisC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCSS, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
MisC-SCS-11.1	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USDOT,NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
MisC-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USDOT,USFWS, NRCS,NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CSCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	1340000	0	0	0	0	1340000

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MisC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
MisC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NMFS,USFWS, BLM,CCC, CDFG,CT,TCFT SCHR,EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
MisC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,USFS, CDFG, CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* El Estero Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, CDFG,SWRCB, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MisC-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, CDFG,SWRCB, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MisC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, BLM,CDFG,CT, TCFT,LPFW, SCHR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-11. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Montecito Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Montecito Creek												
MonC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USFWS, ACOE,BLM, CSCC,CDFG, DWR,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MonC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,USFWS, ACOE,BLM, CSCC,CDFG, DWR,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Dams and surface water diversions	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MonC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,NRCS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFTS,CHR, EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
MonC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis assessment	USGS,DWR, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
MonC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,DWR, SWRCB,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
MonC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CSCC,CDFG, USFWS,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MonC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS,USFWS,NMFS,CSCC,CDFG,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1,4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
MonC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MonC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MonC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
MonC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USDOT,USFW, NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCF,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MonC-SCS-11.2	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill railroad lines and roads	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDGS, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MonC-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USDOT,USFW, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
MonC-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
MonC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CCC,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
MonC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
MonC-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement a riparian restoration plan that replace artificial bank stabilization structures	NRCS,USFWS,NMFS,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
MonC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify if necessary all NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MonC-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MonC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,LPFW,SC HR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-12. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Carpinteria Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Carpinteria Creek												
CarC-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
CarC-SCS-1.2	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zone	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,BLM, USFS,DWR, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,BLM, USFS,DWR, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Dams and surface water diversions	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,DWR, SWRCB,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CarC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,DWR, SWRCB,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
CarC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS,USGS, ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CSCC,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
CarC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,USFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,USFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
CarC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CPPR, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,USFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDOT,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CarC-SCS-11.2	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CDOT, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
CarC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,BLM, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	59630000	0	0	0	0	59630000
CarC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
CarC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CSCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT, SCHR,EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
CarC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,USDOT, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan replace artificial bank stabilization structures	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT, SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
CarC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.*, Carpinteria Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify stormwater permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
CarC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,LPFW, SCHR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10-13. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Rincon Creek Watershed (Conception Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Rincon Creek												
RC-SCS-1.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USGS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	31000	2499200	2499200	2499200	0	7528600
RC-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
RC-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
RC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USFWS, ACOE,BLM, USFS,DWR, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
RC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,USFWS, ACOE,BLM, USFS,DWR, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Dams and surface water diversions	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
RC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
RC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,DWR, SWRCB,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
RC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,DWR, SWRCB,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
RC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	NRCS,USGS, ACOE,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
RC-SCS-8.1	Develop and implement plan to remove quarry and landslide debris from the channel	CDMG,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4, 5	2B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
RC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
RC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,NMFS, CT,USFWS, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
RC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
RC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USDOT,NRCS, NMFS,USFWS, CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
RC-SCS-11.2	Develop and implement a plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
RC-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDOT, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
RC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	USDOT,NMFS, BLM,USFWS, CDOT,CDPR, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	1340000	0	0	0	0	1340000

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
RC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
RC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,NMFS, USFWS,BLM, CDOT,CDFG, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
RC-SCS-13.2	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan to replace artificial bank stabilization structures	NRCS,USFWS,NUMFS,CDFG,CSCC,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
RC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* Carpinteria Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,SCHR,EII, SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
RC-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TCFT,SCHR, EII,SBC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
RC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, USGS,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TCFT,LPFW, SCHR,EII,SBC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

11. Santa Monica Mountains Biogeographic Population Group

"Dispersal connectivity and genetic diversity may be aided by also including smaller 'non-core' populations that serve as stepping stones for dispersal. However, the core populations are fundamental."

NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team
Viability Criteria for South-Central and Southern California Steelhead, 2007

11.1 LOCATION AND PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Santa Monica Mountains BPG region consists of five coastal watersheds located in southern Ventura and western Los Angeles counties. These watersheds drain the east-west oriented coastal Santa Monica Mountains. These mountains are composed of recently uplifted marine and volcanic formations that extend approximately 32 miles from the Oxnard Plain in the west to the Los Angeles Watershed in the east. With the exception of Malibu Creek, these watersheds are relatively small and do not extend inland beyond the Santa Monica Mountains. The watersheds, from west to east, are Big Sycamore Canyon Creek, Arroyo Sequit, Malibu Creek, Las Flores Canyon Creek, and Topanga Canyon Creek (Figure 11-1). The Santa Monica Mountains BPG region is similar to the Conception Coast BPG region in that it is comprised of a series of short, nearly parallel streams that drain steep south-facing slopes, with an average elevation of less than 2,500 feet (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Santa Monica Mountains

The annual seasonal rainfall in the watersheds of this BPG region is approximately 18 inches, although rainfall is lower along the coast and increases with increasing elevation in the upper reaches of the watersheds. Malibu Creek is the largest of the five watersheds, encompassing approximately 110 square miles and, unlike other coastal streams in the Conception Coast BPG region, penetrates through a break in the Santa Monica Mountains to



Figure 11-1. The Santa Monica Mountains BPG region. Five populations/watersheds were analyzed in this region: Arroyo Sequit, Big Sycamore Canyon, Malibu Creek, Las Flores Canyon, and Topanga Canyon.

O

drain a portion of its north-facing slopes and the south-facing slopes of the Simi Hills. Calleguas Creek and the Los Angeles River drain the remainder of the northern slopes of the Santa Monica Mountains. In addition to the major watersheds considered here, there are a number of smaller watersheds within this BPG (*e.g.*, Trancas, Zuma, Solstice, and Las Flores Canyon) which may also be used by steelhead when water conditions are favorable.

11.2 LAND USE

Table 11-1 summarizes land use and population density in Santa Monica Mountains BPG region. A significant portion of the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region is undeveloped, portions are publicly held as part of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, seven state parks and beaches (Point Mugu State Park, Malibu Creek State Park, Leo Carrillo State Beach, Topanga State Park, R. H. Meyer Memorial State Beach, Dan Blocker State Beach, and Will Rogers State Park), and several local parks and beaches, including Zuma County Beach, Solstice Canyon Park, and Trancas Canyon Park. As a result of the relatively large amount of public land in proximity to a large urban area (Los Angeles Basin) recreational facilities receive intensive use.

Malibu Coastal Development

Development within these watersheds is principally residential, with some commercial and recreational development concentrated near the mouths of several of the streams. The Malibu Creek and Topanga Canyon Creek watersheds support the highest human population densities. Watersheds in the western portion of the Santa Monica Mountains generally have less development and significantly more area in public ownership than watersheds in the eastern half of the range. Human population density and private land ownership increases in the Santa Monica Mountains from west to east with increasing proximity to the Los Angeles Watershed. Agricultural conversion of watershed lands is generally light throughout the BPG region (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

11.3 CURRENT WATERSHED CONDITIONS

Watershed conditions were assessed for the five major drainages in the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region. The mainstem and major tributaries of most of the drainages in this BPG region offer fair to good habitat conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss*. Existing habitat quality was rated as "Fair" in the Big Sycamore Canyon, Arroyo Sequit, Malibu Creek, and Las Flores Canyon watersheds, and "Good" in the Topanga Canyon Creek watershed. Existing conditions within the Topanga Canyon Creek watershed are relatively good, despite having the second highest human population density in this BPG region (Table 11-1). For example, Topanga Canyon Creek is characterized by perennial flows, high-quality instream and riparian conditions, an absence of non-native predators, and migration barriers, if present, are seasonally passable. However, the natural seasonal flow regime of Malibu Creek has been substantially altered by the waste discharge

Table 11-1. Physical and Land-Use Characteristics of Major Watersheds in the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS						LAND USE			
WATERSHEDS (west to east)	**Area** (acres)[1]	**Area** (sq. miles)[1]	**Stream Length**[2] (miles)	**Ave. Ann. Rainfall**[3] (inches)	**Total Human Population**[4]	**Public Ownership***	**Urban Area**[5]	**Agriculture/ Barren**[5]	**Open Space**[5]
Big Sycamore Canyon Creek	13,649	21	32	17.9	27	76%	< 1%	< 1%	99%
Arroyo Sequit	7,572	12	17	17.9	370	43%	3%	1%	96%
Malibu Creek	70,726	110	161	18.0	74,585	32%	23%	2%	75%
Las Flores Canyon Creek	2,908	5	6	18.5	1,144	5%	15%	< 1%	85%
Topanga Canyon Creek	12,616	20	30	17.9	5,561	72%	15%	< 1%	85%
TOTAL or AVERAGE	**107,471**	**168**	**246**	**18.0**	**81,687**	**---**	**18%**	**1%**	**81%**

[1] From: CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999 (www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/features/calwater/)
[2] From: CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003 (www.calfish.org/)
[3] From: USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1 km grid cells)
[4] From: CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003; preliminary analysis of Census 2010 indicates the population in the BPG has increased to 99,243
[5] From: CDFFP Multi-source land cover data (v02_2), 2002 (100 m grid cells) (http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgisdata/select.asp)
** Includes National Recreation Areas, State Parks, and County (from: http://old.casil.ucdavis.edu/casil/gis.ca.gov/teale/govtowna/)*



Figure 11-2. Santa Monica Mountains Watersheds.

of the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Tapia wastewater treatment plan (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Arroyo Sequit Creek

Because of the proximity of the Santa Monica Mountains to large urban areas, there is significant pressure to develop and maintain recreational facilities. Each of the watersheds in the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region supports one or more coastal and inland campgrounds and other high-use recreational facilities. This is particularly the case in the Big Sycamore Creek, Arroyo Sequit, and Malibu Creek watersheds, where large portions of the watersheds are publicly owned. Recreational activities are recurring sources of direct and indirect threats to anadromous *O. mykiss* including roadway stream crossings in and around campgrounds that pose physical barriers to upstream and/or downstream movement migration, introduction of non-native plants and animals, disturbance to stream banks and instream habitats, and even redds potentially by foot traffic and off-road vehicles, loss of or disturbance to riparian corridors around campgrounds, and constriction of the floodplain. The type and number of threats posed by recreational facilities varies significantly between watersheds, from single locations such a road crossing on Arroyo Sequit, to multiple sites, such as numerous floodplain campgrounds or multiple stream crossings in the Malibu Creek watershed.

Rindge Dam – Malibu Creek

The Malibu Creek watershed is highly constrained by two major dams: the Rindge Dam and the Malibu Lake Dam. The former structure is located approximately two stream miles upstream of the lagoon and blocks access to over 90% of the anadromous *O. mykiss* spawning and rearing habitat within Malibu Creek. Rindge Dam also has isolated native *O. mykiss* that would otherwise exhibit an anadromous life-history, and prevents the repeated re-colonization of upstream habitats that may experience temporary extirpations as a result of natural stochastic processes, such as wildfires, droughts, and landslides. These dams have numerous effects on physical, hydrological, and habitat characteristics of the middle and lower reaches of the Malibu Creek. Dams also create and maintain favorable habitat conditions for several species of non-native fishes and bullfrogs, which may affect one or more life history stages of *O. mykiss* either directly (*e.g.*, predation) or indirectly (*e.g.*, competition for food). Non-native crayfish, snails, fishes, and bullfrogs are particularly abundant in the Malibu Creek and Las Flores Canyon Creek watersheds.

Malibu Creek

The terrain of the Santa Monica Mountains results in development on steep slopes, often accompanied by road cuts to provide access, thus affecting watershed processes such as erosion and sedimentation. Development has also occurred along narrow riparian corridors, which encourages bank stabilization, levee construction, and other flood control activities, and physically constrains the ability of streams to maintain natural channel morphology and riparian vegetation.

Increased residential development, including high road densities, has significantly altered natural fire regimes in the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region because it has allowed human access to almost all portions of the component watersheds. Fires have consumed 71% to 100% of the Big Sycamore Canyon Creek, Arroyo Sequit, Malibu Creek, and Las Flores Canyon Creek watersheds within the past 25 years, including recent fires in 2007. Approximately 32% of the Topanga Canyon Creek watershed has burned in the last 25 years (Hunt & Associates, Kier Associates 2008b). While the natural fire-cycle is an important source of sediments essential to support productive spawning and rearing habitat, artificially increased fire frequency can increase slope erosion and sediment inputs to streams, resulting in long-term changes to substrate composition and embeddedness, water quality (*e.g.*, turbidity), and water temperature (*e.g.*, loss of riparian canopy cover). Anadromous *O. mykiss* in each of the watersheds in the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region have been subjected to such secondary fire effects. The increase of impermeable surfaces as a result of urbanization (including roads) along the coastal terrace, and the development of homes on steep slopes (*e.g.*, Malibu, Las Flores, and Topanga Canyons), has altered the natural flow regime of streams, particularly in the lower reaches, increasing the frequency and intensity of flood flows (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates).

Topanga Creek

Estuarine habitat loss in the component watersheds of the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region ranges from 66% to 97%. Malibu Creek formerly had the largest estuary of any watershed in the BPG region and still has the highest amount of remaining estuarine habitat (34%), but its estuarine functions have been significantly impaired by upstream waste discharges from point and non-point sources, and the alteration of the natural hydrologic and sediment transport regimes by a series of upstream dams (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Big Sycamore Canyon Estuary

The estuaries of Big Sycamore Canyon, Arroyo Sequit, Los Flores Canyon, and Topanga Canyon Creek have suffered the largest loss of areal extent, and are highly impacted by Highway 1, commercial development, and recreational activities. Road construction, bridges, levees, floodplain encroachment by residential and commercial development (*e.g.*, the City of Malibu and Malibu Colony in Malibu Creek) have significantly reduced estuarine habitat in almost watersheds in this BPG region. Other estuarine habitats such as those of Big Sycamore and Las Flores Canyon have been almost completely lost due to transportation, recreation, and commercial development.

11.4 THREATS AND THREAT SOURCES

The relatively high population and development pressures along the coastal portions of the Santa Monica Mountains, coupled with the proximity to the densely populated Los Angeles Watershed, create a series of recurring, severe to very severe threats to the persistence of anadromous *O. mykiss* in each of the component watersheds in this BPG region. The number of threat sources used by the CAP Workbooks in determining threat status for the Santa Monica Mountains BPG watersheds varied from eight in the Big Sycamore Canyon Creek watershed to 16 in the Malibu Creek watershed.

Ten anthropogenic activities ranked as the top sources of stress to anadromous *O. mykiss* in the Santa Monica Mountains BPG (Table 11-2). Each watershed has a unique combination of threats; however, recurring threats among most or all of the watersheds include: high road density, including roads in close proximity to riparian corridors, impacts from recreational facilities, and barriers to migration at culverts and roadway stream crossings. Other threats are unique to particular watersheds, such as the Rindge and Malibu Lake dams on Malibu Creek (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Table 11-2. Threat source rankings in the component watersheds of the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region (see CAP Workbook for details).

Santa Monica Mountains BPG Component Watersheds (west to east)					
Threat Sources	Big Sycamore Canyon Creek	Arroyo Sequit	Malibu Creek	Las Flores Canyon Creek	Topanga Canyon Creek
Roads					
Recreational Facilities					
Culverts and Road Crossings					
Wildfires*					
Urban Development					
Levees and Channelization					
Dams and Surface Water Diversions					
Non-Native Species					
Upslope/Upstream Development					
Urban Effluents					

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

**Wildfires were not identified during the CAP Workbook analyses as one of the top five threats in several of these watersheds, but recent fires in coastal watersheds since 2007 could result in significant habitats impacts.*

11.5 SUMMARY

Road density is high throughout the Santa Monica Mountains BPG region, both on private and public lands. Road density, particularly roads within or close to riparian corridors are affecting each of these watersheds by contributing to the source of non-point pollutants (*e.g.*, oil, grease, copper from breaking systems, *etc.*), altering surface runoff patterns and stream hydrographs, and encroaching on floodplains and decreasing floodplain connectivity. Such road density creates the need for bank stabilization and levee construction to protect development, which in turn provides conduits for sediment, pollutant, and bacterial inputs to the watercourse. In other cases, road crossings create barriers to upstream and downstream movement of adult and juvenile anadromous *O. mykiss*. Additionally, impacts associated with wildland fires, including fire-fighting measures to control or extinguish them, and the post-fire measures to repair damages incurred in fighting wildland fires, poses a potential threat to watersheds in this BPG. Table 11-3 summarizes the critical recovery actions needed within the Core 1 populations of this BPG.

Restoring conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss* passage, spawning, and/or rearing in these watersheds will require multiple, long-term, measures related to water management, recreation, and fish passage. Impediments to fish passage stemming from the construction and maintenance of roads and other transportation corridors, dams and other passage barriers, groundwater extraction, and modification of channel morphology and adjacent riparian habitats by flood control measures need to be further evaluated for this BPG. Additionally, the loss of estuarine functions caused by filling and pollution from point and non-point agricultural and other anthropogenic waste discharges need to be addressed further in this region.

Malibu Creek Steelhead – 1946.

The threat sources discussed in this section should be the focus of a variety of recovery actions to address addresses specific risks to anadromous *O. mykiss* viability. Spatial and temporal data, for water temperature, pH, nutrients, *etc.*, are not uniformly available, and should be further developed, along with general habitat typing assessments, to better identify natural as well as anthropogenic limiting factors. This type of data acquisition should be the subject of site-specific investigation in order to refine the primary recovery actions or to target additional recovery actions as part of any recovery strategy for the Santa Monica Mountains BPG. Tables 11-4 through 11-8 below rank and describe proposed recovery actions for each sub-watershed in the Santa Monica Mountains BPG, including the estimated cost for implementing the actions in five year increments over the first 25 years, and where applicable extended out to 100 years, though many recovery actions can be achieved within a shorter period.

Table 11-3. Critical recovery actions for Core 1 populations within the Santa Monica Mountains BPG.

POPULATION	CRITICAL RECOVERY ACTION
Malibu Creek	Remove Rindge and Malibu dams, and physically modify road crossings, to allow natural migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and the ocean. Identify, protect, and restore estuarine and freshwater rearing habitats functions.
Topanga Creek	Develop and implement plan to replace the U.S. 101 culvert over Topanga Creek with a full span bridge to remove fill from the Topanga Creek Estuary, and allow natural migration to upstream spawning and rearing and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and the ocean habitat, Develop and implement a restoration and management plan for the Topanga Creek Estuary.

Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Tables Identification Key, Santa Monica Mountains BPG (Tables 11-4 – 11-8).

Recovery Action Number Key: XXXX – SCS – 1.2	
XXXX	Watershed
SCS	Species Identifier – Southern California Steelhead
1	Threat Source
2	Action Identity Number

Action Rank	
A	Action addresses the first listing factor regarding the destruction or curtailment of the species' habitat
B	Action addresses one of the other four listing factors

XXXX ID Table	
BSC	Big Sycamore Canyon
ASC	Arroyo Sequit Creek
MalC	Malibu Creek
LFC	Las Flores Canyon Creek
TopC	Topanga Canyon

Threat Source Legend	
1	Agricultural Development
2	Agricultural Effluents
3	Culverts and Road Crossings
4	Dams and Surface Water Diversions
5	Flood Control Maintenance
6	Groundwater Extraction
7	Levees and Channelization
8	Mining and Quarrying
9	Non-Native Species
10	Recreational Facilities
11	Roads
12	Upslope/Upstream Activities
13	Urban Development
14	Urban Effluents
15	Wildfires

See Chapter 8, Table 8.1 for Detailed Description of Recovery Actions

Table 11-4. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Big Sycamore Canyon Creek Watershed (Santa Monica Mountains BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Big Sycamore Canyon Creek												
BSC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,CDOT, ACOE, SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG, CSCC,CT, TCFT,TU,VC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
BSC-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	CDPR,CDFG, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3B	3	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
BSC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,NMFS, CT,TU,TCFT,VC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
BSC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement a stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG, CSCC, NMFS,CT,TU,TC FT,VC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
BSC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
BSC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
BSC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
BSC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* Point Mugu State Park, Santa Monica National Recreational Area General Management Plan)	CDPR,CDFG, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TU,TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
BSC-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,SMMC, SMMRCD, CT,TU,TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
BSC-SCS-10.3	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests	CDPR,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SMMC, SMMRCD, CT,TU,TCFT,VC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
BSC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, SMMC, SMMRCD,CT, TUC,TCFT,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
BSC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDPR, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD,CT, TU,TCFT,VC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
BSC-SCS-11.3	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads	CDOT,CDPR, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD,CT, TU,TCFT,VC	Roads	1,4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
BSC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDPR,CDFG, CDOT, CSCC, SMMC, SMRCD,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,TU,VC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2A	5	8881455	0	0	0	0	8881455
BSC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, SMMC,CDPR, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TRCF, TU,VC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2A	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
BSC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	BLM,CT,TUC, SDT,VC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
BSC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	NMFS,DOT, CT,TUC,SDT, VC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
BSC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD,CT, TU,TCFT,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
BSC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,SMMC, SMMRCD,CT, TU,TCFT,VC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
BSC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan,	USFS,USFWS, USGS,NMFS, CDF,CDFG, SMMC, SMMRCD,CT, TCFT,TU,VC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1A	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 11-5. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Arroyo Sequit Creek Watershed (Santa Monica Mountains BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Arroyo Sequit Creek												
ASC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASC-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversion (*e.g.*, small, non-functional water impoundments on the east and west forks of Arroyo Sequit)	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USFWS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASC-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,CT, TCFT,VC,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
ASC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,USGS, NMFS,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CT,TU,TCFT, VC,LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement a stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
ASC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,TCFT, VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,TCFT, VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,TCFT, VC,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
ASC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, Leo Carrillo State Park)	CDPR,SMMC, SMRCD,CDFG, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	1	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
ASC-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement a public education program on watershed processes	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USGS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
ASC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDPR, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,USFWS, CT,TU,TCFT, VC,LAC	Roads	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
ASC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
ASC-SCS-11.3	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management	CDPR,CDFG, CDOT,CSCC, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TCFT, VC,LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2A	5	670000	0	0	0	0	670000
ASC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2A	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
ASC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	SMMC SMMRCD, CDFG,NMFS, CT,TU,TCFT, VC,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
ASC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	CDOT,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, CDPR,NMFS, USFWS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
ASC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,CDPR, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,TCFT, VC,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	CDF,CDPR, SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,USGS, NMFS,CT,TU, TCFT,VC,LAC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1A	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 11-6. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Malibu Creek Watershed (Santa Monica Mountains BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Malibu Creek												
MalC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,CSCC CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MalC-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.*, remove or physically modify Rindge and Malibu dams)	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,CSCC USFWS,NMFS, ACOE,CT,TU, LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
MalC-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,ACOE, CT,TU,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
MalC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,USGS, NMFS,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CT,TU,TU,LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
MalC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MalC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MalC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MalC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCCC, SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
MalC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, Malibu State Park)	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USGS,CT,TU, LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	1	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
MalC-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USGS,CT,TU, LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MalC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MalC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
MalC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDPR,CDFG, CDOT, CSCCC, SMMC, SMMR,CD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2A	5	4958000	0	0	0	0	4958000
MalC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2A	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
MalC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	SMMC SMMRCD, CDFG,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
MalC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	SMMC SMMRCD, CDFG,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MalC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, CDFG,CDPR, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MalC-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB, CDFG,CDPR, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MalC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	CDF,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CT,TU,LAC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1A	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 11-7. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Las Flores Canyon Creek Watershed (Santa Monica Mountains BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Las Flores Canyon Creek												
LFC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
LFC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	NRCS,USGS, NMFS,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CT,TU,TU,LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LFC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CDOT,CSCC, SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
LFC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area General Management Plan)	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USGS,CT,TU, LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing -costs of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USGS,CT,TU, LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LFC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT, TU,LAC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
LFC-SCS-11.3	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and road	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Roads	1,4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDFG,CSCC, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT, TU ,LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	67000	0	0	0	0	67000
LFC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
LFC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	SMMC SMMRCD, CDFG NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
LFC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	SMMC SMMRCD, CDFG,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LFC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.*, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, CDFG,CDPR, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB, CDFG,CDPR, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
LFC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	CDF,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CT,TU,LAC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 11-8. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Topanga Canyon Creek Watershed (Santa Monica Mountains BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Topanga Canyon Creek												
TopC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	CDPR,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
TopC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDFG,CDPR, CDOT,CSCC, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TopC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC, SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SMMC, SMMRCD, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
TopC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* Topanga State Park, Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area General Management Plan)	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USGS,CT,TU, LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TopC-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	SMMC, SMMRCD, CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,NMFS, USGS,CT,TU, LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
TopC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-11.2	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
TopC-SCS-11.3	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and road	CDOT,CDPR, RWQCB, CDFG,SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Roads	1,4	2B	20-refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDFG,CDPR, CDOT,CSCC, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2A	5	201000	0	0	0	0	201000
TopC-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, SMMC, SMMRCD, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2A	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TopC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	SMMC SMMRCD, CDFG,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
TopC-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	SMMC SMMRCD, CDFG,CDOT, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,CDPR, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, CDPR,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
TopC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	CDF,SMMC, SMMRCD, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CT,TU,LAC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1A	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

12. Mojave Rim Biogeographic Population Group

"The motivation to consider steelhead recovery from a broad perspective stems from the realization that there is no meaningful way to discuss the science of steelhead recovery without fully embracing its many intricate connections with the human population of the region and the climatic changes now underway."

Dr. David A. Boughton, Chair, NOAA Fisheries South-Central/Southern California Steelhead Technical Recovery Team, 2010

12.1 LOCATION AND PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Mojave Rim BPG region encompasses three large coastal watersheds that drain the northern slopes of the Santa Monica Mountains and the coastal slopes of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains in southern Los Angeles County, southwestern San Bernardino, and western Riverside and Orange counties: the Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, and the Santa Ana River (Figure 12-1). Major tributaries in these drainages include: Arroyo Seco in the Los Angeles River watershed; the East and West forks of the San Gabriel River, and Mill, Lytle, and Fish creeks in the upper Santa Ana River watershed. The upper portions of each of these watersheds include steep, mountainous terrain and the lower watersheds cut across the Los Angeles Watershed—an extensive coastal plain. The Los Angeles, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana rivers have not always discharged to the Pacific Ocean at their current locations, but sometimes migrated across the Los Angeles Watershed and discharged as far west as Ballona Creek and as far east as present-day Huntington Beach. The Los Angeles, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana rivers currently discharge to the Pacific Ocean within 20 miles of each other in southern Los Angeles and northern Orange counties. The component watersheds are large, extending up to 83 miles inland in the case of the Santa Ana River watershed (Figure 12-4).

Los Angeles Basin

Average annual precipitation in these three watersheds is higher than that of the two adjacent BPG regions (*i.e.,* the Santa Monica



Figure 12-1. The Mojave Rim BPG region. Eight *O. mykiss* populations/watersheds were analyzed in this region: two in the Los Angeles River watershed; three in the San Gabriel River watershed, and three in the Santa Ana River watershed.

Mountains and Santa Catalina Gulf Coast) because the upper watersheds include the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountain ranges, whose upper elevations receive high annual rainfall and snowfall (Table 12-1). Rainfall along the coastal terrace portion of each of these watersheds is significantly lower than in the mountainous portions. Many of the mainstem rivers and tributaries in the Mojave Rim BPG region flow across the relatively flat Los Angeles Watershed, with comparatively few small tributaries for watersheds of their size. As a result, the overall stream length in these watersheds is less than that in other BPG regions of comparable size (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

12.2 LAND USE

Table 12-1 summarizes land use and population density in this region. This BPG region encompasses the second-largest metropolitan area in the United States. Human population density here is the highest of any of the five BPG regions, averaging 2,964 persons per square mile. Population centers are mostly concentrated in the Los Angeles River watershed (5,237 persons per square mile), but the interior portions of the Santa Ana River watershed also have densely developed metropolitan areas.

Urban Transportation and Flood Control

There are at least 20 dams on the mainstem and/or major tributaries of each of the three drainages in this BPG that are large enough to be regulated by the California Department of Water Resources and/or Department of Defense (also see Figure 12-1 for distribution and size of reservoirs). 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, fire protection, farm ponds, or some combination of these purposes. Most of the reservoirs and lakes in this region receive high recreational use and many are sources of non-native crayfish, fishes, and bullfrogs, and other non-native species that prey on or compete with *O. mykiss* for food and habitat space.

Angeles National Forest

Public land ownership is concentrated in the upper portions of these watersheds, mostly within the Angeles National Forest, San Bernardino National Forest, and the northern portion of Cleveland National Forest. These three National Forests encompass several federally-designated wilderness areas: the San Gabriel and Sheep Mountain Wilderness Areas (Angeles National Forest), San Gorgonio, Cucamonga, San Jacinto, Santa Rosa, and Big Horn Mountain Wilderness Areas (San Bernardino National Forest). Additionally, several rivers have been evaluated for

inclusion in the federally-designated Wild and Scenic River system: Little Rock Creek, North and South forks of the San Gabriel River (tributaries to the San Gabriel River), and Middle Fork Lytle Creek, Bear Creek, and Siberia Creek (tributaries to the Santa Ana River). Agriculture (row crop, orchard cultivation, and livestock ranching), used to be important land uses throughout the flatter portions of these watersheds, but have largely been displaced by urban development (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

12.3 CURRENT WATERSHED CONDITIONS

Watershed conditions were assessed for eight watersheds and sub-watersheds in the Mojave Rim BPG region. In general, instream, riparian, and floodplain conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss* are poor in this BPG region, reflecting pervasive urban conversion of watershed lands, particularly along the mainstems of these drainages, but also in the upper sub-watersheds of the Santa Ana River watershed. The upper watersheds of the San Gabriel River watershed (East and West forks) still provide good to very good habitat conditions for resident *O. mykiss*, but these fish are isolated from the anadromous component of the population found in the mainstem (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

The mainstems of the Los Angeles and Santa Ana rivers provide little suitable spawning or rearing habitat for anadromous *O. mykiss* because of fish-passage barriers, channelization and flood control activities, loss of surface flows, and impaired water quality. However, several of the tributaries to these major rivers contain suitable habitat for steelhead. Los Angeles River tributaries include Arroyo Seco, Mill, and Alder Creeks. Santa Ana River tributaries include Harding Canyon, Coldwater Canyon, and San Antonio Creeks.

East Fork San Gabriel River

San Gabriel River tributaries include Bear, Salilier, and Prairie Creeks and the East and West Forks. The East and West forks of the San Gabriel River watershed, above Morris, San Gabriel, and Cogswell dams and their reservoirs, are mostly in public ownership (Angeles National Forest and Cleveland National Forest) and these reaches provide relatively good habitat conditions. Both the East and West Forks of the Sana Gabriel River support reproducing populations of non-anadromous *O. mykiss* that are isolated from their anadromous counterparts downstream of the dams.

Morris Dam – San Gabriel River

Table 12-1. Physical and Land Use Characteristics of Major Watersheds in the Mojave Rim BPG region.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS						LAND USE			
WATERSHEDS (north to south)	**Area** (acres)[1]	**Area** (sq. miles)[1]	**Stream Length**[2] (miles)	**Ave. Ann. Rainfall**[3] (inches)	**Total Human Population**[4]	**Public Ownership***	**Urban Area**[5]	**Agriculture/ Barren**[5]	**Open Space**[5]
Los Angeles River	535,923	837	766	19.1	4,383,260	25%	61%	1%	38%
San Gabriel River	463,167	723	784	19.8	2,417,034	35%	53%	2%	46%
Santa Ana River	1,141,195	1,783	2,074	17.3	3,109937	29%	37%	8%	55%
TOTAL or AVERAGE	**2,140,285**	**3,343**	**3,624**	**18.7**	**9,910,231**	**30%**	**50%**	**4%**	**46%**

[1] From: CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999 (www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/features/calwater/)
[2] From: CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003 (www.calfish.org/)
[3] From: USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1 km grid cells)
[4] From: CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003; preliminary analysis of Census 2010 indicates the population in the BPG has increased to10, 561,011
[5] From: 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 only; Military Reservations or State and County Parks not included*

Figure 12-2. The Los Angeles River Watershed.



Figure 12-3. The San Gabriel River Watershed.

Figure 12-4. The Santa Ana River Watershed.

Urban and agricultural conversion of coastal and middle reaches of three major watersheds in this BPG has created a number of severe stressors on anadromous *O. mykiss*. High road density throughout the floodplains has constricted the mainstems of these rivers to narrow channels, increased sediment and non-point pollutant inputs, and degraded rearing and spawning habitats (including estuaries). Nutrient and coliform bacteria-loading from agricultural and wastewater treatment effluents degrades water quality in most of these drainages (Hunt and Associates 2008a). In urban areas, channelization, levee construction, and other flood control activities have completely removed instream and riparian habitat from extensive reaches of the mainstems of the lower Los Angeles River, Santa Ana River, and San Gabriel River. The increase of impermeable surfaces as a result of urbanization (including roads) within the interior valleys, and on the coastal plain, has altered the natural flow regime of streams, particularly in the lower reaches, increasing the frequency and intensity of flood flows.

San Gabriel Dam – San Gabriel River

Other significant threat sources in the Mojave Rim BPG region are recreational facilities, wildfire, and the loss of extensive estuarine habitat. Most watersheds receive very high recreational use because of their proximity to large urban areas. Trash, foot traffic, and off-road vehicle traffic have significantly affected instream and riparian habitats along extensive reaches of the upper watersheds. Fires have burned 21% and 26% of the San Gabriel River and Santa Ana River watersheds, respectively, in the past 25 years and may be significant, widespread, and long-term sources of sedimentation, turbidity, substrate embeddedness, and loss of riparian canopy cover. The historically extensive estuaries that formed at the mouths of the Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, and Santa Ana River have been all but eliminated by urban and commercial development (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service 2008b).

Santa Ana River Estuary

Estuarine habitats at the mouths of these watersheds in this BPG region have been reduced in size by 98 – 100% by the development of harbors, roads and railroads, urbanization. Historically, these estuaries were extensive, formed by the confluence of several watersheds, encompassing thousands of acres. The remaining estuarine habitats are subject to constriction and isolation by development, surface runoff from roads and other impervious surfaces, as well as a reduction in the amount and quality of surface flows resulting from groundwater extraction.

Despite widespread habitat degradation to the coastal and middle mainstems in these watersheds, native non-anadromous *O.*

mykiss populations still persist upstream of the dams in this BPG region and small numbers of anadromous *O. mykiss* attempt to enter and spawn in each of the watersheds when flow conditions are suitable.

New and Old Prado Dams – Santa Ana River

12.4 THREATS AND THREAT SOURCES

Habitat impairments were rated as severe to very severe in five of the eight watersheds and sub-watersheds in this BPG region because of the very high human population densities. Ten anthropogenic activities ranked as the top sources of stresses to steelhead and their habitat in the Mojave Rim BPG (Table 12-2). These sources of threats focus on water management activities to serve municipal uses (dams, surface water diversions, and groundwater extraction). Dams and surface water diversions in this BPG region have been constructed to serve mostly urban purposes. These dams have numerous impacts on physical, hydrological, and habitat characteristics of the middle and lower reaches of mainstem rivers in this region. Dams also create and maintain favorable habitat conditions for several species of non-native fishes and bullfrogs that may affect one or more life history stages of *O. mykiss* either directly (*e.g.*, predation) or indirectly (*e.g.*, competition for food). Non-native fishes, crayfish, and/or amphibians occur in the mainstems of the Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, and Santa Ana River, as well as in most or all of the major tributaries. Water management practices and facilities have significantly altered natural sediment and hydrological processes in these watersheds. Widespread pumping of groundwater from aquifers throughout the region routinely eliminates surface flows in portions of most of these drainages. The magnitude of such losses of surface flows is greater during years of below-average precipitation. Another major indirect impact of dam construction and operation on the mainstem of the San Gabriel River is the periodic sluicing of sediments accumulated behind these dams, which severely degrades instream and riparian habitat quality for downstream of these structures (Hunts & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Table 12-2. Threat source rankings in the Mojave Rim BPG (see CAP Workbooks for individual watersheds for details).

Mojave Rim BPG Component Watersheds								
Threat Sources	Los Angeles River mainstem	Arroyo Seco	San Gabriel River mainstem	West Fork San Gabriel River	East Fork San Gabriel River	Santa Ana River mainstem	Lytle Creek	Mill Creek
Dams and Surface Water Diversions								
Flood Control Maintenance								
Groundwater Extraction								
Levees and Channelization								
Urban Development								
Recreational Facilities								
Culverts and Road Crossings								
Agricultural Development								
Upslope/Upstream Development								
Wildfires*								

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

** Wildfires as a source of threats to steelhead habitat is not reflected in the top five threat sources in the CAP summary for these watersheds (see CAP workbooks), but is included here because of the extent and severity of recent (2005-2007) wildfires in this region; additionally, the presence of non-native species is not reflected in the CAP workbook, but non-native species is a potential threat in this BPG because of the potential for anthropogenic introduction.*

12.5 SUMMARY

Dams and water diversions (including groundwater extraction) along with flood control structures on the major rivers of the Mojave Rim BPG (Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, and Santa Ana River) have had the most serve impacts on the anadromous *O. mykiss* populations in this BPG region by cutting off access to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and altering the magnitude, duration, and timing of flows necessary for immigration of adults and emigration of juveniles. Dams and surface water diversions in this BPG region have been constructed to serve mostly urban purposes. This BPG region encompasses the second-largest metropolitan area in the United States and human population density here is the highest of any of the five BPG regions. Such widespread urbanization has created a number of severe stressors for steelhead. Additionally, impacts associated with wildland fires, including fire-fighting measures to control or extinguish them, and the post-fire measures to repair damages incurred in fighting wildland fires, poses a potential threat to watersheds in this BPG. Table 12-3 summarizes the critical recovery actions needed within the Core 1 populations of this BPG.

Restoring conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss* passage, spawning, and rearing in the Mojave Rim BPG region will require multiple, long-term, measures related to water management, recreation, and urban development. A fish passage barrier inventory and assessment should be conducted for each of the major watersheds. Impediments to fish passage stemming from the construction and operation of dams, groundwater extraction, and channel modification, and the loss of instream and adjacent riparian habitats by flood control measures need to be further evaluated for this BPG region. Additionally, the loss of estuarine functions caused by filling and pollution from point and non-point agricultural and urban waste discharges need to be addressed further in this region.

Los Angeles River Steelhead –1940.

Threat sources discussed in this section should be the focus of a variety of recovery actions to address specific stresses on anadromous *O. mykiss* viability. Spatial and temporal data, for water temperature, pH, nutrients, *etc*., are not uniformly available, and should be further developed, along with general habitat typing assessments, to better identify natural as well as anthropogenic limiting factors. 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 part of any recovery strategy for the Mojave Rim BPG. Tables 12-4 through 12-6 below rank and describe proposed recovery actions for each

sub-watershed in the Mojave Rim BPG, including the estimated cost for implementing the actions in five year increments over the first 25 years, and where applicable extended out to 100 years, though many recovery actions can be achieved within a shorter period.

Table 12-3. Critical recovery actions for Core 1 populations within the Mojave Rim BPG.

POPULATION	CRITICAL RECOVERY ACTION
San Gabriel River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of groundwater extractions and water releases from Morris, San Gabriel, and Cogswell dams provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Physically modify Morris, San Gabriel, Cogswell, and Santa Fe dams, and road, highway, and railway crossings to allow natural rates of migration of steelhead to upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean.

Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Tables Identification Key, Mojave Rim BPG (Tables 12-4 – 12-6).

Recovery Action Number Key: XXXX – SCS – 1.2	
XXXX	Watershed
SCS	Species Identifier – Southern California Steelhead
1	Threat Source
2	Action Identity Number
Action Rank	
A	Action addresses the first listing factor regarding the destruction or curtailment of the species' habitat
B	Action addresses one of the other four listing factors

XXXX ID Table	
LAM	Los Angeles River Mainstem
AS	Arroyo Seco
SG	San Gabriel River
WSG	West Fork San Gabriel
ESG	East Fork San Gabriel
SAM	Santa Ana River Mainstem
LC	Lytle Creek
MilC	Mill Creek

Threat Source Legend	
1	Agricultural Development
2	Agricultural Effluents
3	Culverts and Road Crossings
4	Dams and Surface Water Diversions
5	Flood Control Maintenance
6	Groundwater Extraction
7	Levees and Channelization
8	Mining and Quarrying
9	Non-Native Species
10	Recreational Facilities
11	Roads
12	Upslope/Upstream Activities
13	Urban Development
14	Urban Effluents
15	Wildfires

See Chapter 8, Table 8.1 for Detailed Description of Recovery Actions

Table 12-4. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Los Angeles River Watershed (Mojave Rim BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Los Angeles River Mainstem												
LAM-SCS-3.2	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,MWDSC DWR,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,MWDSC DWR,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
LAM-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement a water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.*, Whittier Narrows, Sepulveda, and Lower San Fernando dams)	NMFS,ACOE, USGS,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,MWDSC DWR,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1B	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
LAM-SCS-3/4.3	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC,DWR, FOLAR,CT,TU	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2B	5	96692	0	0	0	0	96692

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LAM-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,DWR, SWRCB, MWDSC, NMFS,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
LAM-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,DWR, SWRCB, MWDSC, NMFS,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
LAM-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	ACOE,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,ACOE, NMFS,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	ACOE,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
LAM-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LAM-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
LAM-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan, U.S. Forest Service Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LAM-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USDOT,NMFS, CDOT,FOLAR CT,TU,LAC	Roads	1, 4	3B	On-going cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
LAM-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
LAM-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,NMFS, CDOT,FOLAR CT,TU,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan to replace artificial bank stabilization structures	ACOE,NMFSUS FWS,CDFG, CSCC,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
LAM-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4, 5	3B	On-going cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LAM-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Facility, D.C. Tillman Water Reclamation Facility and Hyperion Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB,CDFG USFWS,NMFS, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAM-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Arroyo Seco												
AS-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
AS-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
AS-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zone	NRCS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,DWR, FOLAR CT,TU,LAC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-4.1	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, MWDSCDWR, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1,3,4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3B	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
AS-SCS-4.3	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, MWDSCDWR,	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3B	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
		FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC										
AS-SCS-3/4.4	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,FOLAR CT,TU,LAC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2B	1	96692	0	0	0	0	96692
AS-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,DWR, SWRCB, MWDSC, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
AS-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,DWR, CDFG,SWRCB, MWDSC, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
AS-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA, ACOE,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	ACOE,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
AS-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
AS-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, Arroyo Seco Master Plan (Hahanonga Watershed Park Master Plan, Central Arroyo Master Plan, Lower Arroyo Master Plan, Design Guidelines for the Arroyo Seco)	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, BLM,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	1	68030	0	0	0	0	68030

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
AS-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,USFS, FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
AS-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, FOLAR,CT,TU	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
AS-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,NMFS, CDOT,CDFG, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan to replace artificial bank stabilization structures	AOEC,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
AS-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, FOLAR,CT,TU, LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,NMFS, USFWS,FOLAR, CT,TU,LAC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
AS-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG, FOLAR CT,TU,LAC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 12-5. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Matrix for the San Gabriel River Watershed (Mojave Rim BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
San Gabriel River Mainstem												
SG-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SGMRC,LAC, SBRC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
SG-SCS-1.2	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,CT,TU, SGMRC,LAC, SBRC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB, CT,TU,SGMRC, LAC,SBRC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20	99200	7997440	7997440	7997440	0	24091520
SG-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, USFS,CDFG,CS CC,CDOT, DWR,CT,TU, SGMRC,LAC, SBRC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement a water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU,SGMRC, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SG-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.,* Santa Fe, Morris, and San Gabriel dams)	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU,SGMRC, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SG-SCS-4.3	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.,* Santa Fe, Morris, and San Gabriel dams	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU,SGMRC, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SG-SCS-3/4.4	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,CT,TU, SGMRC, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96692	0	0	0	0	96692
SG-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SG-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, CT,TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SG-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA, NRCS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SG-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SG-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* San Gabriel River Corridor Plan, U.S.	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	Forest Service Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria											
SG-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SG-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,CT,TU, SGMRC,LAC, SBRC	Roads	1, 4	3B	on-going cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	56615000	0	0	0	0	56615000
SG-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SG-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDFG, RWQCB, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SG-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,NMFS, USFWS,CDOT, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan replace artificial bank stabilization structures	NMFS,CDFG, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
SG-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDOT USFWS,NMFS, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, USFWS,NMFS, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SG-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
West Fork San Gabriel River												
WSG-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SGRMC,LAC, SBRC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
WSG-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SGRMC,LAC, SBRC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
WSG-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SGRMC,LAC, SBRC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
WSG-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SGRMC,LAC, SBRC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20 – included in San Gabriel Main-stem	0	0	0	0	0	0
WSG-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, USFS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, DWR,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
WSG-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3B	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
WSG-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement an water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.*, Cogswell Dam) in the West Fork of the San Gabriel River	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3B	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
WSG-SCS-4.3	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
WSG-SCS-3/4.4	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	1	96692	0	0	0	0	96692
WSG-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
WSG-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
WSG-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
WSG-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
WSG-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
WSG-SCS-10.1	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
WSG-SCS-10.2	Review and modify development and management plants for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* U.S. Forest Service Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
WSG-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
WSG-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
WSG-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
East Fork San Gabriel River												
ESG-SCS-1.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SGRMC,LAC, SBRC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	20-Included in San Gabriel Main-stem	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESG-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SGRMC,LAC, SBRC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
ESG-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, USFS,CDFG,CSCC,CDOT, DWR,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESG-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
ESG-SCS-4.2	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	1A	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
ESG-SCS-3/4.3	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	1	96692	0	0	0	0	96692

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
ESG-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESG-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
ESG-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SGRMC, LAC,SBRC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
ESG-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESG-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
ESG-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SGRMC, CT,TU,LAC, SBRC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESG-SCS-10.1	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
ESG-SCS-10.2	Review and modify development and management plans for recreation areas and national forests (*e.g.,* U.S. Forest San Bernardino National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESG-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESG-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB,CDF, USFWS,NMFS, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESG-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG, SGRMC,CT,TU, LAC,SBRC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 12-6. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Matrix for the Santa Ana River Watershed (Mojave Rim BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Santa Ana River Mainstem												
SAM-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
SAM-SCS-1.2	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	USCSS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, USFS,CDFG,CS CC,CDOT, DWR,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC OC,RC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC, OC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
SAM-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.*, Prado and Seven Oaks Dams)	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SAM-SCS-4.3	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions (*e.g.,* Prado, New Prado, Seven Oaks, and Bear Valley dams)	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	3B	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SAM-SCS-3/4.4	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	1	96692	0	0	0	0	96692
SAM-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SAM-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SAM-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SAM-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA, USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CCC,NMFS, CDFG,CT, TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SAM-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SAM-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SAM-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.*, San Bernardino National Recreational Trail Master Plan, U.S. Forest San Bernardino National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SAM-SCS-10.3	Manage off-road recreational vehicle activity in riparian floodplain corridors	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDFG, RWQCB, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SAM-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	201000	0	0	0	0	201000
SAM-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDFG, RWQCB, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SAM-SCS-13.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	CDFG, RWQCB, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-13.3	Develop and implement riparian restoration plan to replace artificial bank stabilization structures	CDFG, RWQCB, CDOT,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	10	10521940	10521940	0	0	0	21043880
SAM-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU.SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing -cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SAM-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Lytle Creek												
LC-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	BLM,NMFS, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
LC-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	CDFG,NMFS, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, USFS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, DWR,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement a water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
LC-SCS-4.2	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, USFS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, DWR,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC-SCS-3/4.3	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC,	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings	1, 4	3B	5	96692	0	0	0	0	96692

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
		OC,RC	(Passage Barriers)									
LC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
LC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
LC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
LC-SCS-10.1	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LC-SCS-10.2	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (e.g., U.S. Forest San Bernardino National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CDFG, NMFS,USFWS CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
LC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU.SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU.SARWA,LAC,OC,RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
LC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Mill Creek												
MilC-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	BLM,NMFS, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
MilC-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, USFS,CDFG,CSCC,CDOT, DWR,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MilC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,ACOE, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, CT,TU, SARWA	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	91850	0	0	0	0	91850
MilC-SCS-4.2	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, USFS,CDFG,CSCC,CDOT, DWR,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 4	2A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MilC-SCS-3/4.3	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,CT,TU, SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2A	1	96692	0	0	0	0	96692
MilC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
MilC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,CT, TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
MilC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MilC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
MilC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,CT,TU SARWA,LAC, OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
MilC-SCS-10.1	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1,3,5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
MilC-SCS-10.2	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national (*e.g.,* U.S. Forest San Bernardino National Forest Land	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
	Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)											
MilC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU.SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MilC-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, CT,TU.SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
MilC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG CT,TU,SARWA, LAC,OC,RC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

13. Santa Catalina Gulf Coast Biogeographic Population Group

"[D]espite the current rarity of the anadromous form in this region, there appears to be time and opportunity to restore it to many creeks and rivers, by providing the existing O. mykiss populations the opportunity to once again express the anadromous life-history."

Dr. David A. Boughton, Chair, NOAA Fisheries South-Central/Southern California Steelhead Technical Recovery Team, 2010

13.1 LOCATION AND PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG region encompasses ten coastal watersheds of moderate size that drain the western slopes of the Santa Ana Mountains and Peninsular Range in southwestern Orange and Riverside counties southward through San Diego County to the United States-Mexico border (Figure 13-1). The upper portions of almost all of these watersheds include steep, mountainous regions and the lower watersheds cut across coastal terraces. Two watersheds, the Sweetwater River and Otay River, drain into San Diego Bay; the other eight watersheds drain directly into the Pacific Ocean. The component watersheds vary greatly in size (*e.g.,* the San Luis Rey River watershed is twelve times the size of the San Onofre Creek watershed). In addition to the major watersheds considered here, there are a number of smaller watersheds within this BPG (*e.g.*, Aliso, Escondido, Los Penasquitos, and Rose Canyon Creeks) which may also be used by steelhead when water conditions are favorable.

Santa Ana Mountains

Average annual precipitation in this region is relatively low and is spatially variable (Table 13-1). The coastal terrace portion of each of these watersheds receives significantly less rainfall that the interior montaine portions. For example, the average annual total precipitation for the City of San Diego is about 9.9 inches, approximately half the average for the San Diego River watershed as a whole. Because of low rainfall, many of the drainages in this BPG



Figure 13-1. The Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG region. Ten steelhead populations/watersheds were analyzed in this region: San Juan, Sana Mateo, San Onofre Creek, and Santa Margarita, San Luis Rey, San Dieguito, San Diego, Sweetwater, Otay, and Tijuana Rivers.

Table 13-1. Physical and Land Use Characteristics of Major Watersheds in the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG region.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS						LAND USE			
WATERSHEDS (north to south)	**Area** (acres)[1]	**Area** (sq. miles)[1]	**Stream Length**[2] (miles)	**Ave. Ann. Rainfall**[3] (inches)	**Total Human Population**[4]	**Public Ownership***	**Urban Area**[5]	**Agriculture/ Barren**[5]	**Open Space**[5]
San Juan Creek	113,977	178	280	12.5	191,997	37%	23%	7%	70%
San Mateo Creek	85,964	134	200	13.3	4,011	48%	3%	2%	95%
San Onofre Creek	37,617	59	86	14.0	4,981	---	6%	< 1%	94%
Santa Margarita River	472,633	738	949	15.6	181,376	10%	10%	13%	77%
San Luis Rey River	367,329	574	749	17.8	147,782	11%	8%	19%	73%
San Dieguito River	223,155	349	432	18.3	129,475	11%	18%	10%	72%
San Diego River	281,059	439	537	18.0	500,469	17%	26%	2%	72%
Sweetwater River	142,511	223	271	17.7	249,589	15%	27%	1%	72%
Otay River	93,504	146	256	16.7	122,342	---	16%	9%	75%
Tijuana River	301,649	471	475	17.3	75,117 (US Only)	38%	5%	2%	93%
TOTAL or AVERAGE	**2,119,398**	**3,311**	**4,235**	**16.1**	**1,607,140**	**---**	**14%**	**7%**	**79%**

[1] *From: CDFFP CalWater 2.2 Watershed delineation, 1999 (www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/features/calwater/)*
[2] *From: CDFG 1:1,000,000 Routed stream network, 2003 (www.calfish.org/)*
[3] *From: USGS Hydrologic landscape regions of the U.S., 2003 (1 km grid cells)*
[4] *From: CDFFP Census 2000 block data (migrated), 2003; preliminary analysis of Census 2010 indicates the population in the BPG has increased to 2,022,805*
[5] *From: CDFFP Multi-source land cover data (v02_2), 2002 (100 m grid cells) (http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgisdata/select.asp)*
** Includes National Forest Lands only; does not include State or County Parks or Military Reservations (from: http://old.casil.ucdavis.edu/casil/gis.ca.gov/teale/govtowna/)*



Figure 13-2. The San Juan Creek / Arroyo Trabuco Watershed.



Figure 13-3. The San Onofre Creek Watershed.



Figure 13-4. The Santa Margarita River Watershed.



Figure 13-5. The San Luis Rey River Watershed.



Figure 13-6. The San Dieguito River Watershed.



Figure 13-7. The San Diego River Watershed.



Figure 13-8. The Sweetwater River Watershed.



Figure 13-9. The Otay River Watershed.



Figure 13-10. The Tijuana River Watershed.

are naturally seasonal or have extensive dry reaches during years of below-average precipitation. Stream length increases substantially in the interior portions of these watersheds because of the highly dissected terrain. Numerous tributaries contribute to the large total stream length for this region (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

San Dieguito River

13.2 LAND USE

Table 13-1 summarizes land use and human population density in this region. Population density varies widely between the component watersheds, but overall population density is the second highest among the five BPG regions, averaging 485 persons per square mile. Population centers are concentrated on the coastal terrace portion of these watersheds, especially around San Diego Bay, which comprises one of the largest urban areas in the United States.

Comparatively, the San Mateo Creek and portions of the Santa Margarita River and San Onofre Creek watersheds have very low population densities compared to the other watersheds (averaging less than 30 and 84 persons per square mile, respectively). Average population densities in the San Diego River and Sweetwater River watersheds, which encompass the greater San Diego urban area, average over 1,100 persons per square mile.

Flood Control—San Juan/Arroyo Trabuco Creeks

In most of these watersheds, the first land use changes involved cattle ranching, followed by row-crop agriculture (primarily orchard crops), which was followed by increasing urbanization, particularly on the coastal terraces. More recently, the upper watersheds of the Santa Margarita River and the San Luis Rey River have experienced rapid urban growth. Semi-developed rural land and orchards cover extensive portions of the coastal and middle portions of these watersheds. Public ownership of land (mostly in Cleveland National Forest lands) is largely concentrated in the interior, higher-elevation portions of these watersheds and includes several federally designated wilderness areas: the Agua Tibia, San Mateo, Pine Creek, and Hauser Wilderness Areas. Portions of several watersheds have also been evaluated for inclusion in the Federal system of Wild and Scenic Rivers: upper San Luis Rey River; Cottonwood Creek (tributary to the Tijuana River), upper San Mateo Creek, and Devil's Canyon (tributary to San Mateo Creek).

The San Juan River/Trabuco Creek watershed contains large county parks (*e.g.*, Caspers Regional Park) that cover much of the upper watersheds of these drainages. The U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton covers the coastal and middle

portions of the San Mateo Creek, San Onofre Creek, and Santa Margarita River watersheds. However, public ownership constitutes a minority of overall land ownership in this BPG region, especially in the coastal and middle portions of these watersheds.

Sweetwater River

Agriculture (row crop and orchard cultivation and livestock ranching), are important land uses that directly or indirectly impact watershed processes throughout these watersheds. A major consequence of agricultural and urban growth in this region is reservoir development. There are at least 20 major dams in this region that are large enough to be regulated by the California Department of Water Resources and/or the Department of Defense (Figure 4-13). 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, fire protection, farm ponds, or a combination of these purposes. Three of these dams create enlarged pre-exiting natural lakes: Lake Henshaw in the San Luis Rey River watershed, Vail Lake in the Santa Margarita River watershed, and Cuyamaca Lake in the San Diego River watershed. None of these facilities have incorporated fish passage provisions, including downstream flow provisions, into their operation. Most of the reservoirs and lakes in this region receive high recreational use and many are sources of non-native crayfish, fishes, and bullfrogs, and other non-native fish species that can prey on or compete with *O. mykiss* for food and habitat (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

13.3 CURRENT WATERSHED CONDITIONS

Watershed conditions were assessed for the 10 watersheds and sub-watersheds in the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG region. In general, instream, riparian, and floodplain conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss* in this BPG region are rated as "Poor" to "Very Poor", reflecting pervasive agricultural and urban land uses, particularly along the middle and coastal reaches. In contrast, the upper watersheds of many of these drainages are in relatively good condition San Mateo and San Juan Creeks, Santa Margarita, San Luis Rey, San Dieguito, San Diego, and Sweetwater Rivers). Relatively few indicators were rated as "Good" or "Very Good."

San Mateo Creek

Urban and agricultural conversion of coastal and middle reaches of these watersheds has created a number of severe stressors for anadromous *O. mykiss* in this BPG region. High road density increases sediment and

pollutant inputs to these streams and their estuaries, degrading rearing and spawning habitat and likely increasing mortality of one or more life stages. In many urban and agricultural areas, channelization, levee construction, and other flood control activities have completely removed instream and riparian habitat or reduced instream refugia and structural complexity to a minimum. Flood control structures are widespread along the lower portions of drainages that pass through large urban areas, such as San Juan Creek, San Luis Rey River, San Dieguito River, San Diego River, Sweetwater River, and the Otay River. The increase of impermeable surfaces as a result of urbanization (including roads) within the interior valleys, along the coastal terrace, has altered the natural flow regime of streams, particularly in the lower reaches, increasing the frequency and intensity of flood flows.

Santa Margarita River

At least 20 major dams and surface water diversions without provisions for fish passage have been constructed to serve agricultural, urban, and recreational purposes. These structures and water management practices have significantly altered natural sediment and hydrological processes in these watersheds. Dams also create and maintain favorable habitat conditions for several species of non-native fishes (*e.g.*, large and smallmouth bass, sunfish, bullhead catfish) and bullfrogs that may affect one or more life history stages of *O. mykiss* either directly (*e.g.*, predation) or indirectly (*e.g.*, competition for food). Non-native crayfish, fishes, and bullfrogs occur in all of the drainages in this BPG region, but are particularly abundant in the San Mateo Creek, San Onofre Creek, and Santa Margarita River watersheds. Widespread pumping of groundwater routinely eliminates surface flows in portions of most of these drainages, particularly during years of below-average precipitation.

San Luis Rey River

Fires have burned between 22% (San Mateo Creek) and 74% (San Diego River) of the watersheds in this BPG region in the past 25 years, including significant coastal portions of watersheds in southern Orange and northern and central San Diego counties in 2007 (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b). Increased fire frequency can increase erosion and sediment input to streams, resulting in long-term changes to substrate composition and embeddedness, water quality (*e.g.*, turbidity), and water temperature (loss of riparian canopy cover). Anadromous *O. mykiss* in each of the watersheds in the BPG region have been subjected to these secondary effects of fire.

Cottonwood Creek –Tijuana River Tributary

Estuarine habitats at the mouths of these watersheds in this BPG region have been reduced in size by 48 – 95% by the development of roads and railroads, urbanization, and development of recreational facilities. Historically, these estuaries were large, with extensive distributary and backwater channel habitats, encompassing thousands of acres (Hunt & Associates 200ba, Kier Associates 2008b). Significant portions of the Santa Margarita River estuarine complex have been isolated from regular freshwater inflow as a result of the construction of the U.S. Interstate Highway 5. The remaining estuarine habitats are subject to constriction and isolation from urban, agricultural, and/or recreational development, as well as degradation of water quality from surface runoff from roads and other impervious surfaces, as well as a reduction in the amount and quality of surface flows resulting from groundwater extraction.

***O. mykiss* –Pine Valley Creek –Tijuana River Tributary**

Despite widespread and varied habitat degradation to the coastal and middle portions, native non-anadromous *O. mykiss* populations still inhabit the relatively high-quality habitat that remains upstream of most of the dams in this region (*e.g.,* Pine Valley Creek in the Otay River watershed), and small numbers of anadromous *O. mykiss* attempt to enter and spawn in each of the watersheds of the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG when flow conditions are suitable (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008).

13.4 THREATS AND THREAT SOURCES

Varying numbers and intensity of habitat impairment (threats) were identified in the CAP Workbooks analyses, ranging from 11 in the San Onofre Creek watershed to 17 in the Santa Margarita River and San Luis Rey River watersheds. NMFS notes that portions of the San Luis Rey River run through tribal lands and additional information is needed to assess the conditions of those portions of the river. Most of the habitat impairments across the BPG were rated as "Severe" to "Very Severe" in all but the San Mateo Creek and San Onofre Creek watersheds, and are related to high human population densities and urban and agricultural conversion of watershed lands. The relatively good habitat quality in San Mateo

and San Onofre creeks, and, to a lesser degree in the Santa Margarita River, is due to the presence of the Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base, which covers substantial portions of the coastal and middle reaches of these watersheds. The upper watersheds, above dams and reservoirs, mostly are in public ownership within Cleveland National Forest. These reaches provide relatively good habitat conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss* and support reproducing populations of non-anadromous *O. mykiss*.

Thirteen anthropogenic activities ranked as the top sources of stress to steelhead in the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG (Table 13-2). The most significant feature of this ranking is that each of the top five threats are rated as "Severe" or "Very Severe" and that groundwater extraction, dams and/or surface water diversions are pervasive threat sources in each of the watersheds. Although open space is the dominant land use in this BPG region, urban and agricultural conversion of the coastal and middle portions of these watersheds, especially within the floodplains of these drainages, has disproportionately degraded habitat conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss*. The occurrence of non-native invasive species in these highly regulated watersheds has spread and increased since this initial threats assessment, and will likely continue to do so unless recovery actions identified in this Recovery Plan are implemented.

Water management activities associated with urban and agricultural conversion of watershed lands are the most pervasive threat sources in this BPG region. Climatically, the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG region is classified as semi-arid, and anadromous *O. mykiss* must compete for water with urban and agricultural interests throughout these watersheds. Widespread pumping of groundwater routinely eliminates surface flows in portions of most of these drainages. The magnitude of such losses of surface flows is greater during years of below-average precipitation. High road density and associated stream crossings (culverts, bridges, *etc.*) in most of the urbanized portions of these watersheds are also a common source of passage impediments for anadromous *O. mykiss*. As a result of the widespread construction of dams in the lower and middle reaches of these watersheds, non-anadromous *O. mykiss* populations are now isolated in the upper watersheds where higher-quality instream and riparian habitat still exists above reservoirs (Hunt & Associates 2008a, Kier Associates 2008b).

Table 13-2. Threat source rankings in watersheds of the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG (see CAP Workbooks for details).

Santa Catalina Gulf Coast Component Watersheds (north to south)										
Threat Sources	San Juan Creek/ Trabuco Creek	San Mateo Creek	San Onofre Creek	Santa Margarita River	San Luis Rey River	San Dieguito River	San Diego River	Sweetwater River	Otay River	Tijuana River
Groundwater Extraction										
Dams and Surface Water Diversions										
Urban Development										
Agricultural Development										
Levees and Channelization										
Culvers and Road Crossings										
Recreational Facilities										
Non-Native Species										
Roads										
Flood Control Maintenance										
Upslope/Upstream Activities										
Agricultural Effluents										
Wildfires*										

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

** Wildfires were not recognized during the CAP Workbook analyses as one of the top five threats in these watersheds, but recent fires in coastal watersheds of southern Orange and northern and central San Diego counties in Fall, 2007 could result in significant, long-term impacts to steelhead habitat. Also, the occurrence of non-native invasive species in these highly regulated watersheds has spread and increased since this initial threats assessment; and additional mining operations are under active consideration. Mining and urban effluents have also been subsequently identified as threat sources.*

13.5 SUMMARY

Dams and water diversions (including groundwater extraction) along with flood control structures on the major rivers of the Catalina Gulf Coast BPG region (Santa Margarita River, San Luis Rey River, San Dieguito River, San Diego River, Sweetwater River, Otay River and Tijuana River) have had the most serve impacts on the anadromous *O. mykiss* populations in this BPG by cutting off access to upstream spawning and rearing habitats and altering the magnitude, duration, and timing of flows necessary for immigration of adults and emigration of juveniles. Additionally, impacts associated with wildland fires, including fire-fighting measures to control or extinguish them, and the post-fire measures to repair damages incurred in fighting wildland fires, poses a potential threat to watersheds in this BPG. Table 13-3 summarizes the critical recovery actions needed within the Core 1 populations of this BPG.

Restoring conditions for anadromous *O. mykiss* passage, spawning, and rearing in the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG region will require multiple, long-term, measures related to water management, recreation, and urban development. A fish-passage barrier inventory and assessment should be conducted for each of the major watersheds. Impediments to fish passage stemming from the construction and operation of dams, groundwater extraction, and channel modification, and the loss of instream and adjacent riparian habitats by flood control measures need to be further evaluated for this BPG region. Additionally, the loss of estuarine functions caused by filling and pollution from point and non-point agricultural and urban waste discharges need to be addressed further in this region.

San Mateo Creek Steelhead – 1939.

Threat sources discussed in this section should be the focus of a variety of recovery actions to address specific stresses on anadromous *O. mykiss* viability. Spatial and temporal data, for water temperature, pH, nutrients, *etc*., are not uniformly available, and should be further developed, along with general habitat typing assessments, to better identify natural as well as anthropogenic limiting factors. 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 part of any recovery strategy for the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG. Tables 13-4 through 13-13 below rank and describe proposed recovery actions for each sub-watershed in the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG, including the estimated cost for implementing the actions in five year increments over the first 25 years, and where applicable extended out to 100 years, though many recovery actions can be achieved within a shorter period.

Table 13-3. Critical recovery actions for Core 1 populations within the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG.

POPULATION	CRITICAL RECOVERY ACTION
San Juan Creek	Physically modify road crossings, highways, and railways to allow natural rates of adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* between the estuary and upstream spawning and rearing habitats, and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean. Identify, protect, and restore estuarine and freshwater rearing habitat functions.
San Mateo Creek	Develop and implement a groundwater and surface water management program to provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Initiate an aquatic exotic species assessment and control program for the San Mateo Creek watershed.
Santa Margarita River	Physically modify or remove the O'Neill Diversion Dam to allow natural rates of adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* between the estuary and upstream spawning and rearing habitats and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean Review; modify the Rancho California Water District water release schedule program to provide the essential habitat functions to support the life history and habitat requirements of adult and juvenile steelhead. Initiate an aquatic exotic species assessment and control program for the Santa Margarita River watershed.
San Luis Rey River	Implement operating criteria to ensure the pattern and magnitude of water releases from Pilgram, Turner, Lower and Upper Stehly, Agua Tibia, Henshaw, and Eagles Nest dams will maintain surface flows necessary to support all *O. mykiss* life history states, including volition rates of adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* migration, and suitable spawning and rearing habitat. Physically modify all dams, and road, highway, and railway crossings to allow volitional rates of adult and juvenile *O. mykiss* between the estuary and upstream spawning and rearing habitats and passage of smolts and kelts downstream to the estuary and ocean. Identify, protect, and restore estuarine and freshwater rearing habitat functions.

Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Tables Identification Key, Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG (Tables 13-4 – 13-13)

Recovery Action Number Key: XXXX – SCS – 1.2	
XXXX	Watershed
SCS	Species Identifier – Southern California Steelhead
1	Threat Source
2	Action Identity Number

Action Rank	
A	Action addresses the first listing factor regarding the destruction or curtailment of the species' habitat
B	Action addresses one of the other four listing factors

XXXX ID Table	
SJT	San Juan/Trabuco Creek
SMC	San Mateo Creek
SO	San Onofre
SMR	Santa Margarita River
SLR	San Luis Rey River
SD	San Dieguito River
SDR	San Diego River
SWR	Sweetwater River
OR	Otay River
TR	Tijuana River

Threat Source Legend	
1	Agricultural Development
2	Agricultural Effluents
3	Culverts and Road Crossings
4	Dams and Surface Water Diversions
5	Flood Control Maintenance
6	Groundwater Extraction
7	Levees and Channelization
8	Mining and Quarrying
9	Non-Native Species
10	Recreational Facilities
11	Roads
12	Upslope/Upstream Activities
13	Urban Development
14	Urban Effluents
15	Wildfires

See Chapter 8, Table 8.1 for Detailed Description of Recovery Actions

Table 13-4. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the San Juan Creek/Trabuco Creek Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
San Juan Creek / Trabuco Creek												
SJT-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	ongoing – costs of doing business					0	
SJT-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SJT-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT CT,TU,OC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement a plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDSRF, TRAN,OC,RC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-3.1	Conduct a watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC,DWR, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SJT-SCS-3.2	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC,DWR, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan diversion operations	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SJT-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,SDT,CT, TU,OC,RC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,SDT, CT,TU,OC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SJT-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement a groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,SDT, CT,TU,OC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SJT-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA, NRCS,USFWS,U SGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SDT,OC, RC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SJT-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS,USFWS, USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SDT,OC, RC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SJT-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SDT, CT,TU,OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SDT, CT,TU,OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,SDT, CT,TU,OC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SJT-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* San Juan Creek Trail Plan, Trabuco Creek Nature Trail Plan, and Descanso Park Plan)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SJT-SCS-10.2	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* U.S. Forest Service Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-10.3	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SJT-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-11.2	Develop and implement a plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.*, U.S. Interstate 5)	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Roads	1, 4	2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SJT-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SJT-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	3350000	0	0	0	0	3350000
SJT-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,NMFS, CT,TU,SDT,OC, RC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SJT-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,SDT,CT, TU,OC,RC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SJT-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDOT USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-14.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDOT USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SJT-SCS-14.3	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDOT USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJT-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG, SDT,CT,TU,OC, RC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-5. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the San Mateo Creek Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
San Mateo Creek												
SMC-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, SMCC,SDC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	ongoing – cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SMCC, SDC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMC-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, SMCC,SDC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,BLM, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SMCC, SDC,RC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-3.1	Conduct a watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC, SDWA,DWR, SDT,CT,TU, SDC,RC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMC-SCS-3.2	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,ACOE, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC, SDWA,DWR, SDT,CT,TU, SDC,RC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan or diversion operations	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDF,CDFG, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SMC-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NMFS, USFWS,BOR, CDFG,CSCC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU.SMCC,SDC, RC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,SMCC, SDC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SMC-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,SMCC, SDC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	1B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SMC-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS,USFWS, USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, SDWA,CT,TU, SDT,SMCC,	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
		SDC,RC										
SMC-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA, NRCS,USFWS, USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, SDWA,CT,TU, SDT,SMCC, SDC,RC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	1B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,USMC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	1A	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,USMC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	1A	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CSCC, USFWS,USFS, NMFS,USMC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	1A	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SMC-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* San Onofre State Park Plan and San Diego Regional Trails Plan)	CDPR,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, CDFG,CT,TU, SDT,SMCC, SDC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMC-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	CDPR,NMFS, USFS,USFWS, CDFG,SDWA, CT, TU,SDT, SMCC,SDC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-10.3	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,BLM, CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SMC-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC, USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-11.2	Develop and implement a plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.,* U.S. Interstate 5)	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Roads	1, 4	2B	10	7514534	7514534	0	0	0	15029069
SMC-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDPR,NMFS, USMC,CDFG, CT,TU,SDT, SMCC,SDC,RC	Roads	1, 4	2B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SMC-SCS-12.1	Review applicable Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans (*e.g*., U.S. Marine Corps Camp Pendleton Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan)	USMC,USFWS, NMFS,NMFS, CT,TU,SDT, SMCC,SDC,RC	Upslope/ Upstream Activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMC-SCS-12.2	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	CDPR,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,SDT,CT, TU,SMMC, SDC,RC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	5360000	0	0	0	0	5360000
SMC-SCS-12.3	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,SDWA CT,TU,SDT, SMCC,SDC, RC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMC-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Urban Development	1, 4	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMC-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDOT USFWS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-14.2	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDOT USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SMCC,SDC, RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMC-SCS-14.3	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (e.g., U.S. Marine Corps Camp Pendleton Wastewater Treatment Facility)	USMC,NMFS, USFWS, RWQCB, CT,TU,SDT, SMCC,SDC,RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMC-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, USGS,CDF, CDFG,SDT,CT, TU,SMCC,SDC, RC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	1B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-6. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the San Onofre Creek Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
San Onofre Creek												
SO-SCS-1.1	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	20 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,BLM, NMFS,USMC, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-3.1	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	USMC,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2B	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690
SO-SCS-3.2	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within	USMC,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	USMC,USFWS, NMFS,USGS, CDFG,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SO-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	USMC,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SO-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, USMC,DWR, CDFG, MWDSC,SDT, CT,TU,SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SO-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring program	USGS,NMFS, USMC,DWR, CDFG, MWDSC,SDT, CT,TU,SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SO-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, USMC,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, USMC,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, USMC,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SO-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* San Onofre State Park Plan and San Diego Regional Trails Plan)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SO-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SO-SCS-11.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.,* U.S. Interstate 5)	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Roads	1, 4	2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SO-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans (*e.g.,* U.S. Marine Corps Camp Pendleton Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan)	USMC,USFWS, NMFS,NMFS, CT,TU, SDT,SDC	Upslope/ Upstream Activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SO-SCS-12.2	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	USMC,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, SDT,SD	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	402000	0	0	0	0	402000
SO-SCS-12.3	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, SDT,SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SO-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDOT, USMC,USFWS, NMFS,SDT,CT, TU,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, CDOT,USMC, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-14.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDOT, USMC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, USMC,USGS, CDF,CDFG, SDT,CT,TU,SDC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-7. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Santa Margarita River Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Santa Margarita River												
SMR-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS,USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	ongoing – cost of doing business			0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	0 62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMR-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USFS, USFWS,BLM, NMFS,USMC, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU.FLC, SDC,RC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,BOR, USMC,USDOT, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, MWDSC, SDWA,DWR, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMR-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.*, Lake O'Neill Dam, Vail Dam, Robert A. Skinner Dam)	USMC,USFWS, BOR,MWDSC, SDWADWR NMFS,USGS, CDFG,SDT,CT, TU,FLC,SDC, RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	10	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SMR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan diversion operations (*e.g.,* Lake O'Neill Diversion)	USMC,BOR, USFWS,NMFS, USGS,CDFG, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SMR-SCS-3/4.3	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,BOR, USMC,USDOT, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, MWDSC, SDWA,DWR, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690
SMR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement and flood control maintenance program	USMC,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,SDT,CT, TU,FLC,SDC, RC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, USMC,DWR, CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,FLC,SDC, RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, USMC,DWR, CDFG, MWDSC, SDWASDT, CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SMR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	NRCS, USFWS,USMC, USGS,ACOE, BLM,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SDT,FLC, SDC,RC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, USMC,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, USMC,SDWA SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, USMC,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* Santa Margarita River Watershed Management Plan and San Diego Regional Trails Plan, U.S. Forest Service Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SMR-SCS-11.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.,* U.S. Interstate 5)	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,FLC,SDC, RC	Roads	1, 4	2B	10	12296511	12296511	0	0	0	24593022

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMR-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC, NRCS.USFWS,NMFS,USMC, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,FLC,SDC, RC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS, USFWS,NMFS, USMC,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SMR-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration management plan	USMC,USFWS, USDOT,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SDT,FLC, SDC,RC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	52292680	0	0	0	0	52292680
SMR-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, CT,TU,SDT,FLC, SDC,RC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,USMC, USFWS,SDT,CT, TU,FLC,SDC, RC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SMR-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, CDOT,USMC, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SMR-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* Fallbrook Public Utility District Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USMC,USFWS, NMFS,SDT,CT, TU,FLC,SDC, RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-14.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, CDOT,USMC, USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,FLC,SDC, RC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SMR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, USMC,USGS, CDF,CDFG, SDT,CT,TU,FLC, SDC,RC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-8. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the San Luis Rey River Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
San Luis Rey River												
SLR-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SLRWC, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SLR-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
SLR-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	2B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USDOT, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, MWDSC,DWR, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SLR-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement a water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.,* Pilgram, Turner, Lower and Upper Stehly, Aqua Tibia, Henshaw, and Eagles Nest dams)	NMFS, USFWS,BOR, CDFG,CSCC, MWDSC,DWR, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SLR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations (*e.g.*, Escondido Diversion)	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, CDFG,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SLR-SCS-3/4.3	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,RWQC, NMFS,USMC, USFWS,SDWA SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690
SLR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,SLRWC, SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SLR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,SLRWC, SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SLR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SLR-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMG,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4	1B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
SLR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SLR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* San Luis Rey River Park Master Plan and San Diego Regional Trails Plan, U.S. Forest Service Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS, CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SLR-SCS-11.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.,* U.S. Interstate 5	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT,SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Roads	1, 4	2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SLR-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	USMC,USFWS, USDOT,NMFS, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SDT, SLRWC,SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	8040000	0	0	0	0	8040000
SLR-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,USMC, CT,TU,SDT, SLRWC,SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SLR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,USFWS, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SLR-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* Buena Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Facility and Oceanside Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-14.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, CDOT,USDOT, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SLRWC,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SLR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, USGS,CDF, CDFG,SDT,CT, TU,SLRWC,SDC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-9. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the San Dieguito River Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
San Dieguito River												
SD-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDRVC, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	2B	20	10 - refer to region al costs	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDRVC, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SD-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDRVC, SDC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USDOT, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, MWDSC,DWR, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SD-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,CDFG, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SD-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement a water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.,* Fairbanks, Upper and Lower 4 S, 4 S Ranch, Lake Hodges, and Sutherland dams)	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFS,USFWS, CDFG,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SD-SCS-3/4.3	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,RWQC, NMFS, MWDSC, USFWS,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690
SD-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,SDRVC, SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SD-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,SDRVC, SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SD-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SD-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-8.1	Review and modify mining operations	USGS,NMFS, USFWS,CDFG, CDMG,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Mining and Quarrying	1, 4	2B	5	68030	0	0	0	0	68030
SD-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SD-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan and San Diego Regional Trails Plan, U.S. Forest Service Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SD-SCS-11.1	Develop and implement a plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.,* U.S. Interstate 5	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Roads	1, 4	2B	10	17078487	17078487	0	0	0	34156975

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SD-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SD-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	USFWS,USDOT, NMFS,CDFG, CSCC,CT,TU, SDT,SDRVC, SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	57651160	0	0	0	0	57651160
SD-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, SDT,SDRVC, SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SD-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,USFWS, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SD-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SD-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-14.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SDRVC,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, USGS,CDF, CDFG,SDT,CT, TU,SDRVC,SDC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-10. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the San Diego River Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
San Diego River												
SDR-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDRFP, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4	3B	10 – refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDRFP, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SDR-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDRFP, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement a plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDRFP, SDC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USDOT, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC,DWR, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SDR-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,CDFG, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SDR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement a water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.,* Murray, San Vicente, El Capitan, and Cuyamaca dams)	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,CDFG, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SDR-SCS-4.3	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,CDFG, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SDR-SCS-3/4.4	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,USDOT, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC,DWR, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690
SDR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SDR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,SDRFP, SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SDR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,U SFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,U SFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SDR-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,U SFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SDR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* U.S. Forest Service Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SDR-SCS-10.3	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* San Diego River Park Master Plan, San Diego Regional Trails Plan, and San Diego River Watershed Management Plan)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5		ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-11.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (e.g., U.S. Interstate 5 bridge)	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Roads	1, 4	2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SDR-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	USFWS,USDOT, NMFS,CDFG, CSCC,CT,TU, SDT,SDRFP, SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	5360000	0	0	0	0	5360000

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SDR-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,SDWA, CT,TU,SDT, SDRVC,SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SDR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,USFWS, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SDR-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* Padre Dam Water Reclamation Facility)	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-14.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SDRFP,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, USGS,CDF, CDFG,SDT,CT, TU,SDRFP,SDC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-11. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Sweetwater River Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Sweetwater River												
SWR-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SWA, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SWR-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SWA, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
SWR-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SWA, SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	2B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SWA, SDC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USDOT, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC, SDWA,DWR, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SWR-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement a water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.,* Sweetwater Main, Willow Tree, Loveland, and Palo Verde dams)	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,CDFG, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SWR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,CDFG, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SWR-SCS-4.3	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,CDFG, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SWR-SCS-3/4.4	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,USDOT, USFWS,USFS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT, MWDSC, SDWA,DWR, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690
SWR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	2B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SWR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,SDT, CT,TU,SWA, SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
SWR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC,SDT, CT,TU,SWA, SDC,SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
SWR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
SWR-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SWMNWR SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SWR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SWMNWR, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SWMNWR, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SWR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* Sweetwater River Watershed Management Plan, Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Management Plan)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
SWR-SCS-11.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.,* U.S. Interstate 5)	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Roads	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SWR-SCS-11.2	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SDWA,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
SWR-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	USFWS,USDOT, NMFS, SWMNWR, CDFG,CSCC, CT,TU,SDT, SWA,SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	2010000	0	0	0	0	2010000
SWR-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, SDT,SWA,SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SWR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,USFWS, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
SWR-SCS-14.1	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
SWR-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* San Diego City Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Facility)	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-14.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, SWA,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, USGS,CDF, CDFG,SDT,CT, TU,SWA,SDC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-12. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Otay River Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Otay River												
OR-SCS-1.1	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
OR-SCS-1.2	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	47520	0	0	0	0	47520
OR-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS,NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USDOT, USFWS,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, MWDSC, SDWA,DWR, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
OR-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	NMFS,USGS USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR, CDFG,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
OR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement a water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.,* Salvage and Upper Otay dams	NMFS,USGS USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR, CDFG,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
OR-SCS-4.3	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	NMFS,USGS USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR, CDFG,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
OR-SCS-3/4.4	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	DWR,CDOT, CDFG,CSCC, NMFS,USFWS, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,ORCP, SDC	Dam and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	3A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690
OR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, CDFG,CSCC, CDOT,SDT,CT, TU,ORCP,SDC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,ORCP, SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
OR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,ORCP, SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	3B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
OR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,ORCP,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS,USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,ORCP,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
OR-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement a plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,USFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,ORCP,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,ORCP, SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,ORCP,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
OR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,ORCP,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
OR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* Otay River Watershed Management Plan and Otay Valley Regional Park Management Plan, U.S. Forest Service Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan, Southern California National Forest Vision, Forest Strategy, and Design Criteria)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, CDPR,CSCC, SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
OR-SCS-11.1	Manage roadways and adjacent riparian corridor and restore abandoned roadways	DOT,CT,TU, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
OR-SCS-11.2	Develop and implement a plan to remove or reduce approach-fill for railroad lines and roads (*e.g.*, U.S. Interstate 5)	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-11.3	Retrofit storm drains to filter runoff from roadways	CDOT,CDFG, CSCC,USFWS, NMFS,USDOT, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Roads	1, 4	3B	20	32260	32260	32260	32260	0	129040
OR-SCS-12.1	Develop and implement an estuary restoration and management plan	USFWS,USDOT, NMFS,CDFG, CSCC,CT,TU, SDT,ORCP, SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	670000	0	0	0	0	670000
OR-SCS-12.2	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,CT,TU, SDT,ORCP, SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
OR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,USFWS, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
OR-SCS-14.1	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR-SCS-14.2	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, SDT,CT,TU, ORCP,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	3B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
OR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, USGS,CDF, CDFG,SDT,CT, TU,ORCP,SDC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13-13. Southern California Steelhead DPS Recovery Action Table for the Tijuana River Watershed (Santa Catalina Gulf Coast BPG).

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
Tijuana River												
TR-SCS-1.1	Manage livestock grazing to maintain or restore aquatic habitat functions	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
TR-SCS-1.2	Develop, adopt, and implement agricultural land-use planning policies and standards	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
TR-SCS-1.3	Manage agricultural development and restore riparian zones	NRCS,BLM, USFS,USFWS, NMFS,CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Agricultural Development	1, 4,	3B	10 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR-SCS-2.1	Develop and implement plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities	NRCS,USGS, BLM,USFS, USFWS, NMFS,TRNER, CDFG, RWQCB,SDT, CT,TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Agricultural Effluents	1, 4	3B	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR-SCS-3.1	Develop and implement plan to remove or modify fish passage barriers within the watershed	NMFS,USFWS, USDOT,CDOT, CDFG,CSCC, DWR, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	20 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TR-SCS-4.1	Develop and implement water management plan for diversion operations	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,TRNER, CDFG,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, SDSRF,TRAN, SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TR-SCS-4.2	Develop and implement a water management plan for dam operations (*e.g.,* Barrett Dam, Henry Jr. Dam, Campo Lake Dam, Morena Dam, Corte Madera Dam, Thin Valley Dam)	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,TRNER, CDFG,SDWA SDT,CT,TU, SDSRF,TRAN, SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TR-SCS-4.3	Provide fish passage around dams and diversions	USFWS,BOR, MWDSC,DWR NMFS,USGS, USFWS,TRNER, CDFG,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, SDSRF,TRAN, SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions	1, 3, 4	2A	20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TR-SCS-3/4.4	Conduct watershed-wide fish passage barrier assessment	NMFS,USFWS, USDOT,CDOT, CDFG,CSCC, DWR, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Dams and Surface Water Diversions, Culverts and Road Crossings (Passage Barriers)	1, 4	1A	5	96690	0	0	0	0	96690
TR-SCS-5.1	Develop and implement flood control maintenance program	ACOE,NMFS, USDOT,USFWS, TRNER,CDFG, CSCC,CDOT, SDT,CT,TU, SDSRF,TRAN, SDC	Flood Control Maintenance	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TR-SCS-6.1	Conduct groundwater extraction analysis and assessment	USGS,NMFS, TRNER, DWR,CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	5	275550	0	0	0	0	275550
TR-SCS-6.2	Develop and implement groundwater monitoring and management program	USGS,NMFS, TRNER,DWR, CDFG, MWDSC, SDWA,SDT, CT,TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Groundwater Extraction	1, 4	2B	10	254350	39775	0	0	0	294125
TR-SCS-7.1	Develop and implement stream bank and riparian corridor restoration plan	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,U SFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF,TRAN	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR-SCS-7.2	Develop and implement plan to restore natural channel features	CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,U SFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	20	4217625	4217625	4217625	4217625	0	16870500
TR-SCS-7.3	Develop and implement plan to vegetate levees and eliminate or minimize herbicide use near levees	FEMA,CDFG, RWQCB, CSCC,NRCS,U SFWS,NMFS, USDOT,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF,TRAN	Levees and Channelization	1, 4	3B	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR-SCS-9.1	Develop and implement watershed-wide plan to assess the impacts of non-native species and develop control measures	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, TRNER,SDWA SDT,CT,TU, SDSRF,TRAN, SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	3B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TR-SCS-9.2	Develop and implement a non-native species monitoring program	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, TRNER,SDWA, SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR-SCS-9.3	Develop and implement public education program on non-native species impacts	CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,USFWS, USFS,NMFS, TRNER,SDWA, SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Non-Native Species	1, 3, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560
TR-SCS-10.1	Review and modify development and management plans for recreational areas and national forests (*e.g.,* Tijuana River Watershed Management Plan, Tijuana River Valley Regional Park Management Plan, Border Field State Park Management Plan, and Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve Plan)	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,TRNER, CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR-SCS-10.2	Develop and implement public education program on watershed processes	USFS,USFWS, NMFS,TRNER, CDFG,CDPR, CSCC,SDWA, SDT,CT,TU, SDSRF,TRAN, SDC	Recreational Facilities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	2B	20	76140	76140	76140	76140	0	304560

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TR-SCS-12.1	Review and modify applicable County and/or City Local Coastal Plans	CCC,CSCC, CDFG,USFWS, NMFS,TRNER, CT,TU,SDT, SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Upslope/ Upstream activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
TR-SCS-13.1	Develop, adopt, and implement urban land-use planning policies and standards	CDOT,CDFG, CCC,RWQC, NMFS,USFWS, SDT,CT,TU, SDSRF,TRAN, SDC	Urban Development	1, 4	3B	5	62400	0	0	0	0	62400
TR-SCS-14.1	Review, assess and modify NPDES wastewater discharge permits (*e.g.,* South Bay International Wastewater Treatment Facility and South Bay Water Reclamation Facility)	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, TRNER,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR-SCS-14.2	Review California Regional Water Quality Control Board Watershed Plans and modify Stormwater Permits	RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, TRNER,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	1B	ongoing - cost of doing business	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR-SCS-14.3	Retrofit storm drains in developed areas	USDOT,CDOT, RWQCB, SWRCB,CDFG, USFWS,NMFS, TRNER,SDT,CT, TU,SDSRF, TRAN,SDC	Urban Effluents	1, 4	2B	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

Action #	Recovery Action Description	Potential Collaborators	Threat Source	Listing Factors (1 - 5)	Action Rank (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B)	Task Duration	Estimated Costs ($)					
							FY 1-5	FY 6-10	FY 11-15	FY 16-20	FY 21-25	FY 1-100
TR-SCS-15.1	Develop and implement an integrated wildland fire and hazardous fuels management plan	USFS,USFWS, BLM,NMFS, USGS,TRNER CDF,CDFG, SDT,CT,TU, SDSRF,TRAN, SDC	Wildfires	1, 4, 5	2B	100 - refer to regional costs	0	0	0	0	0	0

14. Southern California Steelhead Research, Monitoring and Adaptive Management

"The analytic tools to evaluate species health have been greatly developed in recent years. The emergence of extinction theory from population genetics and ecology, the combination of demography and genetics in population viability analysis and the extension of risk analyses into the realm of biological conservation promises to lead us to wiser allocations of effort in the future."

Science and the Endangered Species Act, National Research Council, 1995

14.1 INTRODUCTION

Recovery of southern California steelhead will require a more thorough understanding of the distinctive biology of steelhead within the SCS Recovery Planning Area. Additionally, it is crucially important to identify a program for monitoring the status of individual populations and the DPS as a whole, and a plan for tracking and adjusting the recovery actions and recovery strategy over an extended period to optimize the effectiveness of the recovery effort. The following sections outline the basic elements of a research, monitoring, and adaptive management program, and identify high priority research and monitoring actions.

14.1.1 Southern California Steelhead Research

In 2002 NMFS convened a team of scientific specialists, the Technical Review Team (TRT), whose mission was to survey existing scientific information on steelhead ecology, and formulate a biological framework for a recovery plan for Southern California steelhead (Boughton *et al.* 2007b, 2006, Boughton and Goslin 2006, Boughton *et al.* 2005, Boughton and Fish 2003).

The current state of knowledge of steelhead ecology is largely descriptive and qualitative. This has led to uncertainties in the viability framework, including developing quantitative goals for distribution and abundance of steelhead trout and general strategies for how to achieve these goals. In general, the TRT approached uncertainty about recovery goals with a risk-averse, or precautionary, stance, consistent with accepted practice in conservation biology (McElhany *et al.* 2000). The TRT also recognized that key uncertainties involved in recovery planning arose from the qualitative nature of the current understanding, and could be improved by a carefully conceived and planned program of scientific research and monitoring. The benefits of pursuing such a

program would be a more effective, and more-cost efficient, recovery effort for steelhead.

Recovery of southern California steelhead will depend upon a quantitative framework that addresses their annual run size, along with year-to-year variability over the long term; and the quantitative response of steelhead runs to specific recovery actions. These are related to the two overarching questions of steelhead recovery in this region:

- How do we improve the distribution, abundance, and resilience of steelhead trout populations; and
- How much do we need to improve these biological characteristics for steelhead to be considered viable and eligible for down-listing and/or delisting?

The following sub-sections focus on the viability criteria developed by the TRT, and a series of related research questions grouped into three areas: enhancing anadromy, clarifying the population structure of *O. mykiss*, and planning for climate change.

14.2 VIABILITY CRITERIA

The viability criteria address two levels of biological organization, populations within the Distinct Population Segment (*i.e.,* only the anadromous form), and the more encompassing Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU), which includes all life history forms. The *O. mykiss* ESUs in this Recovery Planning Area are composed of both anadromous and non-anadromous fish, but only the non-anadromous form is on the endangered species list, under the DPS provision of the Federal Endangered Species Act. One of the principal uncertainties is the complicated relationship between the anadromous and non-anadromous (or freshwater-resident) forms of the species. Following convention, the term "steelhead trout" is used for the anadromous fish, "rainbow trout" for non-anadromous fish, and "*O. mykiss*" when referring to both or either. The goal of the Recovery Plan is to ensure the continued persistence of steelhead trout in the region over the long term (Boughton *et al.* 2007b), but it is likely that rainbow trout have some role in securing this future, and thus the viability criteria have provisions for both forms of the species.

14.2.1 Population-Level Criteria

The TRT considered *O. mykiss* in the region to be grouped into demographically - independent populations. Generally, each discrete coastal watershed in the region was assumed to have historically supported one demographically independent population of *O. mykiss.* If migratory steelhead frequently move from one watershed to another, the one-watershed-one-population assumption may have some important exceptions with implications for recovery planning.

The TRT proposed population-level viability criteria for determining whether a demographically- independent population of *O. mykiss* should be considered viable for the purpose of steelhead recovery. The TRT identified two choices for meeting the viability criteria. The first was to meet a set of criteria: a population must exhibit a mean annual run size of at least 4,150 steelhead trout, including during periods of poor ocean conditions (such as occurred from the late 1970s through early 1990s). Additionally, the spawner densities in the river systems needed to meet a minimum density threshold (fish per kilometer of stream channel at some scale), a quantitative criterion yet to be determined. The second choice was to meet a performance-based criterion, demonstrating that the extinction risk for steelhead trout is less than 5% over 100 years, using commonly accepted quantitative methods from conservation biology, demographic data from the population in question, and passing an independent scientific review.

Extinction risk is very sensitive to both annual run size and year-to-year variability. As a result, the performance-based criteria cannot be applied in a meaningful way until run sizes have been monitored for a decade or more, allowing this key quantity to be estimated with reasonable accuracy. In the interim, the prescriptive criteria ensures that the year-to-year variability in run size, whatever its probable magnitude, is unlikely to pose a significant risk to the species. If year-to-year variability turns out to be relatively modest, a mean run size smaller than 4,150 steelhead would perhaps be sufficient to ensure a low extinction risk. Including the option for performance-based viability criteria, provides a mechanism for refining the viability criteria as more is learned over time.

Extinction risk for individual steelhead runs may also be sensitive to the influence of rainbow trout, if the trout tend to stabilize or augment those runs as a result of rainbow trout regularly producing anadromous progeny. This phenomenon is referred to as "life history crossovers," but it is not yet known whether such crossovers occur frequently enough to stabilize steelhead runs. This is another key uncertainty that, if resolved, might allow the run-size criterion of 4,150 spawners per year to be adjusted. In this case, the adjustment would be that some fraction of the 4,150 spawners within a watershed or metapopulation would need to exhibit the anadromous life history, rather than 100%. Additionally, data on the magnitude of natural fluctuations in anadromous run sizes in individual watersheds may identify a smaller mean run size is sufficient for viability in some basins (Williams *et al.* 2011). Until such research is undertaken and revisions made to the viability criteria, the population-level viability criteria for determining whether a demographically-independent population of *O. mykiss* should be considered viable for the purpose of steelhead recovery would remain 4,150. This criteria will be reviewed during NMFSs 5-year review of the Recovery Plan, and potentially during the Southwest Fisheries Science Center's 5-year status review update for Pacific salmon and steelhead listed under the ESA..

In the absence of specific information about the role of life history crossovers, the TRT took a precautionary approach (*i.e.,* it was assumed there was not any beneficial effect of crossovers). This meant that the 4,150 spawners per year required for viability must be composed entirely of steelhead trout, rather than a mixture of rainbow and steelhead to ensure viability. However, the TRT also believed that the criteria should cover the possibility that the beneficial effect of crossovers not only exists, but is necessary for viability of the listed species. This led to additional criteria that the anadromous and freshwater resident life history types should both be expressed in populations for them to be considered viable.

It would be useful to learn whether rainbow trout significantly enhance or stabilize steelhead runs. If rainbow trout progeny crossover does in fact have a beneficial effect on steelhead runs - and its magnitude can be quantified - such knowledge could be used to revise the criteria for anadromous fraction criteria, or it could be incorporated into a performance-based assessment of risk, possibly resulting in different run size and anadromous fraction criteria. Research into these topics is essential to resolve these issues in a way which maintains acceptably low extinction risk to the species.

14.2.2 ESU/DPS-Level Criteria

The TRT outlined a set of ESU/DPS-level criteria, which, if met, would indicate that a steelhead Distinct Population Segment has been successfully recovered. Satisfying the ESU/DPS-level criteria requires a set of *O. mykiss* populations in which:

- Each population satisfies the population-level criteria described above, and

- The set of populations as a whole satisfies requirements for ecological representation and redundancy, and

- The set of populations as a whole exhibit all three life history types (fluvial-anadromous, lagoon-anadromous, freshwater resident)

The criteria for representation and redundancy have two purposes. First, to protect the genetic and ecological diversity that ensures the long-term viability of the species under changing conditions, the set of populations should represent the entire range of ecological and genetic conditions originally present in the ESU/DPS. Second, to protect against catastrophic loss of entire populations due to disease, forest fires, drought, *etc.*, the set of populations should exhibit redundancy with respect to the range of ecological and genetic conditions originally present in the ESU. This ensures that if, for example, entire populations are lost from a particular ecotype, there will be at least one other population in that ecotype that survives, and can serve as a reservoir of individuals retaining the genetic and phenotypic adaptations necessary for inhabiting that ecotype. Ultimately, such individuals would be necessary for recolonizing the watersheds.

The TRT developed criteria for representation and redundancy by grouping the region's populations of *O. mykiss* into biogeographic groups, and specifying a minimum level of redundancy (number of viable populations) within each group. In addition, the TRT recommended that the core populations should inhabit watersheds with drought refugia, should be separated from one another by at least 42 miles if possible, and should exhibit three life history types—the rainbow trout form described previously, and two forms of steelhead trout, the lagoon-anadromous form and the fluvial-anadromous form.

The biogeographic groups were delineated on the basis of geographic proximity, broadly similar climate, and aspects of physiography that are relevant to the fish (see Table 5 and Figure 5 in Boughton *et al.* 2007b). Summer air temperatures, which strongly influence whether summer stream temperatures are cool enough for the fish, were a key consideration. The most important split was between coastal groups of populations, in which cool mesoclimates are maintained by proximity to the ocean, and interior groups of populations, where cool mesoclimates are primarily confined to mountain ranges, and are maintained by the temperature lapse rate (i.e. the reduction in temperature with increased elevation).

The criteria for redundancy within each biogeographic group were based on an assessment of catastrophic risks posed by wildfires and debris flows. However, the assessment was based on historical pattern and did not include considerations of climate change, which could have a large impact on the region. See Chapter 5, Southern California Steelhead and Climate Change.

The TRT also considered the catastrophic risk posed by drought, but could not incorporate it into the criteria due to insufficient information. The broad spatial extent of the typical drought in the region indicated that simple redundancy was not a suitable strategy for protecting the species from its effects. Watersheds having potential as drought refugia—stream systems that maintain suitable summer baseflows and water temperatures during severe multi-year droughts – should be identified and protected.

The broad-scale climatic factors that control the distribution of *O. mykiss* in the region appear to be summer air temperatures, annual precipitation, and the severity of winter storms, the last having its effect by determining the power of high flow events that organize the distribution and extent of in-stream steelhead habitat. All of these factors are likely to undergo a long-term shift as part of CO_2-induced climate

change. In addition, the region's frequent wildfires strongly influence the sediment budgets of streams, and thus the distribution of steelhead habitat. The overall wildfire regime is also likely to undergo a permanent shift in response to climate change. The magnitudes of these shifts, and the magnitude of their direct and interaction effects on stream habitat, are not yet clear. Thus a key uncertainty is how to plan for climate change both at the level of the ESU and individual stream watersheds.

14.3 RESEARCH FOCUS: ANADROMY, POPULATION STRUCTURE, AND MONITORING STEELHEAD RECOVERY

The natural dynamics of watersheds and stream systems maintain steelhead habitat in the recovery planning area in a stochastic, dynamic equilibrium. This equilibrium can involve dramatic processes such as floods and forest fires that disrupt habitat in the short term but ensure its continued existence over the long term. Other processes that circumscribe the productivity of freshwater steelhead habitat, such as the severity of the dry season or the pattern of high-flow events during the wet season, may affect reproductive success. These ecological constraints are generally understood at a qualitative level, but this level of knowledge is, in some cases, too vague to provide specific guidance for setting goals and choosing specific recovery actions. The research program supporting steelhead recovery in this region should focus on quantitative studies that: 1) identify ecological factors that promote anadromy; 2) clarify key aspects of population structure; and 3) monitor progress toward recovery. Many of these research activities could be carried out within the context of the California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring Program (Adams *et al.* 2011).

14.3.1 Identify Ecological Factors that Promote Anadromy

The primary focus of this Recovery Plan - to recover and secure the anadromous form of *O. mykiss* - involves restoring ecological conditions that specifically promote the population growth and abundance of the anadromous form.

While it is necessary to have migration corridors for steelhead to reach a spawning area, this does not necessarily imply that anadromous forms will out-compete the freshwater residents that spawn in the same area. At present it is not clear what ecological conditions specifically promote the sea-going form over the resident form though there are some important clues. These clues present a prime opportunity for research that would lead to more effective recovery actions.

Anadromous females exhibit a large fecundity advantage over their resident counterparts. As shown in Figure 14-1, an adult female's egg production increases exponentially with body length, and adult *O. mykiss* are generally able to attain much larger sizes in the ocean than in freshwater.



Figure 14-1. Fecundity as a function of body size for female steelhead sampled from Scott Creek in Santa Cruz County. Reproduced from Shapovalov and Taft (1954).

Thus, a typical female rainbow trout might attain a length of 35 cm, enabling her to produce 1800 eggs annually, whereas a medium sized steelhead female at 60 cm could produce over 3.5 times that number. This factor alone gives the sea-going form a distinct advantage and, all else being equal (and assuming the two forms breed true), over time the sea-going form should come to dominate any stream system with migration connectivity to the ocean. The resident forms would become confined to streams that lack migration connectivity. This pattern has been observed, for example, in the Deschutes River in Oregon (Zimmerman and Reeves, 2000).

In southern California, three ecological factors could potentially counteract this size advantage so that the resident form is sometimes favored in anadromous waters. First, the migration corridor between the ocean and freshwater habitat could be unreliable. Second, mortality may sometimes be much higher in the ocean than in freshwater, counteracting the potential size advantage of sea-going fish. Third, juveniles of the freshwater form may survive better or compete better in freshwater than juveniles of

the sea-going form, which could also counteract the natural size/fecundity advantage of the sea-going form. Of these three possibilities, the first two are supported by various lines of evidence, and the third has some suggestive evidence. The need is to move beyond existing evidence to a quantitative understanding of ecological mechanism, so that specific recovery strategies can be linked to desired outcomes.

14.3.2 Reliability of Migration Corridors

Question: What is the relationship between reliability of migration corridors, and anadromous fraction?

Discussion: Migration corridors in this arid region are clearly unreliable, but it is not clear precisely how reliable they must be for the anadromous form to persist over the long term, nor how to best characterize reliability.

Recommendation: The relationship between flow patterns in managed rivers, the reliability of migration opportunities, and the long term persistence of steelhead runs is likely to be watershed specific, but could be characterized through the establishment of a long-term monitoring effort that tracks abundance and timing of steelhead runs, and the timing of smolt runs, in specific watersheds of interest. This would provide a framework by which management actions, in the form of managed flow regimes, could be related to outcomes, in the form of migrant abundance and timing. However, answers would probably emerge only over the long term, and numerous confounding factors would also need to be taken into account by the monitoring framework.

14.3.3 Steelhead-Promoting Nursery Habitats

Question: What nursery habitats promote rapid growth rates of juveniles (and therefore larger size) at the time smolts emigrate to the ocean?

Discussion: Marine survival varies among salmonids, ranging from 25% to below 1% (Welch *et al.* 2009, Logerwell *et al*. 2003, Peterson and Schwing, 2003, Ward 2000, Ward *et al*. 1989). Improving the marine survival rate of steelhead would be beyond the scope of most management strategies, since steelhead are rarely fished and other sources of ocean mortality are largely uncontrollable. However, mortality rates of many marine fishes are strongly size-dependent. Consistent with this general pattern, young steelhead migrating to the sea tend to survive much better if they have a larger size at ocean entry (Hayes, *et al.* 2008, Bond, 2006, Ward *et al*. 1989). Thus, their growth opportunities in freshwater may influence their subsequent marine survival.

Figure 14-2, indicates that an outgoing smolt that has a fork length of 14 cm has about a 3% chance of surviving to spawn, but a 16.5 cm smolt's chances are at least 3.5 times better (*c.* 10%), and a 22 cm smolt's chances are an order of magnitude better (37%). Thus, the mortality effects of size at ocean entry can be of the same order as the fecundity advantages of migrating to the ocean in the first place.

A similar relationship between survival and size at ocean entry was observed by Bond (2006) and Hayes *et al*. (2008) in Scott Creek in Santa Cruz County, which is much closer geographically to southern California. Size at ocean entry appears to be at least as important as final spawning size in modulating the relative abundances of the freshwater and ocean-going forms of *O. mykiss.* [1]

[1] Its importance can vary over time, however. Ward (2000) observed that after 1989, marine survival drastically declined in the Keogh River population, and the relationship disappeared between marine survival and size at ocean entry. This was attributed to a change in ocean conditions, and indicates that the survival advantage of being a large smolt varies over time.



Figure 14-2. Marine survival of steelhead as a function of body size at ocean entry, in the Keogh River steelhead population described by Ward *et al.* (1989). Figure depicts the average survival to spawning of smolts emigrating in years 1977 - 1982.

High quality steelhead nursery habitats might develop where cool-water habitats receive large terrestrial inputs of food items. Terrestrial insects often fall in the water (Harvey *et al.* 2002, Douglas *et al.* 1994), and can provide a significant component of the diet of young steelhead (Rundio 2009, Rundio and Lindley, 2008). The study by Rundio and Lindley (2008) in the Big Sur area found terrestrial insects were sporadic in the diet of *O. mykiss*, but each item had large mass and thus was highly nutritious for the fish. Habitats with more frequent inputs of terrestrial insects would afford larger growth opportunities.

Finally, some habitats might produce rapid growth if there is a mechanism to keep juvenile densities low, so that individuals have expanded feeding opportunities. For example, it might be the case that intermittent streams provide expanded feeding opportunities during their wet season, because their dry season prevents the establishment of a large permanent population of resident rainbow trout. Overall, this suggests that the recovery prospects for steelhead runs would be significantly improved by identifying, restoring, and protecting those freshwater habitats that tend to produce large smolts, as part of the overall recovery strategy. These areas would qualify as steelhead "nursery habitats," defined as juvenile habitats that produce adult recruits out of proportion to their spatial extent relative to other habitats (Beck *et al.* 2001).

Recommendation: The identification and restoration of steelhead nursery habitats is a prime research opportunity with large potential

for enhancing steelhead recovery efforts. Nursery habitats would likely be estuarine or freshwater habitats that support rapid growth of young fish during the first or possibly second year of life, since large body size of migrants at ocean entry substantially improves their subsequent survival in the ocean. The simplest type of study to identify such habitats would be to use mark-recapture techniques to track growth and survival of juveniles as a function of habitat use. A more complete study would also track the consequences for marine survival.

14.3.4 Comparative Evaluation of Seasonal Lagoons

Question: What role do seasonal lagoons play in the life history of steelhead, and in particular, to what extent are seasonal lagoons used as nursery areas and promote the growth of juveniles prior to emigration to the ocean as smolts? What specific ecological factors contribute to lagoon suitability steelhead rearing (survival, growth)? What ecological factors contribute to the persistence of those lagoon features?

Discussion: One type of steelhead nursery habitat is the freshwater lagoons that form in the estuaries of many stream systems during the dry season. In some of these seasonal lagoons, juvenile steelhead can grow very quickly and enter the ocean at larger sizes, where they survive relatively well and thus contribute disproportionately to returning runs of spawners (Bond, 2006). Smith (1990), however, has observed that some lagoons can be quite vulnerable to rapid degradation in quality, and others may never be suitable, due to local environmental factors that can produce anoxic conditions or poor feeding opportunities. The existing information on the role of lagoons mostly comes from Santa Cruz County, and is focused only on a few systems. As described above, this work suggests that lagoons can comprise steelhead nursery habitat, but can also be vulnerable to various natural and anthropogenic disturbances (Smith, 1990). There is a need to determine which lagoons have the potential to play a positive role in anadromy-targeted recovery efforts.

Seasonal lagoons are a specific kind of estuary and in general, estuaries are highly dynamic interfaces between two other much larger ecosystems: freshwater stream networks on the terrestrial side, and the ocean ecosystem on the marine side. This accounts for estuaries' dynamism, complexity, and sensitivity to external influences, but also for much of their productivity (Hofmann, 2000; Jay *et al.* 2000). Although there appears to be a general unity in function of many of the small estuaries in our region (due to the general similarity of climate, terrestrial watershed conditions, and the raised coast), there is also much variation and one would expect that small differences in, say, watershed condition or coastal wind and current patterns, would sometimes translate into large differences in the suitability of lagoons as steelhead nursery habitat (Rich and Keller 2011).

Recommendation: Comparative studies on the environmental controls for productivity and reliability of lagoon habitat (including how to restore it if necessary) would aid in identifying those estuaries capable of serving as reliable steelhead nursery habitat. Such studies should focus on factors enabling rapid growth of juvenile steelhead, and factors conferring resiliency against catastrophic failure of habitat quality (anoxia, premature breaching, *etc.*).

14.3.5 Potential Nursery Role of Mainstem Habitats

Question: What role do mainstem habitats play in the life history of steelhead, and in particular, to what extent are they used as nursery areas and promote the growth of juveniles prior to emigration to the ocean as smolts? What specific ecological factors contribute to mainstem quality (survival, growth) for steelhead rearing? What ecological factors contribute to mainstem reliability?

Discussion: There may be other freshwater habitats that support high survival and robust growth of juveniles, and so constitute nursery habitat specifically for the anadromous form of the species. Low-gradient mainstem habitats, such as the trunks of the Santa Ynez, Ventura, Santa Clara, Santa Margarita, San Luis Rey, and San Dieguito River may also have once supported rapid growth of juveniles, particularly if reaches received enough sunlight to support primary productivity, but artesian flows or other groundwater inputs kept water cool in the summer (C. Swift, personal communication). Most mainstem habitats have now been highly altered by agricultural clearing and groundwater pumping, so an effort to determine their potential to contribute to steelhead recovery would require a focused effort.

Recommendation: The potential nursery role of mainstem habitat is much more speculative than the nursery role of lagoons. Initial assessment of the potential nursery role could take the form of 1) empirical study of mainstem habitat use by juvenile steelhead, at broad and fine scales; and 2) water-temperature modeling that accounts for effects of climate, insolation, and groundwater interaction on mainstem water temperatures, especially during the summer. The empirical work would be most useful if it applied mark-recapture techniques to assess growth and survival as a function of habitat use, and in managed rivers, as a function of the flow regime.

14.3.6 Potential Positive Roles of Intermittent Creeks

Question: Do intermittent creeks, serving as steelhead nursery habitat, positively influence the anadromous fraction of *O. mykiss* populations, or otherwise enhance viability of the anadromous form of the species?

Discussion: Juvenile *O. mykiss* are common in intermittent creeks (Boughton *et al*. 2009), but it is unclear whether these only function as sink habitat (a net drain on productivity) or play a more positive role in population viability. Boughton *et al.* (2009) observed that during the early summer in a moderately wet year, densities of young-of-the-year *O. mykiss* were nearly identical in the perennial and intermittent creeks of the Arroyo Seco watershed in Monterey County. Much of the intermittent creeks dried up and killed juveniles later in the summer, and indeed such mortality has been observed in the region for many years (Shapovalov, 1944), although it is also common to find scattered residual pools or reaches packed with fish in late summer. For example, Spina *et al.* 2005 observed fish in San Luis Obispo creek moving into sections of the stream network retaining perennial flow as other streams dried out over the summer months. The important issue for recovery purposes is identifying the potential positive, rather than negative, roles of intermittent creeks in sustaining the viability of steelhead populations.

The most obvious positive role is that intermittent creeks provide migration corridors to perennial creeks during the wet season. Perennial reaches often occur in low-order streams upstream of intermittent sections, so the corridor role increases the amount of accessible perennial habitat, and thus the size of the steelhead population that can be supported. In dry years, the corridor function would fail in some areas.

Boughton *et al*. (2009) found that most spawning habitat in the Arroyo Seco system tended to occur in intermittent streams, and argued that hydrologic and geomorphic processes would tend to produce such a pattern in general. This suggests a second positive function of intermittent streams—significantly expanding the amount of spawning habitat beyond what is available in perennial streams—but it also suggests a need for an additional corridor function. In this case, the corridor function is for young-of-the-year to emigrate to perennial

reaches before the summer dry season traps and kills them.

It is possible that intermittent streams enable a high-risk, high-reward strategy on the part of young steelhead. Many individuals may be killed during the summer drying season, but those surviving in the residual pools may benefit from enhanced growth. One mechanism for enhanced growth may be cannibalism of trapped cohorts. Another mechanism for rapid growth may be rapid recolonization of the dried stream channels as flows become re-established with cooler, wet weather in the fall.[2] Such fish would find few competitors, and perhaps even an enhanced opportunity to feed on eggs and fry of the following winter's spawners (Ebersole *et al.* 2006). In this manner, intermittent creeks could serve as steelhead nursery habitat

In wet years, the seasonal drying may be substantially reduced, increasing summer survival and allowing large pulses of juveniles to be recruited to the subpopulation of adult steelhead in the ocean. Under some scenarios, such as a highly plastic life history strategy (see next section), it is possible that such pulses would be the primary mode of production for anadromous individuals, and sustain the anadromous form of the species over the long term.

Recommendation: Intermittent creeks comprise a large proportion of freshwater *O. mykiss* habitat in the region. Despite an obvious negative role in the species ecology, they may have important positive roles as well. These potentially positive roles have the status of hypotheses with general implications for recovery strategies and viability targets, and should be tested.

[2] Fall rains can re-establish flows, but flows may also be re-established by cooler fall weather, which presumably lowers transpiration demands of riparian vegetation, leaving more groundwater to maintain base flows in stream channels.

14.3.7 Spawner Density as an Indicator of Viability

Question: What spawner density (at what spatial and temporal scale) is sufficient to indicate a viable population of steelhead?

Discussion: Answering this question requires that one or more robust anadromous populations be carefully characterized. The answer is more useful in the long-term, as an indicator of progress toward recovery, than it is in the short term for achieving recovery. The most useful data would be a time-series of observations of spawner density over many years.

Recommendation: Monitor a select number of core and non-core populations to determine the numbers of spawners using both mainstem and tributary spawning habitats.

14.3.8 Clarify Population Structure

Population structure concerns the ecological and biological factors that cause fish to naturally group into functional units known as independent populations. Independent populations are defined as "a collection of one or more local breeding units whose population dynamics or extinction risk over a 100-year time period is not substantially altered by exchanges of individuals with other populations" (McElhany *et al*. 2000).

If groups of fish regularly exchange individuals, they are members of the same population, whereas if exchange is rare or does not significantly affect population dynamics, they are members of separate populations. This definition of "separateness between, exchange within" means that the proper context of most management strategies is the independent population: a strategy that directly affects only a portion of a population will soon have significant indirect effects on the rest of the

population, but few immediate effects on other populations. [3]

The independent population is also the fundamental functional unit of species persistence, and hence viability. As a result, many of the viability criteria described by Boughton *et al.* (2007b) were defined in terms of population traits such as anadromous fraction and mean spawner abundance over time. The collections of fish to which these criteria should be applied are a function of what is known about the patterns of exchange of fish among breeding biological units. Open questions about such exchange result in uncertainty about how to apply the criteria.

Thus, an analysis of a simple quantitative model led Boughton *et al*. (2007) to conclude that an annual adult abundance of 4,150 fish were necessary for an independent population to be considered viable. But it was unclear, due to questions of exchange patterns, whether the criteria should be applied to:

- anadromous fish in a particular watershed, or
- the sum of anadromous fish across several watersheds, or
- the sum of anadromous and freshwater-resident fish in a particular watershed, or
- the sum of anadromous and freshwater-resident fish across several watersheds

The answer has implications for the scope and scale of recovery efforts. The answer depends on the level of exchange of fish across separate coastal watersheds, and on the level of exchange between the anadromous and resident forms of the species within a particular watershed—termed 'life history crossovers". A life history crossover is a freshwater parent that has anadromous fish among its progeny, and/or vice versa. Questions about inter-watershed exchanges and life history crossovers, and the implications for viability criteria, are key issues addressed in this section.

14.3.9 Partial Migration and Life History Crossovers

Partial migration is the phenomenon in which a population consists of both migratory and resident individuals (Jonsson and Jonsson, 1993), implying the regular or at least occasional occurrence of life history crossovers. A diversity of crossover patterns have been observed in the small number of studies conducted on *O. mykiss* to date. Zimmerman and Reeves (2000) observed no crossovers in resident and anadromous *O. mykiss* of the Deschutes River in Oregon, suggesting two demographically distinct (independent) populations. For one natural and eight hatchery populations in California, Donohoe *et al*. (2008) found that anadromous females sometimes produced resident progeny, but resident females did not produce anadromous progeny, suggesting a one-way flow of crossovers away from the anadromous form.

The Babine River *O. mykiss* in British Columbia apparently exhibit modest levels of crossover (*c.* 9%) in both directions (Zimmerman and Reeves, 2000), suggesting a single population that is partially subdivided, whereas J. R. Ruzycki (personal communication in Donohoe *et al.* 2008, p. 1072) reports a high level of bidirectional crossover in various tributaries of the Grande Ronde River in Oregon (0% to 33% of anadromous adults were progeny of resident females, and 44% of resident adults were progeny of anadromous females), indicating a fully integrated population in which the two life history forms functionally coexist.

[3] Over the longer term, a permanent change in population dynamics *would* be expected to trickle out to other independent populations, due to occasional exchanges of individuals. Occasional exchanges are expected to drive important processes such as gene exchange and recolonization of stream systems following a drought.

This continuum has significant implications for viability criteria. Are the populations in southern California fully integrated, or does each form more or less breed true, implying demographically independent populations that share stream systems but play no role in supporting one another, and perhaps even compete? Boughton *et al.* (2007b) made recommendations that embodied these two possibilities (actually two endpoints of a continuum). In one scenario, one should specify criteria that would secure the ocean-going fish if they turn out to comprise a demographically independent population. Under the other scenario, one should specify criteria that secure the ocean-going fish if they turn out to depend on the resident form with which they coexist. However, it is possible that resolution of this uncertainty would eliminate some of the need for hedging and thus lead to a more efficient and effective recovery plan. Resolution would involve two fundamental questions:

Question 1: What is the mechanism for, and frequency of, life history crossovers in southern California?

Question 2: How does crossover affect the persistence of the anadromous form?

Discussion: Answering the first question will take an extended research effort. Currently, Devon Pearse and S. Sogard (NOAA Fisheries) and M. Mangel (UC Santa Cruz) are leading a research effort to better understand life history crossovers in California steelhead; Mangel and Satterthwaite (2008) give an overview of the framework being used. The hypothesis being examined is that the anadromy/residency life history crossover made by individual *O. mykiss* is cued by the environment, using a mechanism similar to what has been observed in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar)*, a better-studied species that also exhibits variation in the timing of the smolting process during life history. Specifically, the hypothesis is that the smolting/residency life history crossover is made by individual fish during a sensitive period some months before the actual process of smolting is observed, and that the cues for the crossover are the fish's size and growth rate during the sensitive period. This might be expected because size and growth in the freshwater habitat integrate information about the quality of that habitat, as well as about the expected survival and fecundity in the marine environment versus the freshwater environment. What is hypothesized is a physiological (and perhaps hormonal) process that processes information from the environment to produce an adaptive life history crossover (See Hayes, *et al*. 2011a, 2011b).

Though the research effort of Sogard and Mangel is important progress on the anadromy/residency life history crossover phenomenon in steelhead recovery planning, it has important limitations at this time. First, it has the status of a hypothesis and at this writing no one has actually experimentally induced life history crossovers in *O. mykiss* by manipulating size, growth rates or any other environmental factor. Second, even if the Atlantic salmon model is useful for understanding life history plasticity in *O. mykiss*, there are almost certain to be important differences and indeed surprises in the *O. mykiss* life history story. Finally, the existence of a plastic life history strategy does not preclude the possibility of important genetic constraints. For example, one might expect that even if the model is broadly correct, the specific timing of sensitive periods, and the thresholds for the size and growth cues, would probably vary quite markedly among populations of steelhead due to genetic differences. In short, the responses to environmental cues would likely have a heritable component, and this component would likely exhibit local adaptation to specific conditions. A response that is adaptive in one watershed may be selected against in another watershed, depending on environmental factors such as those discussed in the previous section.

Recommendation: It is essential for rigorous research on the mechanisms of life history plasticity in *O. mykiss* to be pursued vigorously, for it is difficult to envision a successful recovery

effort without a better understanding of the functional relationship between resident and anadromous fish. The current effort of Sogard, Mangel, and coworkers should yield useful information over time, but it focuses on two systems outside southern California: Soquel Creek in Santa Cruz County (a coastal redwood forest system), and the American River near Sacramento (a large Central Valley River system). One should expect local adaptation of steelhead populations in southern California.

Because of the likelihood of local adaptation, it would be useful and practical to address some related questions about the frequency of life history crossovers and their implications for recovery planning in the southern California. In particular:

- Identify environmental factors that specifically promote anadromy (discussed in the previous section). It is clear that the abundance of anadromous fish needs to be increased, and identifying relevant environmental factors would usefully inform this goal. The principal uncertainty is how much the abundance of anadromous fish needs to be increased, a separate question that depends on the frequency of life history crossovers and the mechanisms underlying them. This question can be addressed over the longer term as more is learned about the mechanism, and used to refine the viability criteria described by Boughton *et al.* (2007b).

- Estimate the frequency of life history crossovers in populations of interest, to determine whether it even occurs with any regularity. The most practical method for doing so is by analyzing otolith microchemistry of juvenile *O. mykiss* (see Donohoe *et al.* 2008), but this requires lethal sampling of juveniles. Modest lethal sampling of juveniles (as opposed to adults) may pose only a negligible increase extinction risk, due to the low reproductive value of juveniles.

- Determine how life history crossover affects the persistence of the anadromous form. This could be done using existing frameworks in population modeling, such as individually-based models or integral projection models, but would require assumptions about typical mortality and growth rates in freshwater and marine environments, as well as about frequency of life history crossovers. However, it might produce important insights. For example, persistence of anadromous runs could be strongly affected by the difference between complete lack of crossovers and a modest rate, such as 5%. However, effects would be much smaller between a 10% rate versus a 50% rate. It would be useful to more rigorously evaluate the validity and relevance of these levels of life history crossovers.

14.3.10 Rates of Dispersal Between Watersheds

Question: How common is dispersal of anadromous *O. mykiss* between watersheds, and how does it relate to population structure, especially in small coastal watersheds?

Discussion: Just as life history crossovers may knit resident and anadromous *O. mykiss* into integrated populations, frequent movement of anadromous fish through the ocean to neighboring watersheds may knit neighboring *O. mykiss* into integrated "trans-watershed" populations. If inter-watershed exchange is common, the most effective recovery strategies might be those that emphasize integration of recovery efforts across a set of linked watersheds. If inter-watershed exchange is rare, the most effective strategies would be those that identify watersheds having stable conditions

that protect small, inherently vulnerable populations.

The places where the implications of the single-watershed versus trans-watershed scenarios are most distinct are those areas along the coast where numerous small coastal watersheds occur in close proximity. In the SCS Recovery Planning Area, these areas include the south coast of Santa Barbara County, and the small watersheds draining the Santa Monica Mountains just north of Los Angeles.

Recommendation: Answering this research question will involve tracking the populations from multiple watersheds, including groupings of small, closely spaced watersheds as well as groupings involving large and small watersheds more spatially dispersed. However, it is not clear at this time what is the most practical and effective way to try to estimate exchange rates in the Recovery Planning Area. Genetic and Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tags and ecological traps may have potential to effectively address this question, particularly in small basins where it is possible to sample a significant fraction (perhaps all) of a given cohort of adults.

14.3.11 Revision of Population Viability Targets

In the framework described by Boughton *et al.* (2007), the key criteria for establishing population viability was that a population be demonstrated to sustain a long-term mean run size of at least 4,150 anadromous spawners per watershed per year. However, the authors noted that the criteria were chosen to be precautionary due to scientific uncertainty about key issues, and that better information might allow the criteria to be revised without increasing the risk of extinction. There were three types of information that seemed most likely to lead to useful revisions of the viability criteria:

1. The threshold run size might be able to be revised downward from 4,150 spawners per year if it was determined that year-to-year variation in run size was modest enough to be consistent with a lower threshold. The necessary information—annual estimates of run size over several decades—would come from the types of monitoring programs described below.

2. Data on the frequency of life history crossovers might justify that the 4,150 threshold could include some fraction of adult resident fish, rather than the 100% anadromous fraction currently recommended (*i.e.,* because the resident and anadromous forms are shown to comprise functionally integrated populations). The necessary information would come from successfully implementing the recommendations identified above.

3. Data on inter-basin exchanges might justify that the 4,150 threshold include spawners from neighboring watersheds (*i.e.,* because inter-watershed exchanges is sufficiently high that the fish in neighboring watersheds comprise a single, trans-watershed population). The necessary information would come from successfully implementing the recommendations identified above.

It should be noted that data for item 1 would arise over time as a byproduct of a comprehensive monitoring program, which is necessary to assess risk in any case. The priority item, however, is probably item 2, since the integration of the resident and anadromous forms is not well understood, but has profound implications for a very diverse set of management issues beyond just revision of recovery criteria.

14.4 MONITORING PROGRESS TOWARD RECOVERY GOALS

Monitoring should be conducted for each BPG, with monitoring initially focused on Core 1 populations. Monitoring involves two different but related activities: status and effectiveness monitoring. Status monitoring is intended to assess the status of a population (or a DPS) as a whole, and to assess its progress toward recovery or further decline toward extinction. It should also be designed to gather data for assessing the viability criteria described by Boughton *et al*. (2007b). Monitoring the annual run size of populations is the most important objective of status monitoring. Effectiveness monitoring is intended to assess the response of populations to specific recovery actions, and thereby develop a better understand of their effectiveness. Effectiveness monitoring will generally be more powerful if it focuses on the specific life stage affected by the recovery actions in particular habitats, and it if compares it to the same life stage in similar unaffected habitats that serve as controls.

As described by Boughton *et al.* (2007b), the general goal of recovery is to establish a diverse and geographically distributed set of populations, each of which meets viability criteria over the long term. These viability criteria are expressed in terms of mean annual runs size, persistence over time, spawner density, anadromous fraction, as well as the continued expression of life history diversity, and the spatial structure of the population. Strategies for monitoring these properties of steelhead populations over the long term are essential for assessing the attainment of recovery goals.

14.4.1 Strategy for Monitoring Steelhead in Southern California

Southern California steelhead habitats exhibit characteristics that must be considered in formulating a monitoring plan. These characteristics include differences in geology, climate and hydrology, as well as the fact that other species of anadromous salmonids are absent. The differences in the geology, climate, and hydrology are described in Adams *et al.* 2011, Boughton and Goslin (2006), and Boughton *et al*. (2006). The strategy described below considers these factors, as well as the spatial and temporal distribution of southern California steelhead. The basic components of the southern California steelhead monitoring strategy include:

- Reconnaissance surveys and assessments of steelhead populations
- Reconnaissance surveys and assessments of riverine and estuarine habitat conditions
- Counting stations stratified at both the BPG and population levels
- Life cycle stations (LCS) stratified at both the BPG and population levels

Presently there is no current comprehensive assessment of the condition and distribution of steelhead populations and habitats in southern California that use standard population and habitat assessment protocols. However, NMFS and the DFG have begun to develop a comprehensive coastal salmonid monitoring program and have identified a basic strategy, design, and methods of monitoring California coastal salmonid population (Adams *et al.* 2011).

The monitoring strategy outline here includes an, initial assessment both of the fish populations and habitat conditions. Assessments should initially focus on Core 1 populations in each BPG, and ultimately include all populations that are necessary for full recovery of the species. Stream habitat assessments should be conducted using the protocol in the California Department of Fish and Game's California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual (California Department of Fish and Game 2010).

Counting stations comprised of fixed structure utilizing technologies such as DIDSON cameras are the most effective means of establishing abundance and trends of adult anadromous

runs of steelhead and juvenile out migration. Counting stations should initially be located in Core 1 populations in each BPG.

Life cycle monitoring can be co-located with counting stations, but may also be conducted in one or more of the non-core populations which support smaller but less impacted populations. LCS monitoring efforts provide the foundation for evaluating the relationship of fish habitat use and habitat condition over time and should focus on:

- Estimation of marine and freshwater survival
- Spawning success (spawning ground distribution, redd to adult ratio)
- Juvenile rearing success (over-summering and winter growth)
- Major life history traits (anadromy/resident relationships, sex ratio, age and size structure, habitat utilization patterns, emigration age and timing, maturation patterns, run-timing, and physiological tolerances)

These LCSs could also be used in evaluating nutritional needs, predation, disease, and other environmental factors relevant to assessing the status of individual populations. Where permanent LCSs are not established, temporary stations should be deployed to maximize the development of population information in Core population watersheds.

Table 14-1 lists the preliminary sites where counting stations and LCSs should be established. LCS sites should be sited based on two criteria: their relation to the DPS and whether they are necessary to represent the full range of watershed types for each BPG.

Table 14-1. Potential Southern California Steelhead Life Cycle Monitoring Stations (alternative populations are listed in parentheses).*

Life Cycle Monitoring Station	Population	Potential Locations
1	Santa Maria River	Suey Crossing Garey Road Tespesquet Road
2	Santa Ynez River	Highway 1 Alisal Road Refugio Rod Highway 154
3	Ventura River	Robles Diversion Casitas Vista Road Santa Ana Road
4	Santa Clara River	Vern Freeman Diversion Highway 123 Highway 126
5	Mission Creek (Arroyo Hondo Creek)	Highway 101 Tallant Road Mission Canyon Road (Highway 1)
6	Carpinteria Creek	Highway 101 East Valley Road
7	Rincon Creek	Highway 101 Highway 150
8	Malibu Creek (Arroyo Sequit, Topanga Creek)	Highway 1 Cross Creek Road (Highway 1)
9	San Gabriel River	Highway 1 San Gabriel Canyon Road
10	San Juan Creek	Highway 1 Metro-link Crossing
11	San Mateo Creek (Santa Margarita River)	Highway 1 (Highway I-5, De Luz Road)
12	San Luis Rey River (San Dieguito River)	College Boulevard Mission Road (Highway I-5, El Camino Real)

* Note: Additional evaluation of other locations may identify more suitable locations than those provisionally identified here.

To the maximum extent possible, monitoring the status and trends of steelhead populations should be undertaken simultaneously with restoration efforts. Watersheds where restoration has occurred or is occurring should be considered a high priority for monitoring. Monitoring stations, whether counting or life cycle stations, should serve as a magnet for research efforts depending on fish and fish related field data.

14.4.2 Monitoring Protocols

There are various ways that status and effectiveness monitoring can be integrated, but the focus of the following discussion is on status monitoring. Below is a brief summary of potential methods to monitor run-size of steelhead (number of anadromous spawners per year per population). All these methods necessarily involve two components:

1. Observed counts for some life history stage of *O. mykiss* that contains information about run size

2. Some method for estimating the number of unobserved fish

For the first component, the observed count may actually be the run, but if it is some other life stage, there is a need to collect data to estimate a conversion factor. For example, if redds are counted, it is necessary to estimate redds per female and sex ratio to get an estimate of the full run size (Gallagher and Gallagher 2005).

The second component is necessary because simple observations can confound the true number of fish with the detection rate of the observer: A large population with poor observing conditions looks the same as a small population with excellent observing conditions. Thus, one must also estimate the number of unobserved fish, which corresponds to estimating the detection rate of the observer.

There are numerous ways to do this (Williams *et al*. 2001 provides a comprehensive technical review), but they all involve making repeated observations (often only two times) of the same group of fish. This redundancy is necessary for estimating unobserved fish. Doing so, and getting an estimate of the full population, is often far more informative than obtaining partial counts in which abundance and detection rate are confounded, because detection rates can be highly variable (Rosenberger and Dunham 2005)

14.4.2.1 Counting at Fish Ladders

Fish ladders can provide important opportunities to count upstream migrants, assuming the fish passage facilities themselves provide effective unimpeded fish passage opportunities. There are a number of technical challenges in operating fish detection and counting devises in extremely flashy systems characteristic of southern California (see discussion below). Additionally, this method is only relevant to watersheds that have fish ladders, and cannot quantify the portion of the run that spawns below the fish ladder. Depending on the location of the ladder and the amount and type of habitat downstream of the ladder, the spawners below the ladder can be an important component of the run.

14.4.2.2 Redd Counts

Gallagher and Gallagher (2005) have shown that salmon and steelhead runs can be estimated using redd counts. A summary of their method and is provided below:

To estimate Chinook salmon *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, coho salmon *O. kisutch*, and steelhead *O. mykiss* escapement in several coastal streams in northern California a stratified index redd method was developed, based on the assumption that redd size is related to the number of redds a female builds. Redd area escapement estimates were compared with estimates from more conventional methods and releases of fish above a counting structure. Reduction of counting errors and uncertainty in redd identification, biweekly surveys throughout the spawning period, and the use of redd areas in a stratified index sampling design

produced precise, reliable, and cost-effective escapement estimates for Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and steelhead.

This method has considerable promise, but has not been tried in the southern California setting, where stream turbidity and channel geomorphology, or repeated disturbance of redds by winter storms, may make redds difficult to detect.. The method has high personnel requirements, because it requires the survey reaches to be visited biweekly throughout the spawning season. On the other hand, it is simple, requires only modest training in field personnel, and has modest costs other than the hiring of personnel.

14.4.2.3 Monitoring runs using the DIDSON Acoustic Camera

Dual-frequency identification sonar (DIDSON) is an off-the-shelf device that uses high frequency sound waves to produce near video-quality images of underwater objects. It can potentially be used to identify and count all migrating steelhead at some survey point in a stream system, for the entire spawning season. Its advantages are similar to those of using a weir to make counts, but has two additional advantages that are key: 1) There is no need for a weir or other device that impedes flow, and so fouling, destruction by high-flow events, etc., are not a major constraint; and 2) it can see through turbid waters (unlike a regular video camera). These two traits appear well suited to the flashy, turbid conditions typical of southern California streams.

DIDSON has been successfully used to estimate adult salmon escapement in high-abundance rivers in Alaska, Idaho, and British Columbia. In principle it should be suitable for low-abundance creeks, such as those in southern California. NOAA's' Southwest Fisheries Science Center have evaluated field methods for using the device to monitor steelhead runs in southern California streams (Pipal *et al.* 2010).

The principal disadvantages are: (1) the cost of the device; (2) deployment constraints for getting good images; and the risk of "flashy flows" damaging or destroying the installation. These constraints have to do with maintaining a good "insonified region" of the channel being monitored for migrants. Some channel shapes are better than others, and there also need to be a strategies for maintaining a completely insonified cross section during the advance and retreat of high flow events. In addition, there is a need to learn how to interpret poor images when they occur. However, the method has the potential to solve some of the intractable problems of monitoring steelhead in southern California, including counting very small numbers of migrants in very turbid waters during and after very flashy high-flow events.

14.4.2.4 Tagging Juveniles and Monitoring Migrants (T-JAMM design)

Steelhead runs can potentially be estimated by tagging juveniles with Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tags during their freshwater phase, and subsequently monitoring migrants using in-stream tag readers.

The tagging phase use standard block-netting and electro-fishing techniques during the summer low-flow season. Depletion-sampling can be used to estimate juvenile abundances. However, Rosenberger and Dunham (2005) found that capture-recapture methods gave more robust estimates than depletion sampling, and Temple and Pearsons (2006) showed that the customary 24-hour period in capture-recapture sessions can be shortened to one or two hours, which simplifies logistics so that capture-recapture sampling can have a time-efficiency similar to that of depletion sampling.

The monitoring phase is accomplished using instream tag readers such as those described by Bond, *et al.* (2007), Zydlewski *et al.* (2006, 2001), Ibbotson *et al.* (2004). These must be deployed for the duration of the migration season (both outgoing and incoming) each year.

The design has promise for monitoring runs of steelhead for which many other methods are problematic. In unpublished simulations, Boughton has found that the precision of run size estimates is primarily controlled by the number of tagged spawners that ultimately return and get detected. The number required is modest: around 30 to 90 tagged spawners are necessary to obtain 50% confidence intervals that stay below one-third of the estimated of run size. However, with marine survival typically falling between 0.3% and 3%, the required tagging effort would usually be between 3,400 and 45,000 juvenile fish tagged per generation per population. Other considerations in using implanted tags are the mortality/fitness risks and the permitting requirements to allow some level of take of the species. The tagging effort could perhaps be spread across a set of populations if one were willing to assume uniform marine survival across the populations.

The estimation method is robust to imperfect detection of tagged fish by the instream tag readers, as long as there are at least two readers that independently scan for tags. Reach-sampling allows the entire run to be estimated using fish from a sample of reaches. In the simulations, the number of reaches needed for acceptable precision could be as low as 30-40 under scenarios of high marine survival, with a sampling fraction of around 2% in large watersheds, such as the Arroyo Seco watershed used in the simulations.

Under low marine survival, the necessary sampling fraction was around 10% in the simulations. A side-benefit of this method is that one would obtain very good estimates of ocean survival. This is useful because it allows the overall trajectory of steelhead runs to be decomposed into marine and freshwater components. This, in turn, will deliver greater statistical power for analyzing patterns in the freshwater component. In short, one would have greater statistical power for determining if recovery actions on the freshwater side are actually having the desired effect.

Boughton has written software to estimate run size from data produced by tagging juveniles and monitoring migrants. It is written in the R computer language, a freely-available statistical programming environment that is widely used in the scientific world. Currently the work is in manuscript form. Williams, Rundio, and Lindley of the Science Center are currently tagging juveniles and monitoring migrants in a case study of Big Creek steelhead population, a member of the Big Sur Coast BPG within the South-Central California Steelhead DPS.

14.4.2.5 Sampling Young-of-the-Year Otoliths (YOYO design)

This method is similar to tagging juveniles and monitoring migrants, but instead of tracking the fate of captured juveniles to estimate run size, one would collect some fraction of the juveniles, and examine their otoliths and genetic relatedness. From this, one could estimate the number of anadromous mothers (and as a byproduct, non-anadromous mothers) for each annual cohort of young-of-the year fish. This should be suitable for estimating annual run size, at least of female fish.

This method would dispense with the need to implant RFID tags in fish, and the need to maintain instream tag readers during difficult winter conditions. All field work would consist of electrofishing juveniles at randomly-sampled stream reaches each summer. However, the method would require the time and expense of otolith analysis, and it would require collecting (*i.e.* killing) some fraction of the juveniles that are electrofished during the summer field season.

This method is currently not well-developed, but it has promise as a relatively simple and efficient way to estimate run sizes using established and familiar field methods. A potential drawback is the need to kill juveniles to get their otoliths. The key unknown at this point is how many fish would have to be sampled to get a reasonable estimate of the number of anadromous mothers.

14.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: LEARNING FROM RECOVERY EFFORTS

Adaptive management is a systematic process that uses scientific methods for monitoring, testing, and adjusting resource management policies, practices, and decisions, based on specifically defined and measurable objectives and goals (Walters 1997, 1996). Adaptive management is predicated on the recognition that natural resource systems are variable, and that knowledge of natural resource systems is often uncertain. Further, the response of natural resources systems to restoration and management actions is complex, and frequently difficult to predict with precision. The Recovery Plan provides both overall goals in the form of viability criteria, and suite of DPS-wide watershed specific recovery actions. The viability criteria, however, are provisional, and the central recovery actions are couched in broad terms which must be given more specificity on a case-by-case basis, and ultimately assessed for their effectiveness. Hence the need to adapt resource management policies, practices and research decisions to changing circumstances, or a better understanding of natural resource systems and their responses.

The success of an adaptive management program can be enhanced by having stakeholders and scientists engage in developing a shared vision for an indefinitely long future together. The development of a guiding image helps organize an adaptive management program, align interests, and enhance cooperation in a complex process. Focusing on fundamental values, rather than on predetermined means can open up possible alternative solutions; participating in this type of framework, scientists can help construct solutions that may not be self-evident to stakeholders.

Adaptive management can be applied at two basic levels: the overall goals of the recovery effort, or the individual recovery or management actions undertaken in pursuit of overall goals. The research sections above are intended to address the first application. The following discussion is focused on the second application of the concept of adaptive management.

14.5.1 Elements of an Adaptive Management Program

There is no uniformly applicable model for an adaptive management program, and key elements must be identified and tailored to recovery action-specific, site-specific, and impact-specific issues. However, effective adaptive management programs will contain three basic components: 1) adaptive experimentation by which scientists and others with appropriate expertise, learn about ecosystem functions response to recovery or management actions; 2) social learning (through public education and outreach) by which stakeholders share in the knowledge gained about ecosystem functions, and 3) institutional structures and processes of governance by which people respond by making shared decisions regarding how the ecosystem will be managed and the natural services it provides will be allocated.

Six specific elements associated with adaptive management have been identified (Panel on Adaptive Management for Resource Stewardship 2011):

1st Element: Recovery Action Objectives are Regularly Revisited and Revised. Key recovery action objectives (and related questions) should be regularly reviewed in an iterative process to help stakeholders maintain a focus on objectives and appropriate revisions to them. The recovery goals, objectives, and criteria in Chapter 6, Steelhead Recovery Goals, Objectives & Criteria, should provide a basic framework, and the recovery actions identified for each BPG should be a starting point for the adjustment of recovery action objectives. The mandatory five-year review process can serve as

a means of conveying any needed modification to the overall recovery goals, as well as individual recovery actions.

2nd Element: Model(s) of the System Being Managed. Four types of models have been have been identified in the use of adaptive management program to test hypotheses regarding the effectiveness of recovery actions (Thomas *et al.,* 2001):

Conceptual Model: Synthesis of current scientific understanding, field observation and professional judgment concerning the species, or ecological system

Diagrammatic model: Explicitly indicates interrelationships between structural components, environmental attributes and ecological processes

Mathematical model: Quantifies relationships by applying coefficients of change, formulae of correlation/causation

Computational Model: Aids in exploring or solving the mathematical relationships by analyzing the formulae on computers.

River systems are generally too complex and unique for controlled, replicated experiments, or to be the subject of traditional scientific models. However, conceptual models based on generally recognized scientific principles can provide a useful framework for refining recovery actions and testing their effectiveness. Diagrammatic models such as the one used to characterize the parallel and serial linkages in the steelhead life cycle, can also be used *in lieu* of formal mathematical models to test hypotheses regarding the effectiveness of recovery actions. Mathematical and computational models, themselves have their limitations in the context of an adaptive management program: they are difficult to explain, and require specific assumptions that may be difficult to justify. As noted in the discussion above regarding recovery goals, viability criteria are based on a combination of a synthesis of current scientific information and a simplified model which uses data not specific to the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. Additional quantifiable data is necessary to refine the viability population and DPS models that form the basis of the provisional recovery goals, objectives and criteria. Modification of the model could result in modification of the priorities assigned to the individual recovery actions in individual populations or BPGs.

3rd Element: A Range of Management Choices. Even when a recovery action objective is agreed upon, uncertainties about the ability of possible recovery or management actions to achieve that objective are common. The range of possible recovery or management choices should be considered at the outset. This evaluation addresses the likelihood of achieving management objectives and the extent to which each alternative will generate new information or foreclose future choices. A range of recovery actions and management measures should be considered, either through a planning process or the environmental review process prior to permitting the individual recovery action.

4th Element: Monitoring and Evaluation of Outcomes. Gathering and evaluation of data allow for the testing of alternative hypotheses, and are central to improving knowledge of ecological and other systems. Monitoring should focus on significant and measurable indicators of progress toward meeting recovery objectives. Monitoring programs and results should be designed to improve understanding of environmental systems and models, to evaluate the outcomes of recovery actions, and to provide a basis for better decision making. It is critical that "thresholds" for interpreting the monitoring results are identified during the planning of a monitoring program. This element of adaptive management will require a design based upon scientific knowledge and principles. Practical questions to be addressed include what indicators to monitor, and when and where to monitor. Guidance on a number of these issues is provided in the sections above regarding research and monitoring.

5th Element: A Mechanism for Incorporating Learning Into Future Decisions. This element recognizes the need for means to disseminate information to a wide variety of stake-holders, and a decision process for adjusting various management measures in view of the monitoring findings. Periodic evaluations of the proposed recovery action, the monitoring data and other related information, and decision-making should be an iterative process in which management objectives are regularly revisited and revised accordingly. Public outreach, including Web-based programs, should be actively pursued. Additionally, the mandatory five-year review process can serve as a means of conveying any needed modification to the Recovery Plan, and well as individual recovery actions.

6th Element: A Collaborative Structure for Stakeholder Participation and Learning. This element includes information dissemination to a variety of stakeholders, as well as a proactive program focused on soliciting decision-related inputs from a variety of stakeholder groups. Inevitably, some of the onus for adaptive management goes beyond managers, decision makers, and scientists, and rests upon interest groups and even the general public. NMFS has provided a general framework by which a shared vision can be further developed and pursued for restoring a set of watersheds supporting a network of viable steelhead populations, and providing sustainable ecological services to the human communities of southern California (Boughton, 2010a, Tallis *et al*. 2010, Levin *et al*., 2009, Ruckelshaus *et al*. 2008). Such a vision also provides opportunities for the protection and restoration of other native freshwater and riparian species which form an integral part of the ecosystems upon which steelhead depend.

15. Implementation by NMFS

"If anthropogenic changes can be shaped to produce disturbance regimes that more closely mimic (in both space and time) those under which the species evolved, Pacific salmon should be well equipped to deal with future challenges, just as they have throughout their evolutionary history."

Dr. Robin R. Waples, NOAA Fisheries, Research Fish Biologist

15.1 INTEGRATION OF RECOVERY INTO NMFS ACTIONS

NMFS must formally incorporate the Recovery Plans within its daily tasks and decision-making, including the actions identified in the DPS-wide Recovery Action narratives and the Recovery Action summaries for each BPG. All of NMMS' missions can be accomplished with due consideration to the needs of listed salmon and steelhead. If NMFS is to promote species and ecosystem conservation (and meet its obligations under section 7(a)(1) of the ESA), then means of incorporating recovery goals and actions must be incorporated into all of the programs and actions we administer and implement. This includes, for example, listing reviews and critical habitat designations under ESA section 4, ESA consultations under section 7, and permit actions under ESA section 10.

Implementation of the Recovery Plan by NMFS will take many forms and is generally and specifically described in the NMFS Protected Resources Division (PRD) Strategic Plan. The Interim Recovery Planning Guidance (National Marine Fisheries Service 2010a) also outlines how NMFS shall cooperate with other agencies regarding plan implementation. These documents, in addition to the ESA, shall be used by NMFS to set the framework and environment for plan implementation. The PRD Strategic Plan asserts that species conservation (in implementing Recovery Plans) by NMFS will be more strategic and proactive, rather than reactive. To maximize existing resources with workload issues and limited budgets, the PRD Strategic Plan champions organizational changes and shifts in workload priorities to focus efforts towards "those activities or areas that have biologically-significant beneficial or adverse impacts on species and ecosystem recovery" (National Marine Fisheries Service 2006a). The resultant shift will reduce NMFS engagement on those activities or projects not significant to species and ecosystem recovery.

NMFS actions to promote and implement recovery planning shall include:

- Formalizing recovery planning goals on a program-wide basis to prioritize work load allocation and decision-making (including developing mechanisms to assure the effective and timely implementation of the Recovery Plan);
- Conducting an aggressive outreach and education program aimed at all stakeholders, including federal, tribal, state, local, non–governmental organizations, landowners, and interested individuals;

- Facilitating a consistent framework for research, monitoring, and adaptive management that can directly inform recovery objectives and goals;
- Participating in the land use and water planning process at the federal, state, and local level to ensure that the provisions of the steelhead Recovery Plan are reflected in the full range of decision making processes;
- Establishing an implementation tracking system that is adaptive and pertinent to annual reporting for the Government Performance and Results Act, Bi-Annual Recovery Reports to Congress and 5-Year Reviews of each species listing status.

15.1.1 Work with Constituents and Partners

Successful implementation of Recovery Plans will require the efforts and resources of many entities, from federal agencies to the individual contributions of members of the public. NMFS commits to working cooperatively with other individuals and agencies on implementation of recovery actions and to encourage other federal agencies to implement the actions for which they have responsibility or authority. The benefits of a successful plan to the species and the currently regulated communities are immense, but the costs can be counted in time, money, and changed behaviors. NMFS is committed to using Recovery Plans as the guiding mechanism for its daily endeavors and can directly implement some of the actions called for in the plans. However, our primary role in plan implementation will be to promote the recovery strategy and provide the needed technical information and expertise to other entities implementing the part of the plan or contemplating actions that may impact the species' chances of recovery.

NMFS is engaged in outreach to various constituencies where we provide technical assistance regarding listed salmonids, their habitat needs, and various life history requirements. Developing partnerships through providing technical assistance will be critical for recovery. Our outreach efforts will need to increase both towards those constituencies with which we already engage and to expanded sets of constituencies including communities, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and Federal and State legislative representatives.

To focus efforts in areas critical for recovery, NMFS shall:

- Develop outreach and educational materials to increase public awareness and understanding of the multiple societal benefits that can be gained from steelhead recovery in southern California watersheds;
- Inform federal, state, and local governmental agencies of the provisions of the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan, and how these respective agencies' activities or planning and regulatory efforts may assist the implementation of the Recovery Plan;
- Advise watershed groups and other non-governmental organizations about the Recovery Plan, and the role of on-going watershed conservation efforts in implementing recovery actions and achieving steelhead recovery within their respective watersheds;
- Facilitate and participate in public forums designed to provide interested parties with an opportunity to directly share experiences and ideas, and learn about the methods and means of implementing steelhead recovery actions;
- Provide technical support and assistance to partners engaged in implementing steelhead recovery actions identified in the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan, including research and monitoring;
- Work with Federal and State agencies to coordinate and develop programmatic permits for incidental take authorization for

actions that contribute to the recovery of southern California steelhead and their habitats;

- Work to assure adequate funding and staff support for full compliance with the legal requirements of land use, water, and natural resource protection laws, codes, regulations and ordinances across the Southern California steelhead DPS; and
- Support the development of information networks that allow collaborators to disseminate information to a broad array of interested and affected parties about steelhead recovery efforts;

15.1.2 Funding Implementation of Recovery Plans

As a means of providing funding to the States, Congress established the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) to contribute to the restoration and conservation of Pacific salmon and steelhead populations and their habitats. The states of Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho, and Alaska, and the Pacific Coastal and Columbia River tribes receive PCSRF appropriations from NMFS each year. The fund supplements existing state, tribal, and local programs to foster development of Federal-state-tribal-local partnerships in salmon and steelhead recovery and conservation. NMFS has established memoranda of understanding (MOU) with the states of Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, and Alaska, and with three tribal commissions on behalf of 28 Indian tribes. The MOUs establish criteria and processes for funding priority PCSRF projects.

For as long as these funds are available to the State of California, NMFS intends on working with the State to ensure the southern California steelhead recovery strategy and priorities are included in the considerations of funding for projects. NMFS also intends on using PCSRF reports as a mechanism to highlight those areas and actions where PCSRF funds have been used to implement needed recovery actions that might not otherwise occur in the absence of PCSRF funds.

NMFS has also identified other potential funding sources to support the implementation of recovery actions identified in the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan (for a list of additional funding sources, see Appendix E, Habitat Restoration Cost References for Steelhead Recovery Planning).

15.2 ONGOING REGULATORY PRACTICES

The ESA provides NMFS with various tools for first protecting and then recovering listed species. The ESA focuses on first identifying species and ecosystems in danger of immediate or foreseeable extinction or destruction and protecting them as their condition warrants. Then, the ESA focuses on the prevention of further declines in their condition through the consultation provisions of section 7(a)(2), habitat protection and enhancement provisions of sections 4 and 5, take prohibitions through sections 4(d) and 9, cooperation with the State(s) in which these species are found (section 6) and needed research and enhancement as well as conservation of species taken by non-federal actions through section 10. Ultimately, the ESA focuses on the conservation (commonly equated with the term recovery) of these species and ecosystems through the recovery planning provisions of section 4, cooperation with States in section 6, and direction to all federal agencies to conserve species in section 7(a)(1). Clean Water Action Section 404 is an important tool for regulating the discharge of material or the additional of fill material to the rivers, streams, and estuaries of California, and is one of the principle means by which consultations under section 7(a)(2) can be initiated.

In the case of listed salmon and steelhead in California, NMFS has already used the listing and designation of critical habitat provisions to protect the current populations of these species. For the past two decades, NMFS has also

worked closely with federal agencies and private landowners pursuant to sections 7(a)(2) and 10(a)(1) of the ESA to avoid and minimize additional harm to these species during the course of land and water-use activities. Significant benefits have already accrued to these listed species from changes in land and water-use practices. Unfortunately, in many areas, salmon and steelhead populations continue to decline. The development and implementation of Recovery Plans has a greater scope and objective than the project-by-project focus of most section 7 and 10 efforts, however. NMFS intends to use this broader perspective to effect more significant and focused beneficial change for salmon and steelhead. In addition, NMFS intends to implement every action within this Recovery Plan for which it has authority.

The following sections describe the methods NMFS intends to use when implementing various sections of the ESA. These methods are intended to institutionalize the Recovery Plans in the daily efforts and decision-making at NMFS in the Southwest Region. Of necessity, some of these methods address the urgent issues of staffing and workload that NMFS faces. As a result, our commitment to implementing Recovery Plans extends to the ways in which we prioritize the many requests for consultations and permits we receive.

15.2.1 ESA Section 4

Section 4 provides the mechanisms to list new species as threatened or endangered, designate critical habitat, develop protective regulations for threatened species, and to develop Recovery Plans. The currently designated critical habitat includes only a portion of the habitat which may be necessary for recovery of the DPS. NMFS intends on using our recovery strategy, recovery criteria and recommended recovery actions to review the Southern California steelhead DPS critical habitat designation. A review of the current critical habitat designations may result in modifications of the current critical habitat designations, including the addition of unoccupied habitat which exhibit Primary Constituent Elements (PCEs).

15.2.2 ESA Section 5

Section 5 is a program that applies to land acquisition with respect to the National Forest System. Four National Forests (Los Padres, Angeles, Cleveland and San Bernardino) are present within the range of southern California steelhead. As funds become available, NMFS will work with the U.S. Forest Service to acquire important habitat areas for the purpose of protecting habitat features and functions needed to support the expression of diversity and spatial structure in the species.

15.2.3 ESA Section 7

15.2.3.1 Section 7(a) (1)

Section 7(a)(1) provides that all Federal agencies shall "…in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretary, utilize their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of this Act by carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered species…". Section 7(a)(1) provides that Federal agencies give the conservation of endangered species a high priority.

To prompt Federal agencies to develop conservation programs to fulfill their Federal obligations, NMFS shall:

- Prepare, and send, after Recovery Plan approval, a letter to all other appropriate Federal agencies outlining section 7(a)(1) obligations and meet with these agencies to discuss listed steelhead conservation and recovery priorities;
- Incorporate recovery actions in formal consultations as Conservation Recommendations;
- Encourage meaningful and focused mitigation, in alignment with recovery goals for restoration and threats abatement, for all

actions that incidentally take steelhead or affect their habitat;

- Encourage Federal partners to include recovery actions in project proposals; and
- Incorporate conservation actions, as appropriate, into the actions that NMFS authorizes, funds, or carries out.

15.2.3.2 Section 7(a) (2)

The purpose of section 7(a)(2) is to "insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by [a Federal agency] is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any [listed species] or result in the destruction or adverse modification of [a listed species' critical habitat]." Federal agencies request interagency consultation with NMFS when they determine an action may affect a listed species or its critical habitat. NMFS then conducts an analysis of potential effects of the action. In the process of consultation, NMFS currently expends considerable effort to assist agencies in avoiding and minimizing the potential effects of proposed actions, and to ensure agency actions do not jeopardize a species or destroy or degrade habitat. Whether the action has a negative effect on the likelihood of the species recovering is considered as part of the analysis; the action may not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery. As a result, these consultations have helped avoid and minimize direct take and contributed to recovery of Southern California steelhead DPS.

Because section 7(a)(2) applies only to Federal actions, its applications are limited only to those areas and actions with federal ownership, oversight, or funding. In the Southern California Steelhead DPS, land ownership varies across the watersheds from areas with significant levels of public ownership to areas almost entirely privately owned. Most of the land use practices on private ownership do not trigger interagency consultation.

Currently, NMFS expends most of its staff time and resources on conducting section 7 consultations. Implementation of the Recovery Plan will require improvements to the process and application of section 7(a)(2) consultation requirements across the DPS.

In order to devote more resources towards recovery action implementation and to ensure section 7(a)(2) consultations are effective, NMFS will utilize its authorities to:

- Use recovery criteria, objectives, and ongoing monitoring efforts as a reference point to determine effects of proposed actions on the likelihood of species' recovery;
- Utilize information on threats to species recovery and needed actions to address such threats when evaluating the impacts of proposed Federal actions on southern California steelhead;
- Place high priority on consultations for actions that implement the recovery strategy or specific recovery actions;
- Develop and maintain databases to track the amount of incidental take authorized and effectiveness of conservation and mitigation measures;
- Incorporate recovery actions in formal consultations as Reasonable and Prudent Measures, Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives, and Conservation Recommendations as appropriate;
- Focus staff priorities towards section 7 and 9 compliance in watersheds identified as core populations for the purpose of recovery of the Southern California Steelhead DPS;
- Streamline consultations for those actions with little or no effect on recovery areas or priorities. Develop streamlined

programmatic approaches for those actions that do not pose a threat to the survival and recovery of the species; and

- Apply the VSP framework and recovery priorities to evaluate population and area importance in jeopardy and adverse modification analyses.

Within this framework NMFS will utilize its authorities to encourage:

- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to fund upgrades for flood-damaged facilities to meet the requirements of the ESA and facilitate recovery;
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to prioritize actions on pesticides known to be toxic to fish and/or are likely to be found in fish habitat; and to take protective actions, such as restrictions on pesticide use near water;
- Development of section 7 Conservation Recommendations to help prioritize Federal funding towards recovery actions (NFMS, USFWS, NRCS, EPA, *etc.*) during formal consultations;
- All Federal agencies that designate a non-Federal representative to conduct informal consultation or prepare a biological assessment to ensure the associated documentation comports to 50 CFR 402.14(c) prior to initiating consultations with NMFS; Compliance with these requirements is expected to increase consultation effectiveness and timeliness;
- All Federal agencies, or their designated representatives, to field review projects and actions upon project completion to determine whether or not the projects were implemented as planned and approved. Encourage all Federal agencies, or their designated representatives to report the initial findings of field review to NMFS; and
- Federal agencies to coordinate and develop programmatic incidental take authorization for activities that contribute to the recovery of southern California steelhead to streamline their permitting processes

15.2.4 ESA Section 9

Section 9 prohibits any person from harming members of listed species including direct forms of harm such as killing an individual, or indirect forms such as destruction of habitat where individuals rear or spawn. The Recovery Plan will assist NMFS' Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) personnel by targeting focus watersheds essential for species recovery. NMFS PRD staff will work closely with NMFS' OLE regarding the identification of threats and other activities believed to place steelhead at high risk of take.

Towards this end, NMFS will:

- Conduct outreach and provide the NMFS' OLE a summary of the recovery priorities and threats;
- Prioritize those actions and areas deemed of greatest threat or importance for focused efforts to halt illegal take of listed species
- Periodically review existing protocols establishing responsibilities and priorities between PRD and Enforcement to ensure activities by NMFS staff, when supporting NMFS' OLE are focused on the highest recovery priorities; and
- When take has occurred in a primary focus area, NMFS PRD will work with NMFS' OLE, to the extent feasible, with the development of a take statement.

15.2.5 ESA Section 10

Section 10(a)(1)(A) provides permits for the authorization of take of listed species for scientific research purposes, or to enhance the propagation or survival of listed species. Typically NMFS has authorized conservation hatcheries and research activities under section

10(a)(1)(A). Section 10(a)(1)(B) provides permits for otherwise lawful activities that incidentally take listed species. Habitat conservation plans minimizing and mitigating the incidental take of listed species from non-federal activities are prepared under section 10(a)(1)(B). Currently, both processes take a long time to implement and Recovery Plans have not been available to guide priorities for permit issuance. To improve the section 10 authorization process, NMFS will utilize its authorities in the following ways:

15.2.5.1 Section 10(a) (1) (A) Research Permits

In order to assure that the best available science is developed and used to recover the Southern California Steelhead DPS NMFS will:

- Prioritize permit applications that address identified research, monitoring, and/or enhancement activities, including any conservation hatchery operations, in the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan;
- Evaluate all proposed research and/or enhancement activities within the framework of identified threats, recovery strategy, and recovery actions identified in the Recovery Plan;
- Develop a streamlined process for permitting priority research activities to facilitate the implementation of the research program identified in the Recovery Plan; and
- Support and maintain the national research and enhancement database to track the amount of take authorized and the effectiveness of conservation and mitigation measures identified in the Recovery Plan.

15.2.5.2 Section 10(a) (1) (B) Habitat Conservation Plans

To ensure that all of the mechanisms available to achieve the goals, objectives and criteria of the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Plan, NMFS will:

- Place the highest priority on cooperation and assistance to landowners proposing activities or programs designed to achieve recovery objectives; and
- Prioritize those areas and actions where threats abatement has the potential to provide the most significant contribution to species recovery based on the threats assessment developed and updated as part of the Recovery Plan.

APPENDIX A

Glossary and Abbreviations

Acclimation
Gradual physiological adjustment in response to relatively long-term environmental changes.

Acidification
Ocean acidification is the process by which CO_2 is dissolved in seawater resulting in an increase in hydrogen ion (H+) concentration, and a corresponding decrease in the ocean's pH.

Acid Rain
Precipitation which contains sulfate aerosols consisting of sulfuric acid, derived from industrial and other emissions.

Age Class
Individuals in a population of the same age. In Pacific salmonids, an individual of less than one year is referred to a 0+ age class; a fish older than one, but less than two years, is termed a 1+ age class fish, etc.

Adaptation
The evolutionary process, whereby populations become better suited to deal with their physical and biological environments, and therefore to survive and reproduce. It is driven by a host of factors including population diversity (genetic, phenotypic, physiological, and behavioral), inter and intra-specific competition, natural selection, and genetic processes.

Adaptive Trait
Any specific physical, physiological, or behavioral trait of an organism that promotes the likelihood of an organism's survival and reproduction in a particular environment.

Adipose fin
Small fin located composed of fatty tissue on the top-side of a fish between the dorsal and caudal fin.

Adiabatic
Insulated from the surroundings, unable to gain or lose heat from the environment.

Albedo
The fraction of incoming solar radiation that is reflected back to space without being absorbed.

Allele
One of two or more forms of a gene. Sometimes, different alleles can result in different physical or physiological traits. Other times, different alleles will have the same result in the expression of a gene.

Allele Frequency
The relative proportion of all copies of a particular gene variant (allele) among the chromosomes carried by an individual of a population. In population genetics, allele frequencies are used to depict the amount of genetic diversity at the individual, population, and species level.

Alevins
Newly hatched salmon or trout with a visible yolk sac, usually still maturing while still in the redd.

Anadromous
A life history cycle that involves reproducing in freshwater, maturing in marine waters, and returning to freshwater to reproduce.

Anadromous Fraction
The proportion of a heterogeneous *O. mykiss* population that exhibits an anadromous life history, as opposed to the freshwater-resident life history.

Anadromous Waters
Water bodies typically accessible to fish migrating from the ocean, including estuaries, rivers, and lakes.

Anal fin
Fin located on the near the rear, and on the bottom side; used for stability when swimming.

Baseline
A set of reference data sets or analyses use for comparative purposes; it can be based on a reference year or a reference set of standard conditions.

Bayesian
A formal statistical approach in which expert knowledge or beliefs are analyzed together with data. Bayesian methods make explicit use of probability for quantifying uncertainty, and are used in decision making.

Benthic
A habitat or organism found on the stream, lake or ocean bottom.

Biological Diversity
The range of in a range of characteristics within an ecosystem or taxonomic group, including genetic, phenotypic and physiological variability of individuals, and life history strategies, age structure and fecundity of populations.

Bootstrap
A statistical methodology use to quantify the uncertainty associated with estimates obtained from a model. The bootstrap is often based on Monte Carlo resampling of residual form the initial model fit.

Brackish Water
Water that has more salinity than fresh water, but not as much as seawater. It may result from mixing of seawater with fresh water, as in estuaries, or it may occur in brackish fossil aquifers. Technically, brackish water contains between 0.5 and 30 grams of salt per liter—more often expressed as 0.5 to 30 parts per thousand (ppt or ‰). Thus, *brackish* covers a range of salinity regimes and is not a precisely defined condition. By comparison, average, seawater in the world's oceans has a salinity of about 35 ppt.

Brood Stock
Sexually mature individuals used within a hatchery or other controlled environment for breeding purposes.

Carnivore
An organism or species that derives its energy and nutrient requirements from a dies consisting mainly or exclusively of animal tissue, whether through predation or savaging. Animals that depend solely on animal flesh for their nutrient requirements are considered obligate carnivores while those that also consume non-animal food are considered facultative carnivores.

Carrying Capacity
The maximum population of a species that an area or specific ecosystem can support indefinitely without deterioration of the character and quality of the resources. It can also refer to the maximum level of recreational use, in term of numbers of people and type of activity, which can be accommodated before ecological value of the area declines.

Catadromous
A life history cycle that involves reproducing in saltwater, maturing in freshwater, and returning to saltwater to reproduce.

Caudal fin
Tail fin, usually with distinct rays; used principally for propulsion and turning.

Climate
The average prevailing conditions in the atmosphere (air temperature, wind speed and direction, humidity, precipitation, etc.) based upon a series of years.

Coded-wire Tag
Coded-wire tags are small pieces of stainless steel wire that are injected into the snouts of juvenile salmon and steelhead. Each tag is etched with a binary code that identifies its time and place of release.

Coefficient of Variation (CV)
The standard error of a statistic, divided by its point estimate. The CV gives an idea of the precision of an estimate, independent of its magnitude.

Competition
Interaction of individual organisms that occupy or share some part of an ecological niche such that both depend upon the same food source, shelter, or some other resource in the same community; competition may be between individuals of the same or different species.

Cohort
A group of fish generated during the same spawning season, and is part of the same age class.

Confidence Interval (CI)
The probability, based on statistics, that a number will be between and upper and lower bound.

Conspecific
Two or more individuals, populations, or other higher order taxonomic grouping such as a sub-species, are said to be conspecific when they belong to the same species.

Continental Shelf
The underwater shelf of the continent, extending seaward from the shore, with a moderate inclination, to the edge of the continental slope where the inclination increases sharply; water depth varies from 0 to 200 meters.

Demersal
Living in close association with the bottom and generally dependent upon it.

Demographic
Properties of a population such as rate of growth, age structure, sex ratio, number of reproductive individuals, etc.

Density Dependence
In population ecology density-dependence is any population characteristic that varies with the degree of the density of the population.

Density Independence
External factors that influence all individual of a population regardless of population density such as climate.

Dimorphism
Existence within a species of two distinct forms according to color, sex, size, organic structure, etc.

Distinct Population Segment
The smallest division of a taxonomic species that can be protected under the U.S. Endangered Species Act.

Dorsal fin
Located on the top side, generally mid-way along the body, and usually distinct rays; provides stability when swimming.

Ecological niche
The position a species or population its ecosystem. The ecological niche describes how an organism or population responds to the distribution of resources and competitors (*e.g.*, by growing when resources are abundant, and when predators, parasites and pathogens are scarce) and how it in turn alters those same factors (*e.g.*, limiting access to resources by other organisms, acting as a food source for predators and a consumer of prey).

Ecosystem
A biological environment consisting of all the organisms living and interacting in a particular area, as well as all the nonliving, physical components of the environment with which the organisms interact, such as air, soil, water and sunlight.

Ecosystem Functions
Intrinsic ecosystem characteristics related to the set of conditions and processes whereby an ecosystem maintains its integrity. Ecosystem functions include such processes as decomposition, production, nutrient cycling, and fluxes of nutrients and energy.

Ecosystem Services
The benefits that people obtain from functioning ecosystems; they include provisioning services such as food, timber, fiber, fuel and energy, and freshwater; regulating services such as air and water quality, equable climate, control of diseases, pests, and sediment supplies (e.g., beaches, building materials); supporting services such as soil formation, photosynthesis, nutrient cycle; and cultural services such as fulfilling spiritual, religious, and aesthetic needs.

Effective Population Size (N_e)
The number of individuals that contribute offspring to the next generation; generally smaller than the absolute population size (N); a basic parameter in many models in population genetics.

El Niño /La Niña Southern Oscillation
A weather pattern that occurs across the tropical Pacific Ocean roughly every five to seven years. It is characterized by variations in the surface temperature of the tropical eastern Pacific Ocean—warming associated with El Niño and cooling with La Niña. The two variations are coupled: the warm oceanic phase, El Niño, accompanies high air surface pressure in the western Pacific, while the cold phase, La Niña, accompanies low air surface pressure in the western Pacific. ENSO causes extreme weather (such as floods and droughts) in many regions of the world, including the west coast of the United States.

Emigration
Movement of individuals out of a population. With Pacific anadromous salmonids, emigration refers to the movement of juveniles (and also adults) from freshwater to a brackish or marine environment.

Endemic
Species or populations occurring in restricted geographic areas due to the presence of a unique suite of environmental and biological conditions that limit the distribution of the species or population.

Ephemeral Streams
Streams that flow briefly after rainstorms.

Essential Fish Habitat
Waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity (16U.S.C. 1802(10)).

Estuary
Estuaries form a transition zone between river environments and ocean environments and are subject to both marine influences, such as tides, waves, and the influx of saline water; and riverine influences, such as flows of fresh water and sediment. The inflow of both seawater and freshwater provide high levels of nutrients in both the water column and sediment, making estuaries among productive natural habitats.

Eutrophication
Enrichment of water by nutrients required for plant growth. The addition of artificial or natural substances, such as nitrates and phosphate through agricultural fertilizer or animal wastes, to an aquatic system. Negative environmental effects include the depletion of oxygen in the water, which induces reductions in specific fish and other animal populations.

Evolutionary Significant Unit
A population (or group of populations) which exhibit two biological characteristics: (1) it is substantially reproductively isolated from other conspecific (of the same taxonomic species) population units; and (2) it represents an important component of the evolutionary legacy of the species.

Evolvability
The potential to generate heritable variation with individuals of a population that can be exploited by natural or artificial selection**.**

Extinction
The disappearance of a species or some other taxonomic group from a region or biota; the precise moment of extinction is generally considered to be the death of the last individual of the species (although the capacity to reproduce and recover may have been lost before that point).
Eutrophication
The process by which a body of water becomes enriched in dissolved mineral nutrients (often phosphorus and nitrogen) that stimulates the growth of aquatic plants, and leads to depletion of dissolved oxygen, and the mortality of oxygen dependent organisms.

Fecundity
The reproductive potential or capacity of an organism or population, usually expressed as the number of eggs or progeny produced during a reproductive cycle. Fecundity usually increases with age and size.

Facultative
The characteristic of being able to adjust to a variety of conditions or circumstances; optional or discretionary.

Fish Ladder
An artificial facility made of a series of steps, with flowing water and pools, to assist fish in swimming up or downstream of a fish passage barrier such as a dam or diversion.

Fitness
The degree that an individual is adapted to or is able to produce progeny in its local environment.

Fry
Juvenile fish that have absorbed their yolk sacs and can emerge from a redd and into deeper water to feed on their own.

Genotype
The genotype of an organism is the inherited genetic code of the individual. Not all individuals with the same genotype look or behave the same way because appearance and behavior are modified by

environmental and developmental conditions. Similarly, not all individual that look alike necessarily have the same genotype.

Genetic Distance
A measure of the difference in allele frequencies between populations. Genetic distance can be used to compare the genetic similarity between different species, such as humans and chimpanzees. Within a species genetic distance can be used to measure the divergence between different sub-species, or populations of the same species.

Gravid
The condition of an individual female carrying ripe eggs, usually with a distended body.

Greenhouse Gas
A gas which is capable of absorbing and emitting infrared light (e.g., water vapor H_20, carbon dioxide $C0_2$, methane CH_4, nitrous oxide N_20, and ozone O_3).

Habitat
The area that is inhabited by a particular species of animal, plant or other type of organisms. It is the natural environment in which an organism lives, or the physical environment that surrounds (influences and is utilized by) a population of a species. The term microhabitat is often used to describe the small-scale physical requirements of a particular organism or population.

Herbivore
An organism that consumes living plants or their parts.

Hydrologic Cycle
The continuous movement of water on, above and below the surface of the Earth, such as from river to ocean, or from the ocean to the atmosphere, by the physical processes of evaporation, condensation, precipitation, infiltration, runoff, and subsurface flow. Water takes alternative forms of liquid, vapor, and a solid (snow and ice). The hydrologic cycle also involves the exchange of heat energy, which leads to temperature changes. For instance, in the process of evaporation, water takes up energy from the surroundings and cools the environment. Conversely, in the process of condensation, water releases energy to its surroundings, warming the environment.

The water cycle figures significantly in the maintenance of life and ecosystems on Earth. By transferring water from one location to another, the water cycle purifies water, replenishes the land with freshwater, and transports minerals to different parts of the globe. It is also involved in reshaping the geological features of the Earth, through such processes as erosion and sedimentation. The water cycle exerts an influence on climate as well.

Incidental Take
The unintentional take of a listed species as a result of the conduct of an otherwise lawful activity.

Independent population
Any collection of one or more local breeding units whose population dynamics or extinction risk over a 100-year time frame are not substantially altered by exchanges of individuals with other populations. For

example, if one independent population were to go extinct, it would not have a significant impact on the 100-year extinction risk experienced by other independent populations.

Indigenous Species
A species occurring naturally in a particular region, and not artificially introduced.

Intermittent Streams
Streams that flow for some, but not all, of the year. Such streams usually receive their waters primarily from surface runoff following storm events.

Interspecific
Interactions, such as competition or predation, between different species.

Interrupted Stream
Stream that flow alternately on and below the surface contemporaneously. Such streams often flow through coarse gravels.

Intraspecific
Interactions, such as competition or predation, between individuals of a single species.

Introgression
The movement of genes from one gene pool to another as a result of hybridization between individuals from genetically distinct populations.

Iteroparous
An organism that has the potential to reproduce more than one during its life cycle. Steelhead are the only members of the Pacific anadromous salmonids (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) that do not die after initial spawning , and may return to the ocean and then return to freshwater to repeat their reproductive phase.

Latent Heat
Heat carried by water, and released when the water vapor condenses to liquid.

Lateral line
A series of sensory receptor arrayed along the sides mid-way between top and bottom of the body; these sensory receptors detect water movement around the fish, allowing it to efficiently navigate currents, detect prey, and swim in coordination with other fish of the same species.

Life Cycle
The successive series of changes through which an organism passes, whether through asexual or sexual reproduction, including breeding, gestation, growth and maturation, and death. This cycle of phases of an individual is also referred to a life history.

Life History Crossover
In Pacific salmonids, the ability of anadromous *O. mykiss to* produce progeny which assume a freshwater reproductive life cycle, and the ability of resident *O. mykiss*, to produce progeny which assume an anadromous reproductive life cycle.

Life History Polymorphism
In Pacific salmonids, the co-occurrence of the anadromous and resident life cycle forms within a population.

Limiting Factor
Any factor that controls a process, such as organism growth or species population size, or distribution. The availability of food, predation pressure, or availability of shelter are examples of natural limiting factors. An example of an anthropogenic limiting factor is set of barriers to migration, which is necessary to complete an organism's life cycle.

Littoral Zone
The zone along the coast the forms the interface between the land and water, and often includes intertidal and near-shore waters.

Mediterranean Climate
The climate is characterized by warm to hot, dry summers and mild to cool, wet winters. Mediterranean climate zones are associated with the five large subtropical high pressure cells of the major oceans. These high pressure cells shift toward the poles in the summer and toward equator in the winter.

Meristics
Measurements of an organism's physical characteristics such as length, scale, spine, fin-ray counts.

Metapopulation
A set of populations that is composed of multiple local populations geographically separated but connected through dispersal and periodic interbreeding. Generally individual populations within such a system have a relatively high probability of local extinction and also recolonization by other populations within the metapopulation. Metapopulations persist as a result of a balance between extinctions of subpopulations and recolonization by others.

Migrate
Travelling of long distances in search of a specific type of habitat to enable an organism to complete some phase of its life cycle; fish such as Pacific anadromous salmonids migrate between their spawning and rearing areas in freshwater habitat the marine environment to feed and grow to maturity.

Mathematical Model
A quantitative description of anything (including processes) that cannot be directly observed, but for which relevant data can be developed, and used to simulate an approximation or estimate of the thing being modeled.

Natural Selection
The process by which the frequency of genetic traits in a population through differential survival and reproduction of individual bearing those traits is determined. Natural selection acts on the phenotype or the observable characteristics of an organism, but the genetic (heritable) basis of any phenotype which gives a reproductive advantage will become more common in a population (see allele frequency). Over time, this process can result in adaptation that adapts populations for a particular ecological niche and may eventually result in the emergence of new species. It is a key mechanism of evolution.

Obligate
The characteristic of being unable able to adjust to a variety of conditions or circumstances; a life history or response to particular environmental conditions without alternative means of responding.

Omnivore
An organism whose diet is broad, including both plant and animal foods; specifically an organism that feeds on more than one trophic level; omnivorous organisms are opportunistic, general feeders not specifically adapted to eat and digest either meat or plant material primarily.

Operculum
The gill cover in bony fishes

Orographic Precipitation
Precipitation induced when air masses pushed by winds are forced up the side of elevated land formations, such as large mountains. The lift of the air up the side of the mountain results in cooling, and ultimately condensation and precipitation.

Otolith
Calcareous concretions in the inner "ear" of lower vertebrates such as fish; the daily accumulation calcareous layers of can be used to determine the age of an organism, and in some cases detect the time spent in waters with different chemical composition (*e.g.*, salt and freshwater).

Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO)
A pattern of climate variability that shifts phases on at least an inter-decadal time scale, usually about 20 to 30 years. The PDO is detected as warm or cool surface waters in the Pacific Ocean north of 20° N. During a "warm", or "positive", phase, the west Pacific becomes cool and part of the eastern ocean warms; during a "cool" or "negative" phase, the opposite pattern occurs.

Panmictic Population
A population in which all individuals are potential reproductive partners, that is, there are no restrictions of mating (e.g., genetic or behavioral).

Parameterization
A technique used in constructing models of substituting an unknown feature such as process or limit, with a simplified, but informed estimate of the feature.

Parr
The rearing stage of freshwater salmonids between alevins and smolt that is distinguished by vertical bars or oval spots (parr marks) on the side of the fish.

Pectoral fin
Fin located high up on the sides of deep bodied fish; used for precise movements.

Pelvic fin
Fin located toward the rear of the fish; used for steering and stopping.

Pelagic
Associated with the open sea or at or near the water's surface. Pelagic fish live near the surface or in the water column of coastal, ocean and lake waters, but not on the bottom of the sea or the lake. They are usually agile swimmers with streamlined bodies, capable of sustained cruising on long distance migrations. They can be contrasted with demersal fish which do live on or near the bottom, and reef fish which are associated with coral or volcanic reefs.

pH
A measure of the acidity or basicity of an aqueous solution (generally expresses as the concentration of H+ ions). pH is normally measured in a range of 0-14. Pure water is said to be neutral, with a pH close to 7.0 at 25 ^{0}C (77 ^{0}F). Solutions with a pH less than 7 are said to be acidic and solutions with a pH greater than 7 are basic or alkaline.

Phenotype
Any observable characteristic or trait of an organism such as its morphology (shape and size) developmental pattern, biochemical or physiological properties, and behavior. Phenotypes result from the expression of an organism's genes as well as the influence of environmental factors and the interactions between the two.

Phenotypic Plasticity
The ability of an individual to modify behavioral or other phenotypic characteristics to adjust to differing environmental conditions. In some Pacific salmonids such as steelhead, phenotypic plasticity refers to the ability to adopt either the anadromous or freshwater-resident life cycle, depending on environmental cues or influences.

Photic Zone
The surface layer of water where there is sufficient light for photosynthesis to occur.

Population
A group of interbreeding individuals that have developed a distinct gene pool and that breed in approximately the same place and time.

Population Density
The number of individuals per unit area, or linear distance.

Population Model
A quantitative description of how a population changes over time; population models can take a variety of basic forms, including age/size structured or biomass based, deterministic, or stochastic, density-dependent, or density-independent, spatially structured, or spatially aggregated, equilibrium or nonequilibrium.

Predation
Predation describes a biological interaction a predator feeds on its prey. Predators may or may not kill their prey prior to feeding them, but the act of predation always results in the death of its prey and the eventual absorption of the prey's tissue through consumption. The key characteristic of predation however is the predator's direct impact on the prey population.

Primary Productivity
The production of organic compounds from atmospheric or aquatic carbon dioxide, principally through the process of photosynthesis, with chemosynthesis being much less prevalent. Almost all life on earth is directly or indirectly reliant on primary production. The organisms responsible for primary production form the base of the food chain. In terrestrial ecosystem these are mainly plants; in aquatic ecosystems, algae are primarily responsible.

Radiative Balance
The physical state of a system, such as the earth-atmosphere system, where the incoming and outgoing solar radiation is in equilibrium; greenhouse gases diminish outgoing solar radiation**.**

R-strategists
R-strategists are species characterized by relatively early age of first reproduction, large brood size, numerous progeny, no parental care, and short generations. Populations exhibit exponential growth rate followed by sudden crashes in population size, and tend to live in unpredictable and rapidly changing environments. Pacific anadromous salmonids are an example of an r-strategist species.

Recruitment
The number of fish from a year class reaching a certain age; in fisheries management it is generally the number of fish that grow to a size subject to harvesting.

Redd
A shallow gravel depression excavated by a fish for the purpose of depositing its eggs within the stream channel.

Refugia
Habitats where individuals can avoid predation or environmental stressors such as elevated temperatures, or flood flows.

Relative humidity
The amount of water vapor in the air, compared with complete saturation. If relative humidity is greater than 100%, the vapor will tend to condense to liquid, until 100% is reached.

Salmonids
Fish of the taxonomic family Salmonidae that includes salmon, trout, whitefish, and char.

Seasonal Lagoon
An estuary that becomes separated from the ocean by a sandbar barrier for part of the year.

Sea Level Rise
The rise in average sea level elevation with respect to current terrestrial elevations. Increasing sea level is the result of increasing temperatures causing the thermal expansion of water and the addition of water to the oceans from the melting of mountain glaciers, polar ice caps, and Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets.

Semelparous
Organisms which reproduce only once. The single reproductive event of semelparous organisms is usually large, as well as fatal. An example of a semelparous organism is the Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.), which lives for several years in the ocean before migrating to the freshwater stream of its birth, laying eggs, and dying.

Sink Population
A local population that has a negative growth rate, or a high probability of periodic extinction; it continued persistence is dependent upon immigration from other local populations, or dispersal from more remote populations.

Smolt
A young salmon or steelhead that is undergoing physiological changes in preparation for entering the ocean.

Source Population
A local population that has a sufficiently high growth rate when small to persist even without immigration from other local populations, or dispersal from more remote populations.

Spawning Density
The number of potentially spawning individual in a length of stream, tributary, or some other hydrologic unit.

Steelhead
A rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) that exhibits an anadromous life cycle.

Stochastic
The state where a system's components are affected by random variability. A stochastic model is a model whose behavior is not fully specified by its form and parameters, but which contains an allowance for unexplained effected represented by random variables.

Stratification
The establishment of distinct layers of temperature or salinity in bodies of water such as an ocean, lake, or estuary, based upon the different density of warm and cold water or saline or freshwater.

Sustainable Fishery
A fishery that does not cause or lead to undesirable changes in the biological and/or economic productivity, biological diversity, ore ecosystem structure and functioning from one human generation to the next.

Taxon
Any named group of organisms at any taxonomic level (*e.g.*, Phylum, Order, Class, Genus, Species, etc.).

Temperature Lapse Rate
The rate of decrease in temperature with altitude in the stationary atmosphere at a given time and location.

Thermocline
A region below the surface layer of the sea or lake, or pool where the temperature gradient increases abruptly (*i.e.*, where temperature decreases rapidly with increasing depth). It is often an ecological barrier, and its oscillations have significant consequences on the distribution of organisms.

Total-Length (TL)
The length of a fish defined as the straight-line distance from the tip of the snout to the tip of the tail (caudal fin) while the fish is lying on its side normally extended.

Triploid
An organism having three sets of chromosomes.

Trophic Level
The position an organism or species occupies in the food chain, or web. A food chain represents a succession of organisms that eat another organism and are, in turn, eaten themselves. The number of energy transfer steps organism is from the start of the chain is a measure of its trophic level. Food chains start at trophic level 1 with primary producer such as plants, move to herbivores level 2, predators at level 3 and typically finish with carnivores or aped predators at level 4 or 5.determined by the number of energy-transfer steps to that level.

Upwelling
An oceanographic phenomenon that involves wind-driven motion of dense, cooler, and usually nutrient-rich water towards the ocean surface, replacing the warmer, usually nutrient-depleted surface water. The increased availability in upwelling regions results in high levels of primary productivity and thus fish growth and abundance. Wind-driven currents are diverted to the right of the winds in the Northern Hemisphere and to the left in the Southern Hemisphere. When surface water transport is occurring away from the coast, surface waters are replaced by deeper, colder, and denser water.

Viable Salmonid Population
An independent population of any Pacific salmonid (genus Oncorhynchus) that has a negligible risk of extinction due to threats from demographic variation (such as population size or sex ratio), local environmental variations, and genetic diversity changes over a 100-year time frame.

Viability Population Parameters
The four measurable characteristics of a viable salmonid population: abundance, growth rate, spatial structure, and diversity (including genetic, phenotypic diversity).

Volitional Fish Passage
The natural movement of fish in response to cues such as natural flow patterns or water temperature, or natural physiological changes in individuals.

Weathering
The physical/chemical processes in which a material is broken down through exposure to the atmospheric conditions (heat, water, etc.)

Young-of-the Year
Fish that are less than a year old (and are in their first year of growth).

Abbreviations

AC	Audubon California
ACOE	Army Corps of Engineers
ACWA	Association of California Water Agencies
AFRP	Anadromous Fish Restoration Program
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
BOR	Bureau of Reclamation
BPG	Biogeographic Population Group
BRT	Biological Review Team
CAMP	Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program
CCC	California Coastal Commission
CCRB	Cachuma Conservation Release Board
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDF	California Department of Forestry
CDOT	California Department of Transportation
CDPR	California Department of Parks and Recreation
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CI	Confidence Interval
CMARP	Comprehensive Monitoring Assessment and Research Program
CMWD	Casitas Municipal Water District
COMB	Cachuma Operations and Maintenance Board
CSCC	California State Coastal Conservancy
C^0	Centigrade
cm	Centimeters
cm/sec	Centimeters per second
CT	California Trout
CV	Coefficient of Variation
CWT	Coded Wire Tag
DIDSON	Dual-Frequency Identification Sonar
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DWR	Department of Water Resources
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EII	Earth Island Institute
ENSO	El Nino/Southern Oscillation
ESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FLC	Fallbrook Land Conservancy
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FL	Fork Length
FLC	Fallbrook Land Conservancy
FOLAR	Friends of the Los Angeles River
FOR	Friends of the River
FOSCR	Friends of the Santa Clara River
FOSMR	Friends of the Santa Margarita River

FOVR	Friends of the Ventura River
FRGP	Fisheries Restoration Grant Program
ft/sec	Feet per second
GSDCRCD	Greater San Diego County Resource Conservation District
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
IRWMP	Integrated Watershed Management Plan
km/hr	Kilometers per hour
KSW	Keep Sespe Wild
LAC	Los Angeles County
LPFW	Los Padres Forest Watch
m	Meters
mi^2	Square miles
m/sec	Meters per second
mm	Millimeters
MC	Matilija Coalition
MWDSC	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
MRCD	Mission Resource Conservation District
ORCP	Otay River Conservation Program (WildCoast)
TBD	To Be Determined
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPSPWRO	National Park Service, Pacific Western Regional Office
NRCS	National Resources Conservation Service
OC	Orange County
OVLC	Ojai Valley Land Conservancy
PCSRF	Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund
PITT	Passive Integrated Responder Tags
ppt	Parts per thousand
PVA	Population Viability Analyses
RC	Riverside County
RFID	Radio Frequency Identification
RM	River Mile
RST	Rotary Screw Trap
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SARWA	Santa Ana River Watershed Alliance
SBC	Santa Barbara County
SBRC	San Bernardino County
SCHR	South Coast Habitat Restoration
SCCWRP	Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
SDBNWR	San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge
SDC	San Diego County
SDRPF	San Diego River Park Foundation
SDRVC	San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
SDSRF	San Diego Surfrider Foundation

SDT	San Diego Trout
SDWA	San Diego Water Authority
SGMRC	San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy
SLRWC	San Luis Rey Watershed Council
SMBRC	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission
SMCC	San Mateo Creek Conservancy
SMMC	Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
SMMRCD	Santa Monica Mountains Resource Conservation District
SWA	Sweetwater Authority
SWMNWR	Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge
SWP	State Water Project
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TBD	To Be Determined
TCFT	Tri-County Fish Team
TL	Total Length
TRAN	Tijuana River Action Network
TRNER	Tijuana River National Estuarine Reserve
TRT	Technical Recovery Team
TU	Trout Unlimited
TWC	The Wildlands Conservancy
USFS	United States Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
USLRRCD	Upper San Luis Rey Resource Conservation District
UWCD	United Water Conservation District
VC	Ventura County
VSP	Viable Salmonid Population
USAF	United States Air Force
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USMC	United States Marine Corps

APPENDIX B
Watershed Intrinsic Potential Rankings

Watershed rankings in the Southern California Steelhead DPS.[1] The rankings are based on the amount of potential habitat as in indicator of potential viability. Watersheds are ranked on the single habitat model that is preferred on *a priori* biological grounds. Horizontal bars show the range of ranks (minimum and maximum) for 48 variant biological models (See Boughton *et al*. 2006).



[1] Category 1 Watersheds are watersheds that experience regular winter flows to the ocean and therefore provide access to freshwater spawning areas. Category 2 Watersheds (*i.e.,* all large Watersheds within the southern portion of the Southern California Steelhead DPS, and the Santa Maria River) experience irregular winter flows to the ocean, even in an unimpaired state. Bars indicate the range of ranks (minimum and maximum) for 48 variant models. (See Boughton *et al*. 2006).

APPENDIX C

COMPOSITION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RECOVERY PLANNING AREA STEELHEAD BPGs

Biogeographic Group	Member Populations (ordered north to south)
Monte Arido Highlands	Santa Maria River, Santa Ynez River, Ventura River, Santa Clara River
Conception Coast[1]	Jalama Creek, Cañada de Santa Anita, Cañada de la Gaviota, Cañada San Onofre, Arroyo Hondo, Arroyo Quemado, Tajiguas Creek, Cañada del Refugio, Cañada del Venadito, Cañada del Corral, Cañada del Capitan, Gato Canyon, Dos Pueblos Canyon, Eagle Canyon, Tecolote Canyon, Bell Canyon, Goleta Slough Complex, Arroyo Burro, Mission Creek, Montecito Creek, Oak Creek, San Ysidro Creek, Romero Creek, Arroyo Paredon, Carpinteria Salt Marsh Complex, Carpinteria Creek, Rincon Creek
Santa Monica Mtns[1]	Big Sycamore Canyon, Arroyo Sequit, Malibu Creek, Topanga Canyon, Solstice
Mojave Rim	Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, Santa Ana River (multiple subpopulations)
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	San Juan Creek, San Mateo Creek, San Onofre Creek, Santa Margarita River, San Luis Rey River, San Dieguito River, San Diego River, Sweetwater River, Otay River, Tijuana River

[1] Population delineations in these groups may be split too finely if there is significant dispersal of fish among neighboring coastal watersheds. For discussion see Boughton *et al.* 2006.

APPENDIX D

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA STEELHEAD RECOVERY PLANNING AREA THREATS ASSESSMENT (CAP WORKBOOK) METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) contracted with Hunt & Associates Biological Consulting Services to provide technical support in developing Recovery Plans for *Oncorhynchus mykiss* populations in the Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. Hunt & Associates (2008a, 2008b) was tasked with reviewing existing information on *O. mykiss* habitat conditions, assessing the magnitude and extent of threats to *O. mykiss* and their habitats, and developing recovery actions across the Southern California Coast Recovery Planning Area. This document summarizes the methodology used to assess *O. mykiss* threats and sources of threats in Southern California coastal watersheds from the Santa Maria watershed of Santa Barbara County southward to the Tijuana River watershed in San Diego County. Specifically, this document details the use of modified Conservation Action Planning Workbooks to assess watershed and life stage specific threats and threat sources for Southern California Coast *O. mykiss*. CAP workbooks have been developed previously for salmonid threat assessment and recovery planning for southern Oregon and northern California coast coho salmon as well as south-central and southern California steelhead. However, previous *O. mykiss* threat assessment workbooks, described in Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service (2008b), were not inclusive of all watersheds within the Southern California Coast Recovery Planning Area or all available environmental data and information. The CAP workbook analysis results presented in this Recovery Plan builds on information presented in these earlier versions.

Methods

The Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Workbook is a database tool developed by The Nature Conservancy to identify conservation targets, assess existing habitat conditions, and identify management issues for target populations. CAP is a Microsoft Excel-based tool that facilitates the assessment of aquatic habitat quality and human-caused threats to that habitat. The CAP Workbook process uses available information in an explicit, consistent, and transparent way, to assess current habitat conditions. The CAP Workbook allows the user to input quantitative as well as qualitative (including best professional judgment) information in order to determine what existing conditions are and what healthy targets should look like. Once data are entered, the CAP workbook then links the observed aquatic habitat conditions to watershed conditions, provides a prioritized list of threats, and provides a summary of overall watershed health. The CAP Workbooks can be used to organize and evaluate large amounts of information on current *O. mykiss* habitat conditions and threats in selected watersheds. The Workbook is iterative and should be updated as additional information becomes available.

The CAP Workbook methodology provides a number of useful features in assessing the magnitude and extent of threats to *O. mykiss* and their habitats in that it:

- Incorporates both quantitative and qualitative (*e.g.*, professional judgment) measures of existing habitat conditions;

- Is an objective, consistent tool for tracking changes in the status of each conservation target (i.e., *O. mykiss* life history stage) over time and between watersheds;
- Provides an overall assessment of a watershed's "health" or viability and objective comparisons to other watersheds;
- Focuses recovery actions by identifying past, current, and potential threats to *O. mykiss* and their habitats;
- Becomes a central repository for documenting and updating knowledge and assumptions about existing conditions; and
- Creates a foundation upon which recovery actions can be tracked and up-dated, based on changing current conditions.

Thirty-four out of 46 coastal watersheds were identified as supporting historical and extant *O. mykiss* populations within the SCS Recovery Area (Boughton *et al.* 2006, Becker *et. al.* 2008, Sleeper 2002, Titus *et al.* 2010, M. Larson, personnel communication 2007-2010). Of the thirty-four coastal watersheds, 26 were selected for threats assessment analysis. A separate CAP Workbook was created for each of the 46 component drainages (Table D-1). Information on existing *O. mykiss* habitat conditions in each watershed was gathered from a broad range of published and unpublished materials, including, peer-reviewed scientific publications, technical reports, federal, state, and local planning documents, EIS/EIRs, management plans, passage barrier assessments, habitat evaluations, and field surveys, as well as information provided by NOAA-NMFS staff, and stakeholders and other interested parties at a series of public workshops held in 2007. These sources are listed in the bibliography at the end of this document.

The CAP workbook data base organized data around several basic categories for analysis; these include conservation targets and related key ecological attributes.

Conservation Targets. Specific "conservation targets" for analysis within a CAP workbook must be identified by the user. The conservation targets in this case were *O. mykiss* life history stages: egg, fry, smolt, and adult. A more general conservation target, "Multiple Life Stages", was also established to allow landscape-scale land use and habitat assessment, based on information derived from GIS-based analysis of entire watersheds.

Key Ecological Attributes (KEAs). Assessing the "viability" or "health" of a particular conservation target (i.e., life history stage) required identifying "Key Ecological Attributes" (KEA) for each target. Specific 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, 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.

All KEAs were grouped into three categories:

- *Size*: target abundance *(e.g.*, number of adult *O. mykiss*);
- *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).

Because of the lack of consistent data regarding many key ecological attributes for most of the watersheds,, as well as the lack of established reference values for parameters such as water temperature, the threat assessment utilized the presence threat sources such as physical passage barriers such as dams, extent of surface and groundwater extractions, agricultural and urban development, flood control facilities, mining and quarrying operation, and non-native, invasive species to evaluate threats to steelhead, and the overall condition of individual watersheds. This assessment was used to identify recovery actions which target these threat sources.

The following table provides an inventory of the watersheds for which CAP workbooks were developed, organized by the five Biogeographic Population Groups of the Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area.

Table D-1. Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Area Component Biogeographic Population Groups, Watersheds, and Corresponding CAP Workbooks.

BPG	Watershed	CAP Workbook
Monte Arido Highlands	Santa Maria River	Mainstem Santa Maria River
		Cuyama River
		Sisquoc River
	Santa Ynez River	Mainstem Santa Ynez River (lower, middle, and upper)
	Ventura River	Mainstem Ventura River
		Coyote Creek
		Mainstem Matilija Creek
		North Fork Matilija Creek
		San Antonio Creek
	Santa Clara River	Mainstem Santa Clara River
		Santa Paula Creek
		Sespe Creek
		Piru Creek
Conception Coast	Jalama Creek	Jalama Creek
	Canada de Santa Anita	Canada de Santa Anita
	Gaviota Creek	Gaviota Creek
	Arroyo Hondo Creek	Arroyo Hondo Creek
	Tecolote Creek	Tecolote Creek
	Goleta Slough	San Jose, Atascadero, San Pedro & Maria Ygnacio creeks
	Mission Creek	Mission Creek
	Montecito Creek	Montecito Creek
	Carpinteria Creek	Carpinteria Creek
	Rincon Creek	Rincon Creek
Santa Monica Mountains	Big Sycamore Canyon Creek	Big Sycamore Canyon Creek
	Arroyo Sequit	Arroyo Sequit
	Malibu Creek	Malibu Creek
	Las Flores Canyon Creek	Las Flores Canyon Creek
	Topanga Canyon Creek	Topanga Canyon Creek
Mojave Rim	Los Angeles River	Mainstem Los Angeles River
		Arroyo Seco
	San Gabriel River	Mainstem San Gabriel River
		East Fork San Gabriel River
		West Fork San Gabriel River
	Santa Ana River	Mainstem Santa Ana River
		Lytle Creek
		Mill Creek
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	San Juan River	San Juan River/Trabuco Creek
	San Mateo Creek	San Mateo Creek
	San Onofre Creek	San Onofre Creek
	Santa Margarita River	Santa Margarita River
	San Luis Rey River	San Luis Rey River
	San Dieguito River	San Dieguito River
	San Diego River	San Diego River
	Sweetwater River	Sweetwater River
	Otay River	Otay River
	Tijuana River	Tijuana River

Current Indicators. The range of variation found for each indicator was then subdivided into four somewhat 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. A description of indicators used in the CAP steelhead analyses and the rationale for these indicators is available in Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service (2008). Functionally, however, we assumed that there are essentially two states for an indicator as it relates to the target: 1) "poor-fair", in which the indicator exceeds or minimally meets the requirements for species survival and the population is in danger of extirpation, and 2) "good-very good", where habitat conditions are favorable for species persistence.

The CAP Workbook can use indicators at a local, regional, and landscape-scale. 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 Kier Associates and NMFS, 2008b). These landscape-scale metrics were used in this threat assessment to overcome logistical and analytical problems inherent in local-scale metrics of *O. mykiss* habitat quality (*e.g.*, water temperature), that exhibit extreme spatial and temporal variation, which can lead to misinterpretations.

The goal of establishing measurable indicators in a number of instances was not possible with the current knowledge of existing habitat conditions in the component watersheds. For example, turbidity is known to be an important habitat indicator for *O. mykiss*. For the *O. mykiss* fry life stage, turbidity was defined as the "number of days turbidity exceeded 25 NTUs"[1]. Currently, there is little or no systematic and widespread collection of turbidity data in most of the subject watersheds drainages to permit a quantitative assessment of this indicator. 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. Because the CAP Workbook analysis is iterative, results can be improved as better quantitative information becomes available.

Stresses and Sources of Stress (Threats). An important step in the CAP Workbook assessment, and the purpose of these analyses, is identification of a series of stresses to each *O. mykiss* life history stage. These stresses are basically altered KEAs, *e.g.*, degraded hydrologic function, increased turbidity, presence of non-native predators, increased substrate embeddedness. Because of the lack of field derived information on specific habitat requirements and specific habitat conditions, the GIS-based surrogate variables used for the "Multiple Life Stages" conservation target actually are sources of stress, not direct stressors on *O. mykiss* life stages; for example,, increased road density (a source of stress) contributes indirectly to increased turbidity (a direct stressor). The severity (very high, high, medium, or low) and geographic scope (very high, high, medium, and low) of each stress was determined through a review of existing information. The CAP Workbook then 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.*). Each threat is ranked 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

[1] Nephelometric Turbidity Unit.

the threat (source of stress) as "Very High', "High", "Medium", or "Low" and inputs that rank into the next step of the assessment. This process is repeated for each conservation target (egg, fry, juvenile, smolt, and adult), as well as the "Multiple Life Stages" conservation target.

Summary of Threats. The CAP Workbook ranks the threat sources for each conservation target (*i.e.,* life history stage) 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 assessment is 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" table 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 the most useful in analyzing stresses and sources of stress to *O. mykiss* in the Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area.

Data Gaps. The tables in the CAP Workbooks for the present study have numerous 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 relevant to *O. mykiss*, with a few notable exceptions, decreased 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). However, an important feature of the CAP Workbook methodology is the ability to update the assessment as information becomes available.

The CAP Workbook analysis of Southern California *O. mykiss* prepared by Hunt & Associates was intended to build on those prepared previously by Kier Associates. Hunt & Associates' workbooks are based on review of a large number and broad range of ground-based *O. mykiss* 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 each of the 46 watersheds in the Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. Kier Associates analyzed 31 of these watersheds, using the GIS-based regional indicators and a small number of point-data measurements (e.g., dissolved oxygen, water temperature, *etc.*). Kier Associates' workbooks are provided in a separate document (Kier Associates and NMFS, 2008b).

Table D-2 compares the results of the two documents for watersheds in the Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area. It should be noted that the difference between a "poor" and "fair" habitat rating and a "good" and "very good" rating was often a matter of professional judgment and may not always represent ecologically important differences in habitat quality. Table D-2 compares the discrepancies between "poor-fair" and "good-very good" categories between the Hunt & Associates and Kier Associates CAP Workbook analyses.

Discrepancies typically could be explained by the type (point-data measurements) and the number of indicators used in the analysis by Kier Associates versus Hunt & Associates. 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-data measurements, such as water temperature or dissolved oxygen, that exhibit extreme spatial and temporal variation, then different results can be obtained. Aside from these relatively few specific differences, the results of the two assessments closely agree.

Further refinement of individual threat severity and threat sources in specific watersheds was conducted for these threat assessments by using information from NOAA staff familiar with these watersheds to override individual assessments.

Table D-2. Assessment of Overall Habitat Conditions for Steelhead in Component Watersheds in the Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area Between Two CAP Workbook Analyses*

WATERSHED	Steelhead Habitat Rating		Reasons for Discrepancy**
	Hunt & Associates	Kier Associates	
Santa Maria River			N/A
Santa Ynez River			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Ventura River			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Santa Clara River			N/A
Gaviota Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Arroyo Hondo			Hunt & Associates rates passage barrier at Highway 101 as severe, but being re-designed for fish passage. Override function used to rate this relatively undisturbed watershed as "good"
Tecolote Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Goleta Slough			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Mission Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Montecito Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Carpinteria Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Rincon Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Big Sycamore Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Arroyo Sequit			fewer number of indicators used in the Kier analyses
Malibu Creek			N/A
Las Flores Canyon Creek			N/A
Topanga Canyon Creek			N/A

Los Angeles River			N/A
San Gabriel River			N/A
Santa Ana River			N/A
San Juan/Trabuco Creek			N/A
San Mateo Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses
San Onofre Creek			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses
Santa Margarita River			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses
San Luis Rey River			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses
San Dieguito River			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses
San Diego River			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses
Sweetwater River			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses
Otay River			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses
Tijuana River			fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses

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

**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). Many of the watersheds exhibit higher quality habitat conditions in portions of the watershed (particularly in upper tributaries, or publically owned reaches) than the overall ranking indicates; however, conditions for the anadromous form of O. mykiss in these watersheds is generally fair to poor as evidenced by the severely depressed (or in some cases irregular, or non-existent) annual run size of anadromous O. mykiss.*

***Pervasive discrepancies between Hunt & Associates vs. Kier Associates "poor" and "fair" categories here are due to fewer number of indicators used in the latter analyses. Watersheds analyzed only by Hunt & Associates are not shown.*

The full CAP Workbooks, with references, are available upon request to NOAA Fisheries Southwest Regional Office, Long Beach, CA.

APPENDIX E

RECOVERY ACTION COST ESTIMATES FOR STEELHEAD RECOVERY PLANNING

Introduction

The ESA provides that "recovery plans, shall, to the maximum extent practicable . . . incorporate in each plan . . . (iii) . . . estimates of the time required and the cost to carry out those measures needed to achieve the plan's goal and to achieve intermediate steps toward that goal." NMFS interim recovery planning guidance (2010) further provides that, "There may be extreme cases in which estimating the date and cost to recovery is not possible due to uncertainty in what actions will need to be taken to recover the species." The precision of any recovery cost estimate is necessarily governed by the specificity of the recovery action, and the availability of information regarding the costs of individual components of that recovery action (labor, materials, logistics, geographic scope and duration, etc.).

As noted in the Recovery Plan, there are many uncertainties regarding the recovery of southern California steelhead, ranging from fundamental biological questions about the ecology of the species, to anticipated changes in climate. The Recovery Plan identifies categories of systemic threat sources within individual watersheds across the DPS but, because of the large number of individual threats (from site-specific activities to general land-use practices), does not provide a detailed assessment of each specific threat, and in many cases calls for further investigations to more clearly characterize and assess threats which are believed to be of particular significance for the conservation of the species (*e.g.*, fish passage barrier inventories, flows restrictions, introduction exotic species, and degradation of estuarine and other habitat types). Because of the uncertainties regarding specific aspects of the life history of steelhead (*e.g.*, relationship between anadromous vs. resident reproductive life history cycles), the Recovery Plan also provides provisional viability, delisting and downlisting criteria, and identifies important research and monitoring needed to better illuminate the biological requirements of the species and thereby better refine the viability, delisting and downlisting criteria, and related recovery actions.

The recovery action tables (Tables 9-4 through 13-10) developed for each BPG within the DPS identify broadly conceived recovery actions for each major threat source in all the core populations (as well as providing a priority ranking for recovery action within each core watershed). These recovery actions are based on the general recovery action descriptions contained in Chapter 8, Summary DPS-Wide Recovery Actions, Table 8.2 (Recovery Action Glossary). However, implementation of the recovery actions will require detailed background studies, and in some cases, engineering and other types of site-specific plans and/or environmental documentation, to further refine the nature, scope and other relevant details of the recovery action. Within the limits of these information constraints, an effort has been made to identify, within an order of magnitude, the estimated cost of the basic types of recovery actions.

Cost Estimation Methodology

The following describes the methods by which cost of individual types of recovery actions were estimated.

NMFS's Southwest Region has utilized a series of assumption tables for costs derived initially from the Southwest Region's *Habitat Restoration Cost References for Salmon Recovery Planning* (Thompson and Pinkerton 2008). These assumption tables have been adjusted to the extent practicable to reflect conditions in southern California, and applied across the DPS.

The "Cost of Doing Business" is estimated on a staff-time basis. When staff is required for review only, the cost is attributed to the initial fiscal year; when implementation is intended, the staff time is annually attributed across the projected duration of the recovery action. All other costs are estimated on a per project, per area, or per distance basis.

Finally the cost estimates provided in the cost assumption tables are the direct costs of implementing each recovery action, and do not reflect indirect costs, or benefits (*e.g.*, benefits to the local economy stemming from restored habitats that support recreational activities, reducing flood hazards, improving water quality, etc.).

Agricultural Development

The costs for implementing a plan to minimize runoff from agricultural activities were derived by estimating the number of river or stream miles running through agriculturally-zoned or agriculturally-designated lands in each BPG using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). After applying a cost per linear mile, project costs were then projected over a twenty-year period. (See Assumptions and Categories Tables 15 and 19.)

Dams and Diversions

The costs to execute recovery actions associated with dams and diversions were calculated using the CalFish.org mapping tool. This tool allows the determination of the number of dams/diversions across the BPG and assigns costs according to passage barrier severity. While this method may be useful for small dams and diversion, the modification or removal of large dams is highly dependent on site-specific conditions and cannot be accurately estimated without extensive technical and planning studies. (Refer to Assumptions and Categories Tables 4 and 5 for cost identities).

Other Passage Barriers

Culvert replacement costs were calculated based on the assumption that a minimum of one culvert would need to be replaced in each identified watershed, or sub-watershed, annually for the first five years of Recovery Plan implementation. (See Assumptions and Categories Table)

Groundwater Management

Groundwater management costs are made based on hiring one staff scientist to assess current groundwater management practices, and identify steps, if necessary, to modify practices to address potential threats. After the first year, the scientist position is dropped to 'Cost of Doing Business". Sediment assessments are initially calculated by stream length and then on a per mile basis. (See Assumptions and Categories Tables 1, 2, and 19.)

Flood Control

The costs for levee and channelization-related recovery actions are estimated by using GIS to perform a dimensional analysis of parameters such as stream length, acreage, etc. Based on these results, costs are assigned on a per mile or per acre basis. As with large dams and diversion, while this method may be useful for facilities, the modification removal of large flood control works is highly dependent on site-specific conditions and cannot be accurately estimated without extensive technical and planning studies. Federal, state and local flood control works, as well as actions such as "minimize herbicide use near levees" are considered to be "Cost of Doing Business". (See Assumptions and Categories, Tables 1, 12 and 13.)

Mining and Quarrying

The cost estimates for aggregate mining operations are made based on hiring one staff biologist to make an initial assessment of current mining practices, and identify steps, if necessary, to modify practices to address potential threats. After the first year, the position is considered to be 'Cost of Doing Business". (See Assumptions and Categories, Tables 1 and 2).

Non-Native Species

Non-native species recovery actions consist of several distinct activities, including assessment, control, education and outreach, as well as development of monitoring programs. The costs for controlling and removing non-native species are derived on a per acre basis and a staff time scenario. The education and outreach costs are based on per program scenarios. The monitoring program costs were based on hiring a biological scientist for one year to develop a monitoring program, and then transitioning that cost into a "Cost of Doing Business" scenario. (See Assumptions and Categories, Tables 2, 17 and 18.)

Urban Development

The costs for recovery actions focused on urban development threat sources were calculated based on the hiring of an Urban Regional Planner under a staff-time scenario for the first year. To assess the adequacy of current land-use planning standards and programs, and to identify step, if necessary, to address potential inadequacies. After the first year, the cost reverts to "Cost of Doing Business". Managing effluents and storm drains were considered to be annual maintenance scenarios and "Cost of Doing Business". (See Assumptions and Categories, Table 1.)

General Planning

The costs associated with reviewing and updating General Plans or Local Coastal Plans, and more focused plans such as transportation, recreation, and water quality plans were all considered to be "Cost of Doing Business". (See Assumptions and Categories, Table 1.)

Wildfires

Public agencies are assumed to be responsible for fuel and equipment required for wildfire planning and management, as is required by the Endangered Species Act for the protection of listed species, including steelhead. Therefore, all costs associated with wildfire planning and management throughout the DPS are considered to be "Cost of Doing Business". (See Assumptions and Categories, Tables 1 and 2.)

Upslope/Upstream Activities

The costs for estuarine restoration recovery actions designed to deal with a variety of upslope/upstream activities were made on a per acre basis using a staff-time scenario. Costs are based on a combination of GIS dimensional analysis to determine currently existing estuarine areas as well as factoring in the percentage of historical estuarine area that still remains. The restoration of coastal estuaries is highly dependent on site-specific conditions and cannot be estimated without extensive technical and planning studies. (See Assumptions and Categories, Tables 2 and 16.)

Regional Cost Estimate Tables: Categories and Assumptions

Table 1. Cost of Doing Business (CDB)

Action Type	Cost Representation
CDB: Enough Staff Available	0
CDB: Inadequate Funding/Staff	0[1]
Over and Above CDB	FTEs[2]

[1]Defer to IRM action where additional FTEs accounted for
[2] See Bureau of Labor Statistics, FTE assumption table (2008) for costs.

Table 2. Staff Time[2]

Occupation	Wage[1] ($/hr.)	Annual Wage ($/FTE)
Biologist	33	68030
Biologist Technician	20	40900
Fish and Game Warden	27	56030
Police/Sheriff Patrol Officers	25	52810
Forest Fire Inspectors/ Prevention	18	36400
Forest and Conservation Workers	13	26110
Urban and Regional Planners	30	62400
Physical Scientists (all others)	44	91850

[1] Seasonal
[2] Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009

Table 3. Groundwater Management[1]

Action	Cost ($/gage) & ($/year)
Installation of State/Private Gage	26136
Installation of USGS Gage	29545
Annual Maintenance of State/Private Gage	7955
Annual Maintenance of USGS Gage	3409

[1] Source: Dem-WRB Streamflow Committee, 2004

Table 4. Fish Passage Improvement ($/Project)[1]				
Stream Crossing	Land Use			
	Forest	Agriculture	Suburban	Urban
Tributary: Total Barrier	63,636	159,090	318,181	556,818
Tributary: Partial/Temporal Barrier	31,818	79,545	159,090	278,409
Stream : Total Barrier	159,090	381,818	556,818	795,454
Stream: Partial/Temporal Barrier	79,545	190,909	278,409	397,727

[1]Source: CDFG 2004 (p. 1-16)

Table 5. Dam Removal[1]	
Dam Height	Cost ($/foot)
< 15'	568,181
>15'	17,045
unknown height: complete barrier	1,022,727
unknown height: partial/temporal/unknown barrier	511,363

[1] Source: CDFG 2004 (p. I.11)

Table 6. Bridge Construction[1]	
Bridge Type	$/sq. ft. of decking
RC Slab	191
RC Box Girder	170
CIP/PS Slab	168
CIP/PS Box Girder	298
PC/PS "I" Girder	231
PC/PS Bulb "T" Girder	239
Average	216

[1]

Source: DOT, 2008.

Table 7. Replacing a Culvert	
New Type of Crossing	Average Cost ($)
Bridge <40ft	51,546
Bridge >40ft	103,093
Bottomless/Open Bottom Arch	193,961
Natural Bottom Pipe Arch	215,776
Box Culvert	248,352

[1]

Source: NMFS 2008, p. 11-15

Table 8a. Road Upgrade/Road Decomissioning[1]	
Location	**Cost ($/mile)**
California	18,104
California	93,279
Table 8b. Road Construction (for relocation purposes)[2]	
Type of Road	**Cost ($/mile)**
Non paved: two directional 12' shared path	175,000
Undivided 2-lane rural road w/ 5' paved shoulders	1,713,000

[1] Source: NMFS 2008, p. 43-44
[2] Source: DOT 2010

Table 9. New Fish Ladder[1]	
Waterway Size	**Cost ($)**
Large	1,022,727
Small	568,181

[1] Source: NMFS 2008, p. 9

Table 10. Culvert Replacement ($/Culvert)[1]				
Size of Waterway	**Road Type**			
	Forest Road	**Minor 2 Lane**	**Major 2 Lane**	**Hwy 4+ Lane**
Small (0-10')	31,976	87,209	174,419	319,767
Medium (10-20')	87,209	220,930	319,767	436,047
Large (20-30')	133,721	267,442	406,977	813,953

[1]Source: NMFS 2008, p. 10

Table 11. Storm Drain Retrofit[1]	
Action	**Cost ($/filter) or ($/program)**
Catch Basin/Filter Installation	98
Annual Maintenance Program	6452

[1]Source: Kosciusko County 2002

Table 12. LWD/Instream Restoration[1*]	
Stream Type	**Cost ($/mile)**
Small, Rocky	68,182
Large, Rocky	159,091

[1]Source: CDFG 2004, p. 1.23 – 1.24
**includes 5 yrs. of monitoring/maintenance and 10% administrative fee*

Table 13. Channel Restoration[1]	
Type	**Cost ($/mile)**
Large scale reach restoration	4,217,623

[1]Source: NMFS 2008, p. 27

Table 14. Riparian Planting			
Materials/Site Accessibility	**Site Preparation Costs ($/acre)[1]**		
	Flat/Light Clearing	**Average Clearing**	**Steep/Heavy Clearing**
Low Cost	17,442	40,698	93,023
Medium Cost	26,163	63,954	110,465
High Cost	46,512	78,488	1,366,279

[1] Source: NMFS 2008, p. 32

Table 15. Bank Stabilization[1]	
Distance From Road (miles)	**Cost ($/foot)**
0.25 - 0.5	284
0.5 - 1	313
1 - 2	341
2 - 3	369
> 3	398

[1]Source: NMFS 2008, p. 38

Table 16. Estuary Restoration[1]	
Project Type	**Cost ($/acre)**
Small: tide gate removal, culvert upgrade, tidal salt marsh restoration	6000
Medium: automated tide gates, culverts, 500 feet of new dikes	67000
Large: automated tide gates, excavation of fill, re-vegetation	20000

[1]Source: Coastal Resources Management Council 2010

Table 17. Education and Outreach Programs[1]	
Type	**Cost ($)**
General Education and Outreach	76,136
Coho Specific Education	55,682

[1] Source: CDFG 2004, p. 1.42

Table 18. Removal of Invasive Plant Species	
Invasive Species	**Cost ($/acre)**
Average	8028

[1]Source: Neil 2002
[2]Source: Bennet 2007 (average cost)
[3]Source: U.S. FWS 2001
[4]Source: Northern California Conservation Center 2010

Table 19. Sediment Assessments[1]	
Location	**Cost ($/mile)**
Average all assessments in CA	1,240

[1]Source: NMFS 2008, p. 61-62

Table 20. BPG: Core 1 and 2 Population Cost Estimates

BPG: Core 1 and 2 Population Cost Estimate

BPG	FY 1-100 Total Costs	Core 1 Populations	Core 1 FY 1-100 Costs	Core 2 Populations	Core 1 + 2 FY 1-100 Costs
Monte Arido	905,765,708	Santa Maria, Santa Clara, Santa Ynez, Ventura	598,092,098	No Core 2 Identified	N/A
Conception Coast	496,776,819	Mission, Carpinteria, Rincon	178,635,055	Goleta & Gaviota	358,983,979
Santa Monica Mountains	125,825,465	Malibu, Topanga	49,591,810	Arroyo Sequit	72,512,230
Mojave Rim	261,428,356	San Gabriel Mainstem	120,068,707	Santa Ana	176,623,694
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	344,666,136	San Juan, San Luis Rey, San Mateo, Santa Margarita	149,990,421	San Onofre, San Dieguito	262,473,286

Funding Recovery Actions

Many of the recovery actions identified in the recovery action tables are intended to restore basic ecosystem processes and function such as more natural hydrologic conditions, water quality, and riparian and estuarine habitats. These actions will, in many cases, serve to restore multiple native species and associated human uses of these natural resources. As a result, such activities may be eligible for funding from multiple funding sources at the federal, state, and local levels.

Federal funding sources include:

- NOAA/NMFS Restoration Center Community-Based Restoration Program
  NOAA/NMFS Restoration Center Open Rivers Initiative
- NOAA/NMFS Proactive Species of Concern Grant Program
- NOAA National Sea Grant College Program
- NOAA Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program
- NOAA/ACOE/USFWS/EPA/NRCS Estuary Habitat Restoration Program
- EPA Wetlands Protection Grants and Near Coastal Waters Programs
- US. Department of Transportation Highway Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement Program
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Program
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Coastal Program
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service North American Wetland Conservation Act
- National Resource Conservation Service
- Federal Highway Administration – Road Aquatic Species Passage Funding

State funding sources include:

- California Department of Fish and Game Pacific Coast Salmon Restoration Fund
- California Coastal Conservancy Proposition 84 Funds

- California Coastal Conservancy Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project Community Wetland Restoration Grants
- California Wildlife Conservation Board
- California State and Regional Water Quality Control Board Clean Water Grant Program
- California Integrated Watershed Management Grant Program Proposition 50 Funds
- California Department of Parks and Recreation Habitat Conservation Fund
- CalTrans Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program
- U.C. California/NOAA California Sea Grant College Program

In addition to federal and state funding sources, there are also numerous private national, regional and local funding sources for southern California habitat restoration projects, such as:

- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- Santa Barbara County Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund
- Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission Proposition Prop 84 Grant Program
- San Diego Association of County Governments TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program

Many of these grant programs also offer technical assistance, including project planning, design, permitting, monitoring. Additionally, regional personnel with NOAA, California Department of Fish and Game, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service can provide assistance and current information on the status of individual grant programs.

LITERATURE AND REFERENCES CITED

Adadia-Cardoso, A., A. J. Clemento, and J. C. Garza. 2011. Discovery and characterization of single-nucleotide polymorphisms in steelhead/rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 11(Sup1):31-49.

Abdul-Aziz, O. L., N. J. Mantua, K. W. Myers. 2011. Potential climate change impacts on thermal habitats of Pacific salmon (Oncorhynchus spp.) in the North Pacific Ocean and adjacent seas. *Canadian Journal of fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68(9):1660-1680.

Adams, P., L. B. Boydstun, S. P. Gallagher, M. K. Lacy, T. McDonald, K. E. Shaffer. 2011. *California Coastal Salmonid Population Monitoring: Strategy, Design, and Methods*. *Fish Bulletin* No. 180. California Department of Fish and Game.

Adaptive Management Services Enterprise Team. 2004. *Ventura River Cumulative Watershed Effects Analysis for the Ojai Community Defense Zone Project.* Prepared for the U.S. Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest, Ojai Ranger District.

Adkison, M. D. 1995. Population differentiation in Pacific salmon: local adaptation, genetic drift, or the environment? *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 52:2762-2777.

Agostinho, A. A., L. C. Gomes, D. R. Fernandez, and H. I. Suzuki. 2002. Efficiency of fish ladders for Neotropical ichthyofauna. *River Research and Applications* 18:299-306.

Ainsworth, J. and T. Doss. 1995. *Natural History of Fire and Flood Cycles.* Prepared for the California Coastal Commission.

Alagona, P. S., S. D. Cooper, M. Stoecker, and P. Beedle. 2011. *Documenting the Historic Distribution of Steelhead and Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) in the Santa Ynez River, Santa Barbara County.* Prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Regional Office, Protected Resources Division.

Allen, L., D. J. Pondella II, M. H. Horn (eds.). 2006. *The Ecology of Marine Fishes: California and Adjacent Waters.* University of California Press.

Allen, M. 1986. *Population Dynamics of Juvenile Steelhead Trout in Relation to Density and Habitat Characteristics*. Master's Thesis, Humboldt State University, Arcata.

Allendorf, F. W., D. Bayles, D. L. Bottom, K. P. Currens, C. A. Frissell, D. Hankin, J. A. Lichatowich, W. Nehlsen, P. S. Trotter, and T. H. Williams. 1997. Prioritizing Pacific salmon stocks for conservation. C*onservation Biology* 11:140-152.

Ambrose, R. (ed.). 1995. *Coastal Wetland Resources of the Santa Barbara County Mainland. Final Report.* Prepared for the County of Santa Barbara, Planning and Development Department.

Ambrose, R. and J. Lilien. 2000. Management alternatives. *In:* Ambrose, R. and A. Orme. *Lower Malibu Creek and Lagoon Resource Enhancement and Management. Final Report.* Prepared for the California Coastal Conservancy.

Ambrose, R. and A. Orme. 2000*. Lower Malibu Creek and Lagoon Resource Enhancement and Management. Final Report.* Prepared for the California State Coastal Conservancy.

Ambrose, R. and T. Trejo. 2000. Biological and water quality objectives and habitat associations. *In:* Ambrose, R.F. and A.R. Orme. *Lower Malibu Creek and Lagoon Resource Enhancement and Management. Final Report.* Prepared for the California Coastal Conservancy.

AMEC Earth and Environmental, Inc. 2004. *Environmental Study of the Santa Clara River Estuary: Water and Sediment Quality, Ecology, and Hydrology.* Prepared for Ventura Water Department, City of San Buenaventura.

American Rivers. 2002. *The Ecology of Dam Removal: A Summary of Benefits and Impacts.* American Rivers.

Anchor Environmental and Everest International Consultants. 2005. *Santa Margarita River Watershed Management Plan: Watershed Management Plan.* Prepared for County of San Diego Department Planning and Land Use, San Diego.

Anchor Environmental and Everest International Consultants. 2005. *San Diego River Watershed Management Plan: Final Watershed Management Plan.* Prepared for San Diego River Watershed Work Group, San Diego.

Anderson, S. S. Anderson and R. F. Ambrose. 2011. *Independent Evaluation of the Estuary Subwatershed Study Assessment of the Physical and Biological Condition of the Santa Clara River Estuary, Ventura County, California.* Final Synthesis Report and the Environmental Effects of the City of Ventura Wastewater Reclamation Facility Discharge to the Santa Clara River Estuary. Prepared for the Wishtoyo Foundation Ventura Coastkeeper Program.

Anderson S. S. and R. Ambrose. 2011. *Estuary Subwatershed Assessment of the Physical and Biological Condition of the Santa Clara River Estuary, Ventura County, California.* Final Synthesis Report and the Environmental Effects of the City of Ventura Wastewater Reclamation Facility Discharge to the Santa Clara River Estuary. Prepared for Wishtoyo Foundation's Ventura Coastkeeper Program.

Anderson, H., M. Hoover, and K. Reinhart. 1976. *Forests and Water: Effects of Forest Management on Floods, Sedimentation, and Water Supply.* U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment. Station General Technical Report PSW-GTR-18.

Ankenbrandt, L. G. 1988. *The Phylogenetic Relationship of the Pacific Fishes Contained in the Teleost Genera Oncorhynchus and Salmo Based on Restriction Fragment Analysis of Mitochondrial DNA.* Master's Thesis, University of Washington.

Annear, T., D. Lobb, C. Cooner, M. Woythal, C. Hendry, C. Estes, and K. Williams. 2009. *International Instream Flow Program Initiative: A Status Report and Provincial Fish and Wildlife Agency Instream Flow Activities and Strategies for the Future.* Final Report for Multi-State Conservation Grant Project WY M-7-T. Instream Flow Council, Cheyenne, WY.

Anonymous. 1909. Southern California record steelhead trout. Los Angeles Herald Sunday Magazine, May 30, 1909, 6.

Araki, H. B., W. R. Ardren, E. Olsen, B. Cooper, and M.S. Blouin. 2007a. Reproductive success of captive-bred steelhead in the wild: evaluation of three hatchery programs in the Hood River. *Conservation Biology* 21:181-190.

Araki, H. B., B. Cooper, and M. S. Blouin. 2007b. Genetic effects of captive breeding cause a rapid, cumulative fitness decline in the wild. *Science* 318:100-103.

Araki, H. B., B. A. Berejikian, M. J. Ford, and M.S. Blouin. 2008. Fitness of hatchery-reared salmonids in the wild. *Evolutionary Applications* 1:342-355.

Araki, H. B., Cooper, and M. S. Blouin. 2009. Carry-over effect of captive breeding reduces reproductive fitness of wild-born descendants in the wild. *Biology Letters, Conservation Biology*. The Royal Society.

Archer, D. 2007. *Global Warming: Understanding the Forecast.* Blackwell Publishing.

Archer, D. and R. Pierrehumbert. 2011. *The Warming Papers: The Scientific Foundation for the Climate Change Forecast.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Armstrong, M. D. 2006. *Prehistoric Exchange in the Santa Ynez Valley: Archaeology and Ethnohistory.* Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Arthington, A. H., R. J. Naiman, M. E. McClain, and C. Nilsson. 2010. Preserving the biodiversity and ecological services of rivers: new challenges and research opportunities. *Freshwater Biology* 55:1-16.

Aspen Institute. 2002. *Dam removal: A New Option for a New Century*. Aspen Institute Program on Energy, the Environment, and the Economy.

Aspen Environmental Group. 2004. *Otay River Watershed Assessment Technical Report.* Prepared for County of San Diego Department Planning and Land Use.

Atkinson, K. J. Fuller, C. Hanson, B. Trush. 2011. *Evaluating Water Temperature and Turbidity Effects on Steelhead Life History Tactics in Alameda Creek Watershed. Technical Memorandum.* Prepared for Alameda Creek Fisheries Restoration Group.

Aubin-Horth, N. C. R. Landry, B. H. Letcher, and H. A. Hofmann. 2005. Alternative life histories shape brain gene expression profiles in males of the same population. *Proceedings of the Royal Society* 272:1655-1662.

Augerot, X. 2005. *Atlas of Pacific Salmon: The First Map-Based Status Assessment of Salmon in the North-Pacific.* University of California Press.

Avise, J. C. 2000. *Phylogeography: The History and Formation of Species.* Harvard University Press.

Aydin, K. Y., G. A. McFarlane, J. R. King, B. A. Megrey, and K. W. Myers. 2005. Linking oceanic food webs to coastal production and growth rates of Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) using model on three scales. *Deep-Sea Research* II 52 (2005):757–780.

Baker, M. B. and G. H. Roe. 2009. The shape of things to come: Why is climate change so predictable? *Journal of Climate* 22:4574-4589.

Barton, H. H, D. E. G. Brings. J A. Eisen, D. B. Goldstein, N H. Patel. 2007. Evolution. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.

Babbitt, Bruce. 1998. A river runs against it: Americas evolving view of dams. *Open Space Quarterly* 1(4):8-13.

Backland, P., *A*. Janetos, and D. Schimel. 2008. *The Effects of Climate Change on Agriculture, Land Resources, Water Resources, and Biodiversity in the United States.* Synthesis and Assessment Product 4.3. Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research.

Bailey, H. 1966. *The Climate of Southern California*. University California Press.

Baker, M. B. Jr., P. Ffolliotte, L. DeBano, and D. Neary. 2004. *Riparian Areas of the Southwestern United States: Hydrology, Ecology, and Management.* CRC Press.

Bakke, P. 2008. *Physical Processes and Climate Change: A Guide for Biologists*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Western Washington FWO.

Bakun, A. 1990. Global climate change and intensification of coastal upwelling. *Science* 247:198-201.

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. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 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.

Barbour, M. T. Keller-Wolf, and Alan A. Schoenherr (eds.). 2007. *Terrestrial Vegetation of California*. University of California Press.

Barbour E. and L. Kueppers. 2008. *Conservation and Management of Ecological Systems in a Changing California.* Public Policy Institute of California.

Barnas, K. and S. L. Katz. 2010. The challenges of tracking habitat restoration at various spatial scales. *Fisheries* 35(5):232-241.

Barnhart, R. 1986. Species profiles: *Life Histories and Environmental Requirements of Coastal Fishes and Invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) - Steelhead.* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report No. 82. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Technical Report. EL-82-421.

Barnhart, R. A. 1991. Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *In:* J. Stolz and J. Schnell (eds.). *Trout.* Stackpole Books.

Barnett, T. P., D. W. Piece, H. G. Hidalgo, C. Bonfils, B. D. Santer, T. Das, G. Bala, A. W. Wood, T. Nozawa, A. A. Mirin, D. R. Cayan, and M. D. Dettinger. 2008. Human induced changes in the hydrology of the western United States. *Science* 319:1080-1083.

Battin J., M. W. Wiley, M. H. Ruckelshaus, R. N. Palmer, E. Korb, K. K. Bartz, and H. Imaki. 2007. Projected impacts of climate change on salmon habitat restoration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104:6720-6725.

Batzer, D. P. and R. R. Shartz. 2006. *Ecology of Freshwater and Estuarine Wetlands.* University of California Press.

Bazin, E. S. Glemin, and N. Galtier. 2006. Population size does not influence mitochondrial genetic diversity in animals. *Science* 312(5773):570-572.

Beakes, M. P., W. H. Satterthwaite, E. M. Collins, D. R. Swank, J. E. Merz, R. G. Titus, S. M. Sogard, M. Mangel. 2010. Smolt transformations in two California steelhead populations: effects of temporal variability in growth. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 139:1263-1275.

Beacham, R. D. and C. B. Murray. 1990. Temperature, egg size, and development of embryos and alevins of five species of Pacific salmon: a comparative analysis. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 119:927-945.

Beacham, R. D. and C. B. Murray. 1993. Fecundity and egg size variation in North American Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus*). *Journal of Fish Biology* 42:485-508.

Bean, G. S. 2007. Geologic *Controls on Channel Morphology and Low-Flow Habitat at Rattlesnake Creek, Santa Barbara, California.* Master's Thesis, Department of Geological Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Beck, M. W., K. L. Heck Jr., K. W. Able, D. L. Childers, D. B. Eggelston, B. M.Gillanders., B. N. Halpern, C. G. Hays, K. Hoshindo, T. J. Minello, R. J. Orth, P. F. Sheridan, and M. P. Weinstein. 2001. The Identification, conservation, and management of estuarine and marine nurseries for fish and invertebrates: a better understanding of the habitats that serve as nurseries for marine species and the factors that create site-specific variability in nursery quality will improve conservation and management of these areas. *BioScience*. 51(8):633–641.

Becker, G., I. Reining, and D. Asbury. 2008. *Steelhead/Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) Resources South of the Golden Gate, California.* Center for Ecosystem Management and Restoration. Prepared for California Coastal Conservancy and the Resources Legacy Foundation.

Bednarek, A. T. 2001. Undamming rivers: a review of the ecological impacts of dam removal. *Environmental Management* 27(6):803-814.

Bedworth, L. and E. Hanak. 2008. *Preparing California for a Changing Climate*. Public Policy Institute.

Beechie, T. and S. Bolton. 1999. An approach to restoring salmonid habitat forming processes in Pacific Northwest watersheds. *Fisheries* 24:6-15.

Beechie, T. J., D. A. Sear, J. D. Olden, G. R. Pess, G. J. M. Buffington, H. Moir, P. Roni, and M. M. Pollock. 2010. Process-based principles for restoring river ecosystems. *BioScience* 60:209-222.

Beissinger, S. R. and M. I. Westphal. 1998. On the use of demographic models of population viability in endangered species management. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 62:821-841.

Belchik, M., D. Hellemeir, and R. M. Pierce. 2004. *The Klamath Fish Kill of 2002: Analysis of Contributing Factors.* Yurok Tribal Fisheries Program.

Bell, C. E., J. M. DiTomaso, and M. L. Brooks. 2009. *Invasive Plants and Wildfires in Southern California.* University of California, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Publication 8397.

Bell, E., R. Dagit, and F. Ligon. 2011. Colonization and persistence of a southern California steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) population. *Southern California Academy of Sciences Bulletin* 110(1):1-16.

Bell, E., S. M. Albers, J. J. Kruz, and R. Dagit. 2011. Juvenile growth in a population of southern California steelhead (*Oncorhynchus*). *California Fish and Game* 97(1):25-35.

Bell, J. L., L. C. Sloan, and M. A. Snyder. 2004. Regional changes in extreme climatic events: a future climate scenario. *Journal of Climate* 17(1):81-87.

Bell, J. L., Lisa C. Sloan, 2006. CO_2 sensitivity of extreme climate events in the western United States. *Earth Interactions* 10:1–17.

Bell, M. A. 1978. *The Fishes of the Santa Clara River System, Southern California.* Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

Bell, M. A., D. J. Futuyama, W. F. Eanes, and J. S. Levinton (eds.). 2010. *Evolution Since Darwin: The First 150 Years.* Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Beller, E. E., R. M. Grossinger, M. N. Salomon, S. J. Dark, E. D. Stein, B. K. Orr, P. W. Downs, T. R. Longcore, G. C. Coffman, A. A. Whipple, R. A. Askevold, B. Stanford, and J. R. Beagle. 2011. *Historical Ecology of the Lower Santa Clara River, Ventura River, and Oxnard Plain: An Analysis of Terrestrial, Riverine, and Coastal Habitats.* Prepared for the State Coastal Conservancy. A Report of the San Francisco Estuary Institute's Historical Ecology Program. San Francisco Estuarine Institute Publication #641, San Francisco Estuary Institute.

Belt, G. H. Buffer strip design for protecting water quality and fish habitat. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry* 9:41-45.

Bendix, J. 1998. Impact of a flood on southern California riparian vegetation. *Physical Geography* 19:162-174.

Bendix, J. and C. M. Cowell. 2010a. Fire, floods and woody debris: Interactions between biotic and geomorphic processes. *Geomorphology* 116:297-304.

Bendix, J. and C. M. Cowell. 2010b. Impacts of wildfire on the composition and structure of riparian forest in Southern California. *Ecosystems* 13:99-107.

Bendix, J. and C. R. Hupp. 2000. Hydrological and geomorphological impacts on riparian plant communities. *Hydrological Processes* 14:2977-2990.

Benestad, R. E. 2006. Can we expect more extreme precipitation on the monthly time scale? *Journal of Climate* 19:630-637.

Benke, R. 2002. *Trout and salmon of North America*. The Free Press.

Benke, R. 1992. *Native Trout of Western North America*. Monograph. No. 6. American Fisheries Society.

Berejikian, B. A., D. Vandoornik, J. Lee, A. LaRae and S. Tezak. 2005. The effects of current velocity during culture of reproductive performance of captively reared steelhead. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 134:1236-1252.

Berejikian, B. A., T. Johnson, R. Endicott and J. Lee-Waltermire. 2008. Increases in steelhead redd abundance result from two conservation hatchery strategies in the Hamma River. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 65:754-764.

Berejikian, B. A., D. M. Van Doornik, J. A. Scheurer, R. Bush. 2009. Reproductive behavior and relative reproductive success of natural- and hatchery-origin Hood Canal summer chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 66:781-789.

Berejikian, B. A, J. T. Gable, and D. T. Vidergar. 2011. Effectiveness and trade-offs associated with hydraulic egg collections from natural salmon and steelhead trout redds for conservation hatchery programs. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 140:549-556.

Berg, N., M. McCorison, and D. Toth. 2004. *Surface Water and Riparian Assessment: Southern California Forests.* Prepared for the USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station, Angeles National Forest and Los Padres National Forest.

Berg, W. J. and G. A. E. Gall. 1988. Gene flow and genetic differentiation among California coastal rainbow trout populations. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 45:122-131.

Bernhardt, E. S., M. A. Palmer, J. D. Allan, G. Alexander, K. Barnas, S. Brooks, J. Carr, S. Clayton, C. Dam, J. Filleted-Shah, D. Galati, S. Gloss, P. Godwin, D. Hard, B. Haslett, R. Jenkinson, S. Katz, G. M. Kondolf, P. S. Lake, R. Lave, J. L. Meyer, T. K. O'Donnell, L. Pagano, B. Powell, E. Sudduth. 2005. Synthesizing U.S. river restoration efforts. *Science* 308(5722):636-637.

Biedlman, R. G. *California's Frontier Naturalists.* University of California Press.

Bilby, R. E., P. A. Bisson, C. C. Coutant, D. Goodman, S. Hanna, N. Huntly, E. J. Loudenslager, L. McDonald, D. P. Philipp, B. Riddell. 2005. *Viability of ESUs Containing Multiple Types of Populations.* Independent Scientific Advisory Board for the Northwest Power and Conservation Council, Columbia River Watershed Indian Tribes, and NOAA Fisheries.

Bjornn, T. C. and D. W. Reiser. 1991. Habitat requirements of salmonids in streams. *American Fisheries Society Special Publication* 4:91-98.

Blakley, E. and K. Barnette. 1985. *Historical overview of Los Padres National Forest*. U.S. Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest Headquarters.

Blahm. T. H. 1976. Effects of water diversions on fishery resources of the west coast, particularly the Pacific northwest. *Marine Fisheries Review* 38:46-51.

Bloom, R. 2005. *Trophy trout in southern California*. *Tracks* 30:16.

Bogan, T., O. Mohseni, and H. G. Stefan. 2003. Stream temperature-equilibrium temperature relationship. *Water Resources Research* 39.

Bogan, T., H. G. Stefan, and O. Mohseni. 2004. Imprints of secondary heat sources on the stream temperature/equilibrium temperature relationship. *Water Resources Research* 40.

Bonar, S. A., B. D. Bolding, M. Divens, and W. Meyer. 2005. Effects of introduced fishes on wild juvenile coho salmon in three shallow pacific northwest lakes. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 134:641-652.

Bond M. H. 2006. *Importance of Estuarine Rearing to Central California Steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) Growth and Marine Survival.* Master's Thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Bond, M. H., C. V. Hanson, R. Baertsch, S. A. Hayes, and R. B. McFarlane. 2007. A new low-cost instream antenna system for tracking passive integrated transponder (pit)-tagged fish in small streams. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 136:562-566.

Borg, B. 2010. Photoperiodism in fishes. *In:* Nelson, R. J., D. L. Denlinger, D. E. Somers (eds.). *Photoperiodism: The Biological Calendar.* Oxford University Press.

Bossard, C., J. Randall, and M. Hoshovky (eds.). 2000. *Invasive Plants of California's Wildlands.* University California Press.

Bottroff, L. J. and J. M. Deinstadt. 1978. *California Wild Trout Management Program: West Fork San Luis Rey River Management Plan.* California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Branch.

Bottorff, R. and T. Robinson. 2007. *Santa Clara River Watershed Monitoring Program.* Prepared for the State Water Resources Control Board, Los Angeles, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

Boughton, D. A. 2007. Memo to Russell Strach, Assistant Regional Administrator for Protected Resources, NMFS, Long Beach, Craig Wingert, Supervisory Fishery Management Specialists, NMFS, Long Beach, and Mark H. Capelli, Recovery Coordinator, South-Central/Southern California Recovery Domain, Santa Barbara re: review of comments on the draft viability report of the Technical Recovery Team for the South-Central/Southern California Recovery Domain. NOAA, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Boughton, D. A. 2009. Estimating the size of steelhead runs by tagging juveniles and monitoring migrants. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 30:89-101.

Boughton, D. A. 2010a. *A Forward-Looking Frame of Reference for Steelhead Recovery on the South-Central and Southern California Coast.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC TM-466.

Boughton, D. A. 2010b. *Some Research Questions on Recovery of Steelhead on the South-Central and Southern California Coast*. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-TM 467.

Boughton, D. and H. Fish. 2003. *New Data on Steelhead Distribution in Southern and South-Central California.* NOAA, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Boughton, D., H. Fish, K. Pipal, J. Goin, F. Watson, J. Casagrande, J. Casagrande, and M. Stoecker. 2005. *Contraction of the Southern Range Limit for Anadromous Oncorhynchus mykiss.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC TM-380.

Boughton, D. and M. Goslin. 2006. *Potential Steelhead Over-Summering Habitat in the South-Central/Southern California Recovery Domain: Maps Based on the Envelope Method.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC TM-391.

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 Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC TM-394.

Boughton, D., M. Gibson, R. Yedor, and E. Kelly. 2007a. Stream temperature and the potential growth and survival of juvenile *Oncorhynchus mykiss* in a southern California creek. *Freshwater Biology* 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. 2007b. *Viability Criteria for Steelhead of the South-Central and Southern California Coast.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC TM-407.

Boughton, D., E. Anderson, and J. Garza. 2007c. Letter to Rodney R. McInnis, Regional Administrator, NMFS, Long Beach, CA, re: Piru Creek steelhead issues raised by United Water Conservation District. NOAA, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz.

Boughton, D. and J. Garza. 2008. Letter to Rod McInnis, Regional Administrator, NMFS, Long Beach, CA, re: Santa Clara River steelhead genetic integrity issues raised by United Water Conservation District and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Boughton, D., H. Fish, J. Pope and G. Holt. 2009. Spatial patterning of habitat for *Oncorhynchus mykiss* in a system of intermittent and perennial stream. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* 18:92-105.

Bower, D., D. M. Hannah, and G. R. McGregor. 2004. Techniques for assessing the climate sensitivity of river flow regimes. *Hydrological Processes* 18:2115-2543.

Boydstun, L. B. 1973. *Steelhead Management in California with Emphasis on the Years 1969-1972.* Technical Report. Anadromous Fisheries Branch. California Department of Fish and Game.

Brandt, S. A. 2000. Classification of geomorphological effects downstream of dams. *Catena* 40:375-401.

Brett. J. R. 1971. Energetic responses of salmon to temperature – study of some salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*). *American Zoologist* 11:99-113.

Brinson, M., L. J. MacDonnell, D. J. Austen, R. L. Beschta, T. A. Dillaha, D. L. Donahue, S. V. Gregory, J. W. Harvey, M. C. Molles, E. I. Rogers, and J. A. Stanford. 2002. *Riparian Areas: Functions and Strategies for Management.* Committee on Riparian Zone Functioning and Strategies for Management, Water Science and Technology Board. National Research Council. National Academy Press.

Bradford, M. J., R. A. Myer, and J. R. Irwin. 2000. Reference points for coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch), harvest rates and escapement goals based on freshwater production. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 57:677-686.

Broecker, W. 2010. *The Great Ocean Conveyer: Discovering the Trigger for Abrupt Climate Change*. Princeton University Press.

Brostrom, J. K., C. W. Luzier, and K. Thompson. 2010. *Best Management Practices to Minimize Effects to Pacific Lamprey (Entosphenus tridentatus).* Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Forest Service.

Brown, L. R., R. H. Gray, R. H. Hughes, and M. R. Meador (eds.). 2005a. *Effects of Urbanization on Stream Ecosystems.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 47.

Brown, L. R., C. A. Burton, and K. Belitz. 2005b. Aquatic assemblages of the highly urbanized Santa Ana River basin, California. *In:* Brown, L. R., R. H. Gray, R. H. Hughes, and M. R. Meador (eds.). *Effects of Urbanization on Stream Ecosystems.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 47.

Brown, L. R., S. D. Chase, M. G. Mesa, R. J. Beamish, and P. Moyle (eds.). 2009. *Biology, Management and Conservation of Lampreys in North America.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 72.

Buchanan, D. V., J. E. Sanders, J. L. Zinn, and J. L. Fryer. 1983. Relative susceptibility of four strains of summer steelhead to infection by *Ceratomyxa shasta. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 112:541-543.

Buffington, J. M., D. R. Montgomery, and H. M. Greenberg. 2004. Basin-scale availability of salmonid spawning gravel as influenced by channel type and hydraulic roughness in mountain catchments. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 61:2085-2096.

Bunderson, B., D. Corey, C. Helmer, A. Locke, and M. Meyers. 2008. *Steelhead Passage Restoration Options for Canada de Santa Anita, Santa Barbara County, California.* Group project submitted as Master's Thesis, Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, University California, Santa Barbara.

Bunn, S. E. and A. H. Arthington. 2002. Basic principles and ecological consequences of altered flow regimes for aquatic biodiversity. *Environmental Management* 30:492-507.

Bureau of Reclamation. 2003. *Revised Biological Assessment for Diversion Operations and Fish Passage Facilities at the Robles Diversion, Ventura River, CA.* February 21, 2003. Prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Burgner, R. L. 1980. Some features of ocean migrations and timing of Pacific salmon. *In:* McNeil, W. J. and D. C. Himsworth (eds.). *Salmonid Ecosystems of the North Pacific. O*regon State University Press.

Burgner, R. L. J. T. Light. L. Margolis, T. Okazaki, A. Tautz, and S. Ito. 1992. *Distribution and Origins of Steelhead Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) in Offshore Waters of the North Pacific Ocean.* International North Pacific Fisheries Commission Bulletin No. 51.

Burgy, R. 1968. *Hydrologic Studies and Watershed Management on Brushlands*. Annual Report. No. 8, 1966-1967. Department Water Science and Engineering, University of California, Davis.

Burroughs, W. J. 2003. *Weather Cycles: Real or Imaginary.* Cambridge University Press.

Burroughs, W. J. 2005. *Climate Change in Prehistory: The End of the Reign of Chaos*. Cambridge University Press.

Burton, C. A. 2002. Effects of urbanization and long-term rainfall on the occurrence of organic compounds and trace elements in reservoir sediment cores, streambed sediment, and fish tissue from the Santa Ana River basin, California, 1998. U.S. *Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 97-4173.*

Burton, C. A., J. A. Izbicki, and K. S. Paybins. 1998. Water-quality trends in the Santa Ana River at MWD Crossing and below Prado Dam, Riverside County, California. *U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 97-4173.*

Burton, C. A., L. R. Brown, and K. Belitz. 2005. Assessing water source and channel type as factors affecting benthic macroinvertebrate and perphyton assemblages in the highly urbanized Santa Ana River basin, California. *In:* Brown, L. R., R. H. Gray, R. H. Hughes, and M. R. Meador (eds.). *Effects of Urbanization on Stream Ecosystems.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 47.

Busby, P. B., T. C. Wainwright, G. Bryant, L. J. Lierheimer, R. S. Waples, F. W. Waknitz, and I. V. Lagomarsino. 1996. *Status Review: West Coast Steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-27.

Butler, R. L. and D. P. Borgeson. 1965. *California "Catchable" Trout Fisheries*. *Fish Bulletin* No. 127. California Department of Fish and Game.

Cachuma Resource Conservation District and the Carpinteria Creek Watershed Coalition. 2005. *Carpinteria Creek Watershed Plan*. Prepared for the California Department Fish and Game, Grant #P0150016.

Cachuma Resource Conservation District. 2010. *Santa Maria River Management Plan for Non-Point Source Pollution*. Prepared for State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region.

Cada, G. F. and J. J. Sale. 1993. Status of fish passage facilities at nonfederal hydropower projects. *Fisheries* 18:4-12.

Cada, G. F. and J. E. Francfort. 1995. Examining the benefits and costs of fish passage and protection measures. *Hydro Review* 14(1):47-55.

Cairns, J., G. R. Best, P. L. Brezonik, S. R. Carpenter, G. D. Cooke, D. L. Hey, J. A. Kusler, C. L. Schelske, L. Shaman, R. R. Sharitz, S. Sorooshian, R. E. Sparks. J. T. B. Tripp, D. E. Willard, and J. B. Zedler. 1992. *Restoration of Aquatic Ecosystems: Science, Technology, and Public Policy.* Committee on Restoration of Aquatic Ecosystems: Science, Technology, and Public Policy Water Science and Technology Board. National Research Council. National Academy Press.

Caissie, D. 2006. The thermal regimes of rivers: a review. *Freshwater Biology* 51:1389-1406.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2000. Steelhead Rainbow Trout in San Mateo Creek, San Diego County. California. Report prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2003. *Atlas of the Biodiversity of California.* California Department of Fish and Game.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2006. San Juan Creek stream survey, 4 May 2006. Appendix F. *In:* CDM, Inc. *San Juan and Trabuco Creeks Watershed Steelhead Recovery Plan*. Prepared for Trout Unlimited (South Coast Chapter) and California Department Fish and Game.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2011a. 2011-12 *Freshwater Sportfishing Regulations*. California Department of Fish and Game.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2011b. *Passage Assessment Data Base*. California Department of Fish and Game.

California Department of Fish and Game and National Marine Fisheries Service. 2001. *Final Report on Anadromous Fish Hatcheries in California.* Joint Hatchery Review Committee. December 3, 2001.

California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. *Final Hatchery and Stocking Program EIR/EIS.* State Clearing House #20008082025. Prepared by ICF Jones and Stokes.

California Department of Water Resources. 1978. *Land Use Within the California Coastal Zone.* Vol. 207.

California Department of Water Resources. 1988. *Dams Within the Jurisdiction of the State of California.* Bulletin 17-88.

California Department of Water Resources. 2004. Hydrologic Region South Coast: San Luis Rey Valley groundwater watershed plan update. *In:* California's Groundwater. *California Groundwater Bulletin* No. 118.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. 2000. *East Fork San Gabriel River - Trash TMDL.* California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. 2002. *State of the Watershed: Report on Surface Water Quality in the Ventura River Watershed*. Prepared by the Los Angeles Region.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region. 1994. *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Watershed.* Prepared by the San Diego Region.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region. 2008. *Water Quality Control Plan: Santa Ana River Watershed (8)*, updated June 2011. Prepared by the Santa Ana Region.

California State Water Resources Control Board. 2010. *Policy for Maintaining Instream Flows in Northern California Coastal Streams.* Division of Water Rights. State Water Resources Control Board.

California Trout, Inc. 2006. *Santa Monica Mountains Steelhead Habitat Assessment. Final Project Report.* Prepared for California Department Fish and Game and California Coastal Conservancy-Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project.

Camp, Dresser, & McKee. 2008. *Trabuco Creek Interstate 5 Steelhead Migration Channel Design: 30 Percent Submittal.* Prepared for Trout Unlimited and California Department Fish and Game Wildlife Conservation Board.

Capelli, M. H. 1974. Recapturing a Steelhead Stream: The Ventura River. *Salmon Trout Steelheader.* April-May 1974.

Capelli, M. H. 1997. *Ventura River Steelhead Survey, Ventura County, California.* Prepared for California Department Fish and Game, Region 5.

Capelli, M. H. 1999. Dam sand rights: removing Rindge and Matilija dams. *Conference Proceedings, Sand Rights, '99 Bringing Back the Beaches*. California Shore and Beach & Coastal Zone Foundation, September 23-26, Ventura, CA.

Capelli, M. H., 2004. Removing Matilija Dam: opportunities and challenges for Ventura River restoration. *Proceedings, U.S. Society of Dams*. USSD Annual Meeting, March 29-April 2, 2004, St. Louis, Missouri.

Capelli, M. H. 2007a. San Clemente and Matilija Dam Removal: Alternative Sediment Management Scenarios. *Proceedings, U.S. Society on Dams*. USSD Annual Meeting, March 5-9, 2007, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Capelli, M. H. 2007b. Memorandum to D. Boughton, Chair, Technical Recovery Team for South-Central/Southern California Steelhead Recovery Planning Domain and A. Spina, Southern California Steelhead Team Leader, re: recent Ventura River steelhead sightings. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

Capelli, M. H. 2009. Memorandum to File: Maria Ygnacio Creek *O. mykiss* Mortalities, Jesusita Fire, Santa Barbara, May 15, 2009. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

Capelli, M. H. and S. J. Stanley. 1984. Preserving riparian vegetation along California's south central coast. *In:* Warner, R. E. and K. M. Hendrix (eds.). *California Riparian Systems: Ecology, Conservation, and Productive Management.* University of California Press.

Capelli, M. H., C. Dueber, S. Glowacki, M. McGoogan, A. Spina. 2004. Memorandum to Craig Wingert, Supervising Fishery Management Specialist, Southwest Region. *Recommended Unoccupied Critical Habitat Areas for Southern California Steelhead Evolutionarily Significant Unit*. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

Cardenas, M. 1996. *Upper Sisquoc River, U.S. Forest Service steelhead surveys for 1983 and 1993.* California Department of Fish and Game.

Carlson, J. M. and J. Doyle. 2002. Complexity and robustness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 99:2538-2545.

Carlson, S. R. L. G. Coggins Jr., and C. O. Swanton. 1998. A simple stratified design for mark-recapture estimation of salmon smolt abundance. *Alaska Fishery Research Bulletin* 5(2):88-102.

Carpanzano, C. 1996. *Distributions and Habitat Associations of Different Age Classes and Mitochondrial Genotypes of Oncorhynchus mykiss in Streams in Southern California.* Master's Thesis, Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Casitas Municipal Water District and City of San Buenaventura. 1984. *The 1983 River Report: Documentation of Wildlife Surveys Conducted and Information Obtained During 1983 on the Ventura River.*

Casitas Municipal Water District. 2005. 2005 *Robles Diversion Fish Passage Facility Progress Report.* Casitas Municipal Water District.

Casitas Municipal Water District. 2006. *2006 Robles Diversion Fish Passage Facility Report.* Casitas Municipal Water District.

Casitas Municipal Water District. 2007. *2007 Robles Diversion Fish Passage Facility Progress Report.* Casitas Municipal Water District.

Casitas Municipal Water District. 2008. *2008 Robles Diversion Fish Passage Facility Progress Report.* Casitas Municipal Water District.

Casitas Municipal Water District. 2009. *2009 Robles Diversion Fish Passage Facility Progress Report.* Casitas Municipal Water District.

Casitas Municipal Water District. 2010. *2010. Robles Diversion Fish Passage Facility Progress Report.* Casitas Municipal Water District.

Castro, J. 2005. *Geomorphic Impacts of Culvert Replacement and Removal: Avoiding Channel Incision*. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office, Portland.

Caudill, C. C., W. R. Daigle, M. L. Keefer, C. T. Boggs, M. A. Jepson, J. J. Burke, R. W. Zabel, T. C. Bjornn, and C. A. Peery. 2007. Slow dam passage in adult Columbia River salmonids

associated with unsuccessful migration: delay negative effects of passage obstacles or condition-dependent mortality? *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 64:979-995.

Cayan, D. P. 2006. *Scenarios of Climate Change in in California.* 2006. California Climate Change Center. University of California, Berkeley.

Cayan, D., E Maurer, M. Dettinger, M. Tyree, K. Hayhoe. 2008a. Climate change scenarios for the California region. *Climatic Change* 87(Suppl. 1):21-42.

Cayan, D, P. Bromirski, K. Hayhoe, M. Tyree, M. Dettinger, R. Flick. 2008b. Climate Change Projections of Sea Level Extremes along the California Coast. *Climatic Change* 87(Suppl. 1): 57-73.

Cayan, D., M. Tyree, M. Dettinger, H. Hidlago, T. Das, E. Maurer, P. Bromirski, N. Graham, and R. Flick. 2009. *Climate Change Scenarios and Sea Level Rise Estimates for the California 2009 Climate Change Scenarios Assessment*. California Climate Change Center, University of California, Berkeley.

CDM, Inc. 2007. *San Juan and Trabuco Creeks Watershed Steelhead Recovery Watershed Management Plan*. Prepared for Trout Unlimited (South Coast Chapter) and California Department Fish and Game.

Cederholm, C., J, D. H. Johnson, R. E. Bilby, L. G. Dominguez, A. M. Garrett, W. H. Graeber, E. L. Greda, M. D. Kunze, B. G. Marcot, J. F. Palmisano, R. W. Plotnikoff, W. G. Pearcy, C. A. Simenstad, and P. C. Trotter. 2000. *Pacific Salmon and Wildlife - Ecological Contexts, Relationships, and Implications for Management. Special* Edition Technical Report. Prepared for Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Chambers Group, Inc. 2001. *Habitat Restoration Plan for Fish Creek, Los Angeles County, California*. Prepared for Vulcan Materials Company.

Chambers Group, Inc. 2003. *Restoration of Southern Steelhead and Native Fish to the San Mateo Creek Watershed, Cleveland National Forest – Phase I.* Prepared for Trout Unlimited and California Coastal Conservancy.

Chan, K. M. A., M. R. Shaw, D. R. Cameron, E. C. Underwood, and G. C. Daily. 2006. Conservation planning for ecosystem services. *PLoS* 4(11):2138-2152.

Chandler, G. L. and T. C. Bjornn. 1988. Abundance, growth, and interactions of juvenile steelhead relative to time of emergence. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 117:432-443.

Changnon, S. A. (ed.). 2000. *El Nino 1997-1998: The Climate Event of the Century*. Oxford University Press.

Chilcote, M. W. 2003. Relationship between natural productivity and the frequency of wild fish in mixed spawning populations of wild hatchery steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 60(9):1057-1067.

Chilcote, M. W., K. W. Goodson, and M. R. Falcy. 2011. Reduced recruitment performance in natural populations of anadromous salmonids associated with hatchery-reared fish. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68:511-522.

Chin, A., S. Anderson, A. Collison, B. J. Ellis-Sugai, J. P. Haltiner, J. B. Hogervort, G. M. Kondolf, L. S. O'Hirok, A. H. Purcell, A. L. Riley, and W. Wohl. 2009. Linking theory and practice for restoration of step-pool streams. *Environmental Management* 43:645-661.

Chubb, S. 1997. *Ventura Watershed Analysis: Focused for Steelhead Restoration, Los Padres National Forest, Ojai Ranger District.* July 1997, revised 1999. U.S. Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest.

Christie, M. R., M. Marine, and M. S. Blouin. 2011. Who are the missing parents? Grandparentage analysis identifies multiple sources of gene flow into a wild population. *Molecular Ecology* 10:1-14.

City of Los Angeles. 2007. *Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan.* City of Los Angeles, Public Works Department.

Clanton, D. and J. Jarvis. 1946. Field inspection trip to the Matilija-Ventura Watershed in relation to the construction of the proposed Matilija Dam. Field Correspondence. May 8, 1946. California Department of Natural Resources. Division of Fish and Game.

Clarke, O. F., D. Svehla, G. Ballmer, and A. Montalvo. 2007. *Flora of the Santa Ana River and Environs With References to World Botany.* Heyday Books.

Clay, C. H. 1995. *Design of Fishways and Other Fish Facilities*. Lewis Publishers.

Clemento, A. and J. C. Garza. 2007. *Santa Ynez River Steelhead in Space and Time: Population Genetics of O. mykiss in the Santa Ynez river in southern California.* American Fisheries Society 137th Annual Meeting, September, 2-6, 2007, San Francisco.

Clemento, A. J., E. C. Anderson, D. Boughton, D. Girman, and J. C. Garza. 2009. Population genetic structure and ancestry of *Oncorhynchus mykiss* populations above and below dams in south-central California. *Conservation Genetics* 10:1321-1336.

Cluer, B. 2004. *Sediment Removal from Freshwater Salmonid Habitats: Guidelines to NOAA Fisheries Staff for the Evaluation of Sediment Removal Actions from California Streams.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Habitat Conservation Division.

Colt, J. and R. J. White (eds.). 1991. *Fisheries Bioengineering Symposium*. American Fisheries Society Symposium.

Combs, T. 1972. *The Steelhead Trout: Life-History, Early Angling, Contemporary Steelheading*. Northwest Salmon Trout Steelheader Company.

Committee on Atlantic Salmon in Maine. 2004. *Atlantic Salmon in Maine*. National Research Council of the National Academies. National Academy Press.

Cooke, S. J., S. G. Hinch, G. T. Crossin, D. A. Patterson, K. K. English, M. C. Healey, J. M. Shrimpton, G. Van Der Kraak, and A. P. Farrell. 2006. Mechanistic basis of individual mortality in Pacific salmon during spawning migrations. *Ecology* 87:1575-1586.

Cooper, S., T. Dudley, and N. Hemphill. 1986. The biology of chaparral streams in southern California. *In:* J. Devries (ed.). *Proceedings of the Chaparral Ecosystems Research Conference*. California Water Resources Center Report No. 62.

Cooper, S. D. 2009. Memorandum to Mark H. Capelli, South-Central/Southern California Steelhead Recovery Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service re: *Fish Kill in Maria*

Ygnacio Creek Associated with Jesusita Fires, Santa Barbara, CA. Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology, University of California, Santa Barbara.

County of Santa Barbara. 1997. Coast Rock Products, Inc. *Mining and Reclamation Plan*. *Kiser Sand and Gravel, Inc. Mining and Reclamation Plan, Santa Maria/Sisquoc Rivers Specific Plan.* Final EIR 96-EIR-004, with assistance from County of San Luis Obispo Planning and Building Department and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department, Santa Barbara.

County of Santa Barbara Environmental Health Services Div. 1999. *Lower Rincon Creek Watershed Study: A Field Investigation into the Source of Fecal Contamination in the Lower Rincon Creek Watershed and Ocean Interface (Surf Zone).* Prepared for Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Santa Barbara County Water Agency (Project Clean Water) and Heal the Ocean.

County of Ventura Watershed Protection District. 2005. *Matilija Dam Ecosystem Restoration Project, Ventura County, California.* http://www.matilijadam.org/reports/pmpfinal.pdf.

Coyne, J. A. and H. A. Orr. 2004. *Speciation.* Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Cramer, S. and N. K. Ackerman. 2009. Prediction of stream carrying capacity for steelhead: the unit characteristic method. *In:* Knudsen, E. E and J. Hal Michael, R. (eds.). *Pacific Salmon Environmental Life History Models: Advancing Science for Sustainable Salmon in the Future*. American Fisheries Society Symposium 71.

Crisp, D. T. 1988. Prediction, from temperature, of eyeing, hatching and 'swim-up' times for salmonid embryos. *Freshwater Biology* 19:41-48.

Crisp, D. T. and P. A. Carling. 1989. Observations on siting, dimensions and structure of salmonid redds. *Journal of Fish Biology* 34:119-134.

Cross, P. 1975. Early *Life History of Steelhead Trout in a Small Coastal stream*. Master's Thesis, Humboldt State University.

Crozier, L., A. P. Hendry, P. W. Lawson, T. P. Quinn, N. J. Mantua, J. Battin, R. Shaw, and R. Huey. 2008. Potential responses to climate change in organisms with complex life histories: evolution and plasticity in Pacific salmon. *Evolutionary Applications* 1:252-270.

Cucherousset, J. and J. D. Olden. 2011. Ecological impacts of non-native freshwater fishes. *Fisheries* 36(5):215-30.

Culver, G. B. and C. L. Hubbs 1917. The fishes of the Santa Ana system of streams in southern California. *Lorquinia* 1:82-83.

Dagit, R. and C. Webb. 2002. *Topanga Creek Watershed and Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Study.* Resource Conservation District Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R., K. Reagan, and C. Swift. 2003. *Topanga Creek Watershed Southern Steelhead Trout: Preliminary Watershed Assessment and Restoration Plan Report.* Prepared for California Department Fish and Game, Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R., K. Reagan, and C. Swift. 2004a. *Topanga Creek Southern Steelhead Trout Monitoring Report.* Prepared for Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and California Department Fish and Game, Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R., B. Meyer, and S. Drill. 2004b. *Southern Steelhead Trout Archival Resources for the Santa Monica Bay. R*esource Conservation District Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R., S. Williams, and J. Fuhrman. 2004c. *Topanga Creek Watershed Water Quality Study: Final Report.* Resource Conservation District Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R., B. Meyer, and S. Drill. 2005a. *Historical Distribution of Southern Steelhead Trout in the Santa Monica Bay*. Prepared for NOAA Fisheries and California Department Fish and Game. Resource Conservation District Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R. and C. Swift. 2005b. *Malibu Lagoon Fish Survey*. Prepared for the California Coastal Conservancy Malibu Lagoon Restoration and Enhancement Plan. Resource Conservation District Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R. and K. Reagan. 2006. *Topanga Creek Southern Steelhead Trout Monitoring Summary, June 2001-September 2005*. Prepared for the California Department of Fish and Game. Resource Conservation District Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R. and M. Abramson. 2007. *Malibu and Arroyo Sequit Creeks Southern Steelhead Monitoring.* Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game, Contract No. P0450012.

Dagit, R., K. Reagan, and V. Tobias. 2007. *Topanga Creek Southern Steelhead Monitoring: Habitat Suitability and Monitoring Summary, June 2005-March 2007*. Prepared for California Department of. Fish and Game, Contract No. P0450011. Resource Conservation District Santa Monica Mountains.

Dagit, R. S. Albers, S. Williams. 2009. *Topanga Creek Southern Steelhead Monitoring Snorkel Survey and Temperature Report 2008.* Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game.

Dagit, R. and J. Krug. 2011. *Summary Report Santa Monica Bay Steelhead Monitoring 2009-2011.* Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Dahl, T. E. 1990. *Wetland Loses in the United States: 1780's to 1980's.* U.S. Department of Interior. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Dailey, M. D., D. J. Reish, and J. W. Anderson. 1993. *Ecology of the Southern California Bight: A Synthesis and Interpretation.* University of California Press.

Dambacher, J. M., P. A. Rossingnol, H. W. Li, and J. M. Emlen. 2001. Dam breaching and Chinook salmon recovery. *Science* 291:939.Daufresne, M. D. and P. Boet. 2007. Climate change impacts on structure and diversity of fish communities in rivers. *Global Change Biology* 13:2467-2478.

Davidson, F. A. and S. J. Hutchinson. 1938. The geographical distribution and environmental limitations of the Pacific salmon (*genus Oncorhynchus). Bulletin of the United States Bureau of Fisheries.* No. 26.

Davies B, and N. Bromage. 1991. The effects of fluctuating seasonal and constant water temperatures on the photoperiodic advancement of reproduction in female rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. *Aquaculture* 205:183-200.

Davis, F. W., E. A. Keller, A. Parikh, J. Florsheim. 1988, Recovery of the chaparral riparian zone after wildfire. *In*: *Proceedings of the California Riparian Conference*, September 22-24, 1988. U.S. Forest Service Technical Report PSW-110.

Davis, M. H. 2009. *Invasion Biology*. Oxford University Press.

Davy, C and M. Lapointe. 2007. Sedimentary links and the spatial organization of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) spawning habitat in a Canadian Shield river. *Geomorphology* 83:82-96.

Dawson, T P., S. T. Jackson, J. I. House, I. C. Prentice, G. M. Mace. 2011. Beyond predictions: biodiversity, conservation in a changing climate. *Science* 332:53-58.

DeBano, L. 1991. The effect of fire on soil properties. *In: Proceedings, Management, and Productivity of Western-Montane Forest Soils.* General Technical Report. INT-280. USDA Forest Service Intermountain Res. Station, Fort Collins, CO.

Décamps, H. 2011. River networks as biodiversity hot lines (in press). *Comptes Rendus Biologie* 2011.

Deinstadt, J. M., E. J. Pert, F. G. Hoover, and S. Sasaki. 1990. *Survey of Fish Populations in Six Southern California Streams: 1987.* California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Branch. Administrative Report No. 90-1.

Dennis, H., J. M. Ponciano, S. R. Lele, M. L. Taber and D. F. Staples. 2006. Estimating density dependence, process noise, and observation error. *Ecological Monographs* 76:323-341.

Desbonnet, A., P. Pogue, V. Lee, and N. Wolf (eds.). 1994. *Vegetated Buffers in the Coastal Zone: A Summary Review and Bibliography*. CRC Press.

Dettinger, M., H. Hildalgo, T. Das, D. Cayan, and N. Knowles. 2009 *Projections of Potential Flood Regime Changes in California.* California Climate Change Center, University of California, Berkeley.

DeVries, P. 1997. Riverine salmonid egg burial depth: review of published data and implications for scour studies. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 54:1685-1689.

Diaz, R.J., and Rosenberg, R. 2008. Spreading dead zones and consequences for marine ecosystems. *Science* 321(5891):926-929.

Diffenbaugh, N. S, M. A. Snyder and L. C. Sloan. 2004. Could CO_2-Induced Land Cover Feedbacks Alter Near-shore Upwelling Regimes? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.

Dill, W. A. and A. J. Cordone. 1997. *History and Status of Introduced Fishes in California, 1871-1996. Fish Bulletin* No. 178. California Department of Fish and Game.

Dobzhansky, T. 1970. *Genetics of the Evolutionary Process.* Columbia University Press.

Docker, M. F., and D. D. Heath. 2003. Genetic comparison between sympatric anadromous steelhead and freshwater resident rainbow trout in British Columbia, Canada. *Conservation Genetics* 4:227-231.

Donohoe, C. J., P. Adams, and C. C. Royer. 2008. Influence of water chemistry and migratory distance on ability to distinguish progeny of sympatric resident and anadromous rainbow trout *(Oncorhynchus mykiss)*. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 65:1160-1175.

Douglas, P. L. 1995. *Habitat Relationships of Oversummering Rainbow Trout in the Santa Ynez River Drainage.* Master's Thesis, Bren School of Environmental Management, University of California-Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara.

Douglas, P. L., Forrester, G. E., and Cooper, S. D. 1994. Effects of trout on the diel periodicity of drifting in baetid mayflies. *Oecologia.* 98:48-56.

Downs, P. W., and G. M. Kondolf. 2002. Post-project appraisals in adaptive management of river channel restoration. *Environmental Management* 29:477-496.

Downs, P. W., Y. Cui, J. K. Wooster, S. R. Dusterhoff, and D. B. Booth. 2009. Managing reservoir sediment release in dam removal projects: an approach informed by physical and numerical modeling of non-cohesive sediment. *International Journal of River Management* 7(4):433-452.

Doyle, M. W., E. H. Stanley, J. M. Harbor, and G. Grant. 2003 Dam removal in the United States: emerging needs for science and policy. *Transactions of the American Geophysical Union* 84(4):29-36.

Drake, D. R. J. Naiman, B. Finney, and I. Gregory-Eaves. 2009. Long-term perspectives on salmon abundance: Evidence from Lake sediments and tree rings. *In:* Knudsen, E. E and J. Hal Michael, R. (eds.). *Pacific Salmon Environmental Life History Models: Advancing Science for Sustainable Salmon in the Future*. American Fisheries Society Symposium 71.

Dumas, C. F., P. W. Schumann, and J. C. Whitehead. 2005. Measuring the economic benefits of water quality improvement with benefit transfer: an introduction or noneconomists. *In:* Brown, L. R., R. H. Gray, R. H. Hughes, and M. R. Meador (eds.). *Effects of Urbanization on Stream Ecosystems.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 47.

Dunne, T. and L. Leopold. 1978. *Water in Environmental Planning*. W. H. Freeman and Company.

Dvorksy. J. R. 2001. *The Influence of Valley Morphology and Coarse sediment Distribution on Rainbow Trout Populations in Sespe Creek, California at the Landscape Scale.* Master's Thesis, Department of Geography, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Eaton, G. J. and R. M. Schaller. 1996. Effects of climate warming on fish thermal habitat in streams of the United States. *Limnology and Oceanography* 41:1109-1115.

Ebersole, J. L., P. J. Wigington, J. P. Baker, M. A. Cairns, M. R. Church, B. P. Hansen, B. A. Miller, H. R. LaVigne, J. E. Compton, and S. G. Leibowitz. 2006. Juvenile coho salmon growth and survival across stream network seasonal habitats. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 135:1681-1697.

Ecology Consultants, Inc. 2003. *Santa Barbara County Creeks Bioassessment Program. 2002 Annual Report.* Prepared for the County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department and the City of Santa Barbara Planning Department.

Ecology Consultants, Inc. 2004a. *Steelhead Habitat and Population Study, Carpinteria Creek Watershed*. Prepared for Cachuma Resource Conservation District, Santa Barbara, CA. Contract No. P0150016.

Ecology Consultants, Inc. 2004b. *Santa Barbara County Creeks Bioassessment Program. 2003 Annual Report.* Prepared for County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department and the City of Santa Barbara Planning Department.

Edelman, G. M. and J. A. Galley. 2001. Degeneracy and complexity in biological systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 98:1376-13768.

Elton, Charles S. 1958. *The Ecology of Invasions by Animals and Plants*. Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Endler, J. A. 1977. *Geographical Variation, Speciation, and Clines.* Monographs in Population Biology. No. 10. Princeton University Press.

Endler, J. A. 1986. *Natural Selection in the Wild.* Monographs in Population Biology. No. 21. Princeton University Press.

Engblom, S. 1995. *Data Compilation Report for 1995 Santa Ynez River Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).* Prepared for the Santa Ynez River Cachuma Project Technical Advisory Committee.

Engblom, S. 2001. *2001 Lower Santa Ynez River Steelhead Studies: Annual Report*. Prepared for the Cachuma Operation and Management Board.

Engblom, S. 2003a. *Data Compilation Report for 1996-97*. Prepared for the Santa Ynez River Cachuma Project Technical Advisory Committee.

Engblom, S. 2003b. *Santa Ynez River Fish Monitoring Results*. Prepared for the Santa Ynez River Cachuma Project Technical Advisory Committee.

Entrix, Inc. 1994. *Fish Resources Technical Report for the EIS/EIR, Cachuma Project Contract Renewal.* Prepared for Woodward-Clyde Consultants, Inc.

Entrix, Inc. 1995a. *Historical Steelhead Runs in the Santa Ynez River, Santa Barbara County, California.* Prepared for Price, Postel, and Parma Law Office.

Entrix, Inc. 1995b. *Cachuma Project Contract Renewal: Fish Resources Technical Report*. Prepared for Woodward-Clyde Consultants, Inc.

Entrix, Inc. and Woodward-Clyde Consultants. 1997. *Ventura River Steelhead Restoration and Recovery Plan.* Prepared for Casitas Municipal Water District, City of San Buenaventura, Ventura County Flood Control District, Ventura Transportation Department, Ventura County Solid Waste Management Department, Ojai Valley Sanitary District, Ventura County Water District, Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Agency, Meiners Oaks County Water District, and Southern California Water Agency. Project No. 351001.

Entrix, Inc. 2001a. *Ventura River Habitat Conservation Plan Habitat Evaluation.* Prepared for the Casitas Municipal Water District, City of San Buenaventura, Ventura County Flood Control District, Ventura Transportation Department, Ventura County Solid Waste Management Department, Ojai Valley Sanitary District, Ventura County Water District, Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Agency, Meiners Oaks County Water District, and Southern California Water Agency. February 12, 2001.

Entrix, Inc. 2001b. *Surface water-groundwater interaction.* Prepared for the Casitas Municipal Water District, City of San Buenaventura, Ventura County Flood Control District, Ventura Transportation Department, Ventura County Solid Waste Management Department, Ojai

Valley Sanitary District, Ventura County Water District, Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Agency, Meiners Oaks County Water District, and Southern California Water Agency. February 12, 2001.

Entrix, Inc. 2001c. *Channel Geomorphology and Stream Processes*. Prepared for the Casitas Municipal Water District, City of San Buenaventura, Ventura County Flood Control District, Ventura Transportation Department, Ventura County Solid Waste Management Department, Ojai Valley Sanitary District, Ventura County Water District, Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Agency, Meiners Oaks County Water District, and Southern California Water Agency. February 12, 2001.

Entrix, Inc. 2002a. *Steelhead Habitat Evaluation, Ventura River Watershed. Matilija Dam Ecosystem Restoration Project. Feasibility Study F3 Report.* Prepared for the Matilija Dam Ecosystem Restoration Environmental Working Group, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Ventura County Watershed Protection District.

Entrix, Inc. 2002b. Metals *Translator Study, Santa Clara River Estuary, Ventura Water Reclamation Facility*. NPDES Permit No. CA0053651, CI-1822. Prepared for the City of San Buenaventura.

Entrix, Inc. 2002c. *Resident Species Study, Santa Clara River Estuary, Ventura Water Reclamation Facility.* NPDES Permit No. CA0053651, CI-1822. Prepared for the City of San Buenaventura.

Entrix, Inc. 2003a. *Ventura River Watershed Technical Investigation: Summary Report and Recommendations*. Prepared for City of San Buenaventura.

Entrix, Inc. 2003b. *Proposal to Conduct Southern Steelhead Habitat Assessment above Matilija Dam: Matilija Dam Ecosystem Restoration Project.* Prepared for the County of Ventura Public Works Agency.

Entrix, Inc. and URS Corp. 2004a. *Draft Ventura River Habitat Conservation Plan*. Prepared for Casitas Municipal Water District. Prepared for the Casitas Municipal Water District, City of San Buenaventura, Ventura County Flood Control District, Ventura Transportation Department, Ventura County Solid Waste Management Department, Ojai Valley Sanitary District, Ventura County Water District, Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Agency, Meiners Oaks County Water District, and Southern California Water Agency.

Entrix, Inc. 2004b. *Historical Rainbow Trout/steelhead Stocking in the Santa Ynez River Above Bradbury Dam*. Prepared for Cachuma Project Adaptive Management Committee.

ESA, Inc. 2003. *McGrath State Beach Natural Resources Management Plan.* Prepared for the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Escario, H., M. J. Kelley, D. Morrissey, S. Mulley, G. O. Taylor, Jr., P. N. Pregill, and D. Delgado. 2008. *Vision Plan for the Ventura River Parkway: Reconnecting People with the Ventura River.* Prepared for the Trust for Public Land and the California State Coastal Conservancy. 606 Studio, Department of Landscape Architecture. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Evans, E. C., G. R. McGregor, and C. E. Petts. 1998. River energy budgets with special reference to river bed processes. *Hydrological Processes* 12:575-595.

Evans, W. 1947. *Ventura County, Ventura River Steelhead Situation*. Field Memo. March 29, 1947. California Department of Fish and Game. Bureau of Fish Conservation.

Evans, W. 1951. *Report of Survey for Santa Clara-Ventura Rivers and Calleguas Creek Watershed,* California. February 20, 1951. California Department of Fish and Game. Bureau of Fish Conservation.

Ewing, L. C., J. M. Michael, R. J. McCarthy. 1989. *Planning for an Accelerated Sea Level Rise Along the California Coast.* California Coastal Commission.

Faber, P. M., E. A. Keller, A. Sands, B. M. Massey. 1989. *The Ecology of Riparian Habitats of the Southern California Region: A Community Profile*. Biological Report 85(7.27). Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Series, Research and Development National Wetland Research Center.

Fabry, V. J., B. A. Seibel, R. A. Feely, and J. C. Orr. 2008. Impacts of ocean acidification on marine fauna and ecosystem processes. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 65:414-432.

Fain, S. R. 2005. *An Assessment of the O. mykiss Population Genetics Literature Regarding Genetic Discreteness of Selected ESUs*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Fausch, K. D., Y. Taniguchi, S. Nakano, G. D. Grossman, and C. R. Townsend. 2001. Flood disturbance regimes influence rainbow trout invasions success among five holarctic regions. *Ecological Applications* 11(5):1438-1455.

Fausch, K. D., B. Rieman, M. Young, and J. Dunham 2006. Strategies for conserving native salmonid populations at risk from nonnative invasions: tradeoffs in using barriers to upstream movement. General Technical Report RMSRS-GTR-174. U.S. Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station.

Feely, R. A., C. L., K. Lee, W. Berelson, J. Kleypas, V. J. Fabry, and F. J. Millero. 2004. Impact of anthropogenic CO_2 on the $CaCO_3$ system in the oceans. *Science* 305(5682):362-366.

Feely, R. A., C. L. Sabine, J. Martin Hernandez-Ayton, D. Ianson, and B. Hales. 2008. Evidence for upwelling of corrosive "acidified" water onto the continental shelf. *Science* 320(5882):1490-1492.

Felton, E. 1965. *California's Many Climates*. Pacific Books.

Fenn, M. and M. Poth. 1999. Temporal and spatial trends in streamwater nitrate concentrations in the San Bernardino Mountains, southern California. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 28:822-836.

Ferren, W. R., Jr., M. H. Capelli, A. Parikh, D. Magney, K. Clark, and J. Haller. 1990. *Botanical Resources at Emma Wood State Beach and the Ventura River Estuary, California: Inventory and Management*. Environmental Resources Team, The Herbarium, Department of Biological Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara. Environmental Report No. 15.

Ferren, W. R., Jr., P. Fiedler, and R. Leidy. 1995. *Wetlands of the Central and Southern California and Coastal Watersheds*. Final Report. Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX.

Ficke, A. D., C. A. Myrick, L. J. Hansen. 2007. Potential impacts of global climate change on freshwater fisheries. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 17:581-613.

Fife, D. L. and J. A. Minch (eds.). 1982. *Geology and Mineral Wealth of the California Transverse Range.* Annual Symposium and Guidebook No. 10. South Coast Geological Society.

Finger, S. (ed.) 1997. *Toxicity of Fire Retardant and Foam Suppressant Chemicals to Plant and Animal Communities. Final Report*. Prepared for Interagency Fire Coordination Committee.

FishXing. 2000. *FishXing software: Version 3.2.* U.S. Forest Service, Six Rivers National Forest. www.stream.fs.fed.us/fishxing.

Flagg, T. A. and C. E. Nash (eds.). 1999. *A Conceptual Framework for Conservation Hatchery Strategies for Pacific Salmonids.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Fisheries Science Center. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC TM-38.

Fleming, D. F. and J. B. Reynolds. 1991. Effects of spawning-run delay on spawning migration of Arctic grayling. *American Fisheries Society Symposium* 10:299-305.

Florsheim, J. L., E. A. Keller, and D. W. Best. 1991. Fluvial sediment transport in response to moderate storm flows following chaparral wildfire, Ventura County, southern California. *Geological Society of America Bulletin* 103:504-511.

Flosi, G., S. Downie, J. Hopelian, M. Bird, R. Coey, and B. Collins. 2010. *California Salmonid Stream Restoration Manual,* 4th ed. State of California, The Resources Agency, California Department Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Branch.

Foley, P. 1994. Predicting extinction times from environmental stochasticity and carrying capacity. *Conservation Biology* 8(1):124-137.

Foley, P. 1977. Extinction models for local populations. *In:* A. Hanski and M. E. Gilpin (eds.), *Metapopulation Biology: Ecology, Genetics, and Evolution.* Academic Press.

Ford, M. J. 2002. Selection in captivity during supportive breeding may reduce fitness in the wild. *Conservation Biology* 16:815-825.

Francis, A. 2010a. *Hopper Creek Stream Inventory Report. September-November, 2008*. Prepared for Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission and California Department of Fish and Game.

Francis, A. 2010b. *El Capitan Creek Stream Inventory Report: December, 2008.* Prepared for Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission and California Department of Fish and Game.

Francis, A. 2011. *Maria Ygnacio Stream Inventory Report: December, 2010.* Prepared for Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission and California Department of Fish and Game.

Franklin, R. and S. Dobush. 1989. *Malibu Creek Steelhead Habitat Assessment*. Entrix, Inc. Prepared for California Trout, Inc.

Fraser, D. J. 2008. How well can captive breeding programs conserve biodiversity? A review of salmonids. *Evolutionary Applications* 1:535-586.

Fretwell, S. J. 1972. *Populations in a Season Environment.* Monographs in Population Biology. No. 5. Princeton University Press.

Friends of the Santa Clara River. 2007. *Santa Clara River Water Monitoring Program*. *Final Report*. Prepared for State Water Resources Control Board Clean Water Team.

Frimpong, E. A., T. M. Sutton, K. Lim, J. Kyoung, P. J. Hrodey, B. A. Engel, T. P. Simon, J. G. Lee, and D. C. Le Master. 2005. Determination of optimal riparian forest buffer dimensions for

stream biota- landscape association models using multimetric and multivariate responses. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 62:1-6.

Fritts, A. L. and T. N. Pearsons. 2006. Effects of predations by non-native smallmouth bass on native salmonid prey: the role of predator and prey size. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 135:853-860.

Fry, D. H. 1938. Trout fishing in southern California streams – instructions for the beginner. *California Fish and Game* 24(2):84-117.

Fry, D. H. 1973. *Anadromous Fishes of California.* California Department of Fish and Game.

FugroWest, Inc. 1994. *Biological Resources of the Sycamore Ranch Aggregate Mining Project Site, Boulder Creek, Santa Clara River Watershed, Ventura County, California*. Prepared for Southern Pacific Milling Company.

FugroWest, Inc. 1996. *San Antonio Creek Southern Steelhead Habitat Characterization, Ventura County, California.* Prepared for Ventura County Flood Control District.

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

Fukushima, M. 2001. Salmonid habitat-geomorphology relationships in low gradient streams. *Ecology* 82:1238-1246.

Furniss, M. J., B. P. Stabb, S. Hazelhurst, C. F. Clifton, K. B. Roby, B. L. Ilhadrt, E. B. Larry, A. H. Todd, L. M. Reid, S. J. Hines, K. A. Bennett, C. H. Luce, and P. J. Edwards, 2010. *Water, Climate Change, and Forests: Watershed Stewardship for a Changing Climate*. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-812. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Fusaro, C. A. (ed.). 1995. *Public Trust and the River: A Discussion of Santa Ynez River Natural Resources: Summary of Presentations.* Meeting held on March 26, 1995 at Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Gallagher, S. P. and Gallagher, C. M. 2005. Discrimination of Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and steelhead redds and evaluation of the use of redd data for estimating escapement in several unregulated streams in northern California. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 25:284-300.

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

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

Gary and Jerri-Ann Jacobs High Tech High. 209. *San Diego Bay: A Call for Conservation.* California Sea Grant Program. NOAA Grant #NA080AR4170669.

Gard, R. and D. W. Seegrist. 1965. Persistence of the native rainbow trout type following introduction of hatchery trout [in the Santa Ana River]. *Copeia* 1965(2):182-185.

Garza, J. C. and A. Clemento. 2007. *Population Genetic Structure of Oncorhynchus mykiss in the Santa Ynez River, California. Final Report.* Project partially funded by the Cachuma Conservation Release Board.

Gerstung, E. R. 1973. *Fish Population and Yield Estimates from California Trout Streams.* California-Nevada Wildlife Society.

Gibbins, C. N., M. J. Jeffries, C. Soulsby, and R. M. Acornley. 2001. Developing ecologically acceptable flow regimes for regulated rivers: a case study of Kielder reservoir and the Kielder water transfer system. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* 8:463-485.

Gibbins, C., J. Shellberg, H. Moir, and C. Soulsby. 2008. Hydrological influences on adult salmonid migration, spawning, and embryo survival. *In:* Sear, D. and P. DeVries (eds.). *Salmonid Spawning Habitat in Rivers: Physical Controls, Biological Responses, and Approaches to Remediation.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 65.

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*. Prepared for California Department. Fish and Game Project No. P0350021 and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. Contribution No. AWIP-S-1.

Glassow, M. A. L. H. Gamble, J. E. Perry, and G. S. Russell. 2007. Prehistory of the northern California bight and the adjacent transverse ranges. *In:* T. Jones and K. Klar (eds.). *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*. AltaMira Press.

Gleason, M. G., S. Newkirk, M. S. Merrifield, J. Howard, R. Cox, M. Webb, J. Koepcke, B. Stranko, M. W. Beck, R. Fuller, P. Dye, D. Vander Schaaf, and J. Carter. 2011. *A Conservation Assessment of West Coast (USA) Estuaries.* The Nature Conservancy.

Glick, P, B. A. Stein, and N. A. Edelson. 2011. Scanning the Conservation Horizon: A Guide to Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment. National Wildlife Federation.

Glick, R. n.d. *Summary of Field Data for Fish, Amphibians, and Reptile Snorkel Surveys in Gaviota Creek, Santa Barbara County, California, During November.* Prepared for California Department of Parks and Recreation, Gaviota Beach State Park.

Gobalet, K. W., P. D. Schulz, T. A. Wake, and J. Siefkin. 2004. Archaeological perspectives on Native American fisheries of California with emphasis on steelhead and salmon. *Transaction of the American Fisheries Society* 133:801-833.

Godinho, H. P., A. L. Godinho, P. S. Formagio and V. C. Torquato, 1991. Fish ladder efficiency in a southeastern Brazilian River. *Ciencia e Cultura* 43(1):63-67.

Good, T. P., R. S. Waples, and P. Adams (eds.). 2005. *Updated Status of Federally Listed ESUs of West Coast Salmon and Steelhead.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest and Southwest Fisheries Science Centers. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-66.

Good. T. P., T. J. Beechie, P. McElhany, M. M. McClure, and M. H. Ruckelshaus. 2007. Recovery planning for endangered species act-listed Pacific salmon: using science to inform goals and strategies. Fisheries 32(9):426-440.

Goodridge, J. 1997. *Historic Rainstorms in California.* California Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, CA. http://water.usgs.gov/data.html.

Graf. W. L. 1999. Dam nation: A geographic census of American dams and their large-scale hydrologic impacts. *Water Resources Research* 35:1305-1311.

Graf, W. L. (ed.). 2002. *Dam Removal: Science and Decision Making*. The Heinz Center.

Graf, W. L. (ed.). 2003. *Dam Removal Research: Status and Prospects*. The Heinz Center.

Grant, G. E. 2005. Out, out dam spot! The geomorphic response of rivers to dam removal. *Pacific Northwest Science Findings* 71(3):1-5. Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Grant, P. R. and B. R. Grant. 2008. *How and Why Species Multiply: The Radiation of Darwin's Finches.* Princeton Series in Evolutionary Biology. Princeton University Press.

Greenwald, G and D. Campton. 2005. *Genetic Influence of Hatchery-Origin Fish to Natural Populations of Rainbow Trout in the Santa Ynez River, California: Final Report.* Submitted to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Intra-agency Agreement No. 1140-1-4000 between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Geological Survey. California-Nevada Operations Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Gregory, R. and K. Wellman. 2001. Bringing stakeholder values into environmental policy choices: a community-based estuary case study. *Ecological Economics* 39:3752.

Greig, S. M., D. A. Sear, and P. A. Carling. 2005. Fine sediment accumulation in salmon spawning gravels and the survival of incubating salmon progeny: implications for spawning habitat management. *Science of the Total Environment* 344:241-258.

Greystone Environmental Consultants. 2002. *Biological Assessment for the Southern California Steelhead for the National Park Service General Management Plan/EIS for the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area*. Prepared for U.S. National Park Service.

Grimes, Churchill B., R. D. Brodeur, L. J. Haldorson, S. M. McKinnell (eds.). 2007. *The Ecology of Juvenile Salmon in the Northeast Pacific Ocean: Regional Comparisons.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 57.

Groot, C. and L. Margolis. 1991. *Pacific Salmon Life Histories*. University of British Columbia Press.

Groot, C., L. Margolis, and W. C. Clarke (eds.). 1995. *Physiological Ecology of Pacific Salmon.* University of British Columbia Press.

Grossinger, R., E. D. Stein, K. Cayce, R. Askevold, S. Dark, and A. Whipple. 2011. *Historical Wetlands of Southern California: An Atlas of U.S. Survey T-Sheets 1851-1889.* San Francisco Estuary Institute Contribution #586 and Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Technical Report #859.

Grossman, E. 2002. *Watershed: The Undamming of America.* Counterpoint.

Gumprecht, B. 1999. *The Los Angeles River: Its Life, Death, and Possible Rebirth*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gunderson, D. R. 1993. *Surveys of Fisheries Resources.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gunderson, L. H., A. P. Clevenger, A. T. Cooper, V. H. Dale, L. Evans, G. L. Evink, L. Fahrig, K, E. Hanes, W. W. Kober, S. B. Lester, K. H. Redford, M. N. Strand, P. Wagner, and J. M. Yowell. 2005. *Assessing and Managing the Ecological Impacts of Paved Roads***.** Committee on Ecological Impacts of Road Density, National Resources Council. National. Academy Press.

Gustafson, R. G., R. S. Waples, J. M. Myers, L. A. Weitkamp, G. J. Bryant, O. W. Johnson, and J. J. Hard. 2007. Pacific salmon extinctions: quantifying lost and remaining diversity. *Conservation Biology* 21:1009-1020.

Guthrie, D., J. M. Hoeing, C. M. Jones, M. J. Mills, S. A. Moberly, K. H. Pollock, and D. R. Talhelm. 1990. *Creel and Angler Surveys in Fisheries Management.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 12.

Hall, C. A., Jr. 2007. *Introduction to the Geology of Southern California and Its Native Plants.* University of California Press.

Halsey, R. W. 2005. *Fire, Chaparral, and Survival in Southern California*. Subelt Publications.

Hanak, E. and J. Lund. 2008. *Adapting California's Water Management to Climate Change*. Public Policy Institute of California.

Hanak, E. and G. Moreno. 2008. California *Coastal Management with a Changing Climate.* Public Policy Institute of California.

Hannah, D. M., I. A. Malcolm, C. Soulsby, and A. F. Youngson. 2008. A comparison of forest and moorland stream microclimate, heat exchanges, and thermal dynamics. *Hydrological Processes* 22:919-940.

Hanski, I. A. and M. E. Gilpin (eds.). 1997. *Metapopulation Biology: Ecology, Genetics, and Evolution.* Academic Press.

Hanson, M. 1992. Wildlife Survey of Santa Maria and Sisquoc Rivers. Prepared for Bissell & Karn, Inc.

Haro, A. J., K. L. Smith, R. A. Rulifson, C. M. Moffitt, R. J. Klauda, M. J. Dadswell, R. A. Cunjak, J. E. Cooper, K. L. Beal, and T. S. Avery. 2009. *Challenges for Diadromous Fishes in a Dynamic Global Environment.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 69.

Harrelson, C., C. Rawlins, and J. Potyondy. 1994. *Stream Channel Reference Sites: An Illustrated Guide to Field Techniques*. General Report. RM-245. U.S. Forest Service.

Harrison, L. R., E. A. Keller, and M. Sallee. 2005. Santa Monica Mountains steelhead habitat analysis: Watershed hydrologic analysis. Unpublished Report, March 29, 2005, Department of Geology, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Harrison, L. R. and E. A. Keller. 2006. Modeling forced pool-riffle hydraulics in a boulder-bed stream, southern California. *Geomorphology* 83:232-248.

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.

Hartt, A. C. and M. D. Bell. 1985. *Early Oceanic Migrations and Growth of Juvenile Pacific Salmon and Steelhead.* Trout. Bulletin 46. International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, Vancouver, Canada.

Harvey, B. and T. Lisle. 1998. Effects of suction dredging on streams: A review and an evaluation strategy. *Fisheries* 23:8-17.

Harvey, B. C., Whiket, J. L., and Nakamoto, R. J. 2002. Habitat relationships and larval drift of native and non-indigenous fishes in neighboring tributaries of a coastal California river. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 131:159-170.

Haston, L. and J. Michaelsen. 1997. Spatial and temporal variability of southern California precipitation over the last 400 yr and relationship to atmospheric circulation patterns. *Journal of Climate* 10:1836-1852.

Hatfield, T. and J. Bruce. 2000. Predicting salmonid habitat-flow relationships for streams from western North America. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 20:1005-1015.

Hayes, S. A., M. H. Bond, C. V. Hanson and R. B. MacFarlane. 2004. Interaction between endangered wild and hatchery salmonids: can pitfalls of artificial propagation be avoided in small coastal streams? *Journal of Fish Biology* 65(SupA):101-121.

Hayes, S. A., M. H. Bond., C. V. Hanson, E. V. Freund, J. J. Smith, E. C. Anderson, A. J. Ammann, and R. B. MacFarlane. 2008. Steelhead growth in a small Central California watershed: upstream and estuarine rearing patterns. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 137:114-128.

Hayes, S. A., M. H. Bond. C. V. Hanson, A. W. Jones., A. J. Ammann, J. A. Harding, A. L. Collins, J. Peres, and R. B. MacFarlane. 2011a. Down, up, down and "smolting" twice? Seasonal movement patterns by juvenile steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in a coastal watershed with a bar closing estuary. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68(80:1341-1350.

Hayes, S. A., C. V. Hanson, D. Pearse, M. H. Bond, R. B. MacFarlane. 2011b. Should I stay or should I go? The influence of genetic origin on emigration and behavior and physiology of resident and anadromous juvenile *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (in press). *North American Journal of Fisheries Management.*

Hayhoe, K., D. Cayan, C. B. Field, P. C. Frumhoff, E. P. Maure, N. L. Miller, S. C. Moser, S. H. Schneider, K. N. Cahill, E. E. Cleland, L. Dale, R. Drapek, R. M. Hanemann, L. S. Kalkstein, J. Lenihan, C. K. Lunch, R. P. Neilson, S. C. Sheridan, and J. H. Verville. 2004. Emissions pathways, climate change, and impacts on California. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101:12422-12427.

Hedderly, E. L. 1910a. Twin trout law vexing anglers: confusion worked by Jordanic verdict that steelheads and rainbows are identical. *Los Angeles Herald*, April 10, 1910, Part III, 6.

Hedderly, E. L. 1910b. Rainbow trout hard to catch: seems more so now than last year in streams of the San Gabriel Valley. Steelhead are plentiful. *Los Angeles Herald*, April 15, 1910, 11.

Helmbrecht. D. and D. A. Boughton. 2005. *Recent Efforts to Monitor Anadromous Oncorhynchus Species in the California Coastal Region: A Complication of Metadata*. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC TM-381.

Hendry, A. P. and T. Day. 2003. Revisiting the positive correlation between female size and egg size. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 5:421-429.

Hendry, A., P. and S. C. Stearns (eds.). 2004. *Evolution Illuminated: Salmon and Their Relatives.* Oxford University Press.

Hendry, A. P., T. Bohlin, B. Johnsson, O. K. Berg. 2004a. To Sea or Not to Sea? Anadromy versus Non-Anadromy in Salmonids. *In:* Andrew, H. P. and S. C. Stearns (eds.*). Evolution Illuminated: Salmon and Their Relatives.* Oxford University Press.

Hendy, I. L., T. F. Pedersen, J. P. Kennett, and R. Tada. 2004b. Intermittent existence of a southern California upwelling cell during submillennial climate change of the last 60 kyr. *Paleoceanography* 19:1-15.

Henke, E. 1999. *Historical Research Documentation Relative to Anadromous/Migratory Salmonid Habitat on Vandenberg Air Force Base and Point Arguello Area Air Force Properties.* Prepared for Tetra Tech, Inc.

Hey, J., E. L. Brannon, D. E. Campton, R. W. Doyle, I. A. Fleming, M. T. Kinnison, R. Lande, J. Olsen, D. P. Philipp, J. Travis. 2005. *Considering Life History, Behavior, and Ecological Complexity in Defining Conservation Units for Pacific Salmon.* An Independent Panel Report. May 16, 2005. Prepared for National Marine Fisheries Service, Protected Resources Division.

Hickman, J. C. (ed.) 1993. *The Jepson Manuel: Higher Plants of California.* University of California Press.

Higgins, P. 1991. *Southern California Steelhead Recovery Assessment: San Mateo Creek and the Santa Margarita River.* Prepared for Trout Unlimited, South Coast Chapter.

Hilderbrand, R. H., A. C. Watts, and A. M. Randall. 2005. The myths of restoration ecology. *Ecology and Society* 10(1):1-11.

Hildebrandt, W. R. 2004. *Xonxon'ata, in the Tall Oaks: Archaeology and Ethnohistory of a Chumash Village in the Santa Ynez Valley.* Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. Contributions in Anthropology No. 2.

Hoelzer, G. A., R., Drewes, J. Meier, and R. Doursat. 2008. Isolation-by-distance and outbreeding depression are sufficient to drive parapatric speciation in the absence of environmental influences. *Computational Biology PLoS* 4(7).

Hofmann, E.E. 2000. Modeling for estuarine synthesis. *In*: J. E. Hobbie (ed.). *Estuarine Science: A Synthetic Approach to Research and Practice.* Island Press.

Holland, E.. 2001. *The State of California Rivers*. Western Rivers Program. The Trust for Public Land.

Holland, V. L. 1996. *California Vegetation.* Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.

Holmes, E. E. 2001. Estimating risks in declining populations with poor data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98(9):5072-5077.

Horne, S. P. 1981. *The Inland Chumash: Ethnography, Ethnohistory, and Archaeology*. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Hornbeck, David. 1983. *California Patterns: A Geographical and Historical Atlas.* Mayfield Publishing Company.

Hover, E. E. 1937. Experimental modification of the sexual cycle in trout by control of light. *Science* 86:425-426.

Hovey, T. 2004. Current status of southern steelhead/rainbow trout in San Mateo Creek, California. *California Fish and Game* 90(3):140-154.

Hosale, L. C. 2010. *6000 Years on the River: Evidence for Marine Resource Use and Coastal/Inland Interactions from SBA-485, An Inland Site in the Santa Ynez River Valley, Santa Barbara, CA.* Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Hubbs, C. L. 1946. Wandering of pink salmon and other salmonids fishes into southern California. *California Fish and Game* 32:81-86.

Hudson, T. and T. C. Blackburn. 1982. *The Material Culture of the Chumash Interaction Sphere.* Volume 1: *Food Procurement and Transportation*. Volume II: *Food Preparation and Shelter*. Ballena Press and Sana Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Hunt, L. 1992. Biological *Assessment of Pilot Sediment Sluicing Program on Aquatic Biological Resources in San Gabriel River Below Morris Reservoir, Los Angeles County, California.* Prepared. for the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.

Hunt, L. 1993. *Origin, Maintenance, and Land Use of the Santa Maria Watershed, California.* Prepared. for The Nature Conservancy.

Hunt, L. 1994. *Relocation and Movements of Southwestern Pond turtles (Clemmys marmorata pallida), Gibraltar Dam Strengthening Project, Upper Santa Ynez River, Santa Barbara, California.* Prepared for City of Santa Barbara Department of Public Works and Woodward-Clyde Consultants.

Hunt, L. 1999. Biological *Assessment of Colson Quarry Landslide on Aquatic and Riparian Resources in North Fork La Brea Creek Watershed, Santa Barbara County, California.* Prepared for the County of Santa Barbara, Planning and Development Department.

Hunt & Associates Biological Consulting Services. 2008a. *Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Workbooks Threats Assessment.* Prepared for National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

Hunt & Associates Biological Consulting Services. 2008b. *Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Area Recovery Actions.* Prepared for National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

Hunt, L., P. Lehman, and M. H. Capelli. 1992. *Vertebrate Resources at Emma Wood State Beach and the Ventura River Estuary: Inventory and Management.* Prepared for the California Department Parks and Recreation and the City of San Buenaventura.

Hutchings, J.A. and D.J. Fraser. 2008. The nature of fisheries and farming-induced evolution. *Molecular Ecology*. 17:294-313.

Hutchinson, G. E. 1978. *An Introduction to Population Ecology.* Yale University Press.

Hynes, H. B. N. 1970. *The Ecology of Running Waters.* University of Toronto Press.

Ibbotson, A. T., W. R. C Beaumont, D. Collinson, A. Wilkinson, and P. C. Pinder. 2004. A cross-river antenna array for the detection of miniature passive integrated transponder tags in deep fast flowing rivers. *Journal of Fish Biology* 65:1441-1443.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007a. *Climate Change 2007, Working Group I: The Physical Basis*. Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007b. *Climate Change 2007, Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability.* Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007c. *Climate Change 2007, Working Group III: Mitigation of Climate Change.* Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.

Isaak, D. J., S. Wollrab, D. Horan, and G. Chandler. 2010. Climate change effects on stream and rive temperatures across the northwest U.S. from 1980-2009. *Climate Change* DOI 10.1007/s10584-011-0326-z.

Jackson, J. B. C., K. E. Alexander, and E. Sala (eds.). 2011. *Shifting Baselines: The Past and the Future of Ocean Fisheries*. Island Press.

Jacobs, D., E. Chatfield, L. Kiley, G. M. Kondolf, L. Lloyd, F. Smith, D. Walker, and K, Walker 1993. *California's Rivers: A Public Trust Report.* California State Lands Commission.

Jacobs, D., E. Stein, and T. Longcore. 2011. *Classification of California Estuaries Based on Natural Closure Patterns: Templates For Restoration and Management.* Southern California Coastal Water Research Project. Technical Report 619a.

Jay, D. A., W. R. Geyer, and D. R. Montgomery. 2000. An ecological perspective on estuarine classification. *In:* Hobbie, J. E. (ed.). *Estuarine Science: A Synthetic Approach to Research and Practice*. Island Press.

Johannsson, P. O. 1987. The Economic Theory and Measurement of Environmental Benefits. Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, D. H., B. M. Shrier, J. S. O'Neal, J. A. Knutzen, X. Augerot, T. A. O'Neil, and T. N. Pearsons. 2007. *Salmonid Field Protocols Handbook: Techniques for Assessing Status and Trends in Salmon and Trout Populations*. American Fisheries Society.

Johnson, P. T. J., J. D. Olden, and M. Jake Vander Zanden. 2008. Dam invaders: impoundments facilitate biological invasions into freshwaters. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 6(7):357-363.

Jones, T. L. and Klar (eds.) 2007. *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity.* AltaMira Press.

Jonson, B. and J. Ruud-Hansen. 1985. Water temperature as the primary influence on timing of seaward migrations of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo sala*r) smolts. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 42:593-595.

Jonsson, B. and N. Jonsson. 1993. Partial migration: Niche shift versus sexual maturation in fishes. *Reviews in Fish Biology* (3):348-365.

Jordon, D. S. and C. H . Gilbert. 1881. *Notes On The Fishes of the Pacific-Coast of the United States. Proceedings of the United States National-Museum*. Vol. 4.

Jordan, D. S. and B. W. Evermann. 1896. *The Fishes of North and Middle Americ*a. *United States National Museum Bulletin* 47:1896.

Jordan, D. S. and J. Grinnell. 1908. Description of a new species of trout (*Salmo evermanni*) from the upper Sana River, Mount San Gorgonio, southern California. *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* 21:31-32.

Jordan, D. S. and B. W. Evermann. 1923. *American Food and Game Fishes.* Doubleday, Page and Co.

Kahler, T., H. P. Roni, and T. P. Quinn. 2001. Summer movement and growth of juvenile anadromous salmonids in small western Washington streams. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 58:1947-1956.

Kajtaniak, D. 2008. *Pole Creek Stream Inventory Report.* Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and California Department of Fish and Game.

Kajtaniak, D. 2010. *San Luis Rey River Watershed Asses*sment. California Department Fish and Game, Coastal Watershed Assessment Program.

Karl, T. R., G. A. Meehl, C. D. Miller, S. J. Hassol, A. M. Waple, and W. L. Murray (eds.). 2008. *Weather and Climate Extremes in a Changing Climate. Regions of Focus: North America, Hawaii, Caribbean, and U.S. Pacific Islands. Synthesis and Assessment 3.3*. Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research.

Karl, T. R., J. M. Melillo, and T. C. Peterson (eds.). 2009. *Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States*. Cambridge University Press.

Karl, William. 1979. *The California Water Atlas.* California Department of Water Resources.

Keefer, M. L., C. C. Caudill, C. A. Peery, and S. R. Lee. 2008. Transporting juvenile salmonids around dams impairs adult migration. *Ecological Applications* 18:1888-1900.

Keefer, M. L., C. A. Peery, and B. High. 2009. Behavioral thermoregulation and associated mortality trade-offs in migrating adult steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss): variability among sympatric populations. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 66:1734-1747.

Keegan, T. 1990a. *Malibu Creek/Santa Monica Mountains Steelhead Investigations*. Entrix, Inc. Prepared for California Trout, Inc.

Keegan, T. 1990b. *Santa Monica Mountains steelhead restoration project: Candidate Stream Analysis.* Entrix, Inc. Prepared for California Trout, Inc.

Keeley, J. E. (ed.). 1993. *Interface Between Ecology and Land Development in California.* Southern California Academy Sciences.

Keeley, J. E. 2002. Fire management of California shrubland landscapes. *Environmental Management* 29(3):395-408.

Keeley, J. E. 2006. South Coast Bioregion. *In:* Sugihara, N. G., J. W. Van Wagtendonk, K. E. Shaffer, J. Frites-Kaufman, and A. E. Thode (eds.). *Fire in California's Ecosystems.* University of California Press.

Keeley. J. E., C. J. Fotheringham, and M. Morias. 1999. Reexamining fire suppression impacts on brushland fire regimes. *Science* 284:1829-1832.

Keller, E. A. and F. J. Swanson. 1979. Effects of large organic material on channel form and alluvial processes. *Earth Surface Processes* 4:361-380.

Keller, E. A. and M. H. Capelli. 1992. Ventura River flood of February 1992: A lesson ignored? *Water Resources Bulletin* 28(5). American Water Resources Association.

Keller, E. A. 2011. *Santa Barbara Land of Dynamic Beauty: A Natural History.* Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Kelley, E. 2003. *Information Synthesis and Priorities Regarding Steelhead Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) on the Santa Clara River*. Prepared for The Nature Conservancy.

Kelley, E. 2008. *Steelhead Trout Smolt Survival in the Santa Clara and Santa Ynez Rivers.* Prepared for the California Department of Fish and Game. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Kennedy-Jenks Consultants, Inc. 2006. 2005 *Ventura River and San Antonio Creek Watershed Sanitary Survey Update.* Prepared for the City of San Buenaventura.

Kennett, J. P. and L. C. Peterson. 2002. Rapid climate change: ocean responses to earth system instability in the later quaternary. *In: Achievements and Opportunities of Scientific Ocean Drilling, The Legacy of the Ocean Drilling Program,* A Special Issue of the JOIDES Journal 28(1):5-9.

Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service. 2008a. Guide to the Reference Values *Used in the South-Central/Southern California Steelhead DPS Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Workbooks (DVD).* Prepared for National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

Kier Associates and National Marine Fisheries Service. 2008b. *Fifty-Five South-Central/Southern California Steelhead DPS Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Workbooks (DVD).* Prepared for National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

Kim, J. T. K. Kim, R. W. Arritt, N. L. Miller. 2002. Impacts of increased atmospheric c02 on the hydroclimate of the western United States. *Journal of Climate* 15:1926-1942.

Knudsen, E. E and J. Hal Michael, R. (eds.). 2009. *Pacific Salmon Environmental Life History Models: Advancing Science for Sustainable Salmon in the Future.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 71.

Konrad, C. P. and D. B. Booth. 2005. Hydrologic changes in urban streams and their ecological significance. *In:* Brown, L. R., R. H. Gray, R. H. Hughes, and M. R. Meador (eds.). *Effects of Urbanization on Stream Ecosystems.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 47.

Kondolf, G. M. 1997. Hungry water: effects of dams and gravel mining on river channels. *Environmental Management* 21:533-551.

Kondolf, G. M. and H. Piegay (eds.). 2003. *Tools in Fluvial Geomorphology.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kondolf, C. M., D. R. Montgomery, H. Piegay, and L. Schmitt. 2003. Geomorphic classification of rivers and streams. *In:* Kondolf, G. M. and H. Piegay (eds.). *Tools in Fluvial Geomorphology.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kondolf, G. M., M. J. G. Williams, T. C. Horner, and D. Milan. 2008. Assessing physical quality of spawning habitat. *In:* Sear, D. A. and P. S. Devries (eds.). *Salmonid Spawning Habitat in*

Rivers: Physical controls, Biological Responses and Approaches to Remediation. American Fisheries Society Symposium 65.

Kostyack, J. and D. Rohlf. 2008. Conserving endangered species in an era of global warming. *Environmental Law Institute* 28:10203-10213.

Kraft, M. E. 1972. Effects of controlled flow reduction on a trout stream. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada* 29:1405-1411.

Kreider, C. M. 1948. *Steelhead.* G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Kreissman, Bern. 1991. *California: An Environmental Atlas and Guide.* Bear Klaw Press.

Kuligowski, D. R., M. J. Ford and B. A. Berejikian. 2005. Fine-scale patterns of genetic relatedness in a population of steelhead. *Transaction of the American Fisheries Societ*y 132:1202-1212.

Kuyper, J. 1998. *Identification and Evaluation of Barriers to Native Steelhead in the Coastal Drainages of Santa Barbara County, California.* Bachelor of Science Thesis, Department of Environmental Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Lackey, R. T., D. H. Lach, S. L. Duncan (eds.). 2006. *Salmon 2010: The Future of Wild Coast Salmon.* American Fisheries Society.

Lande, R. 1993. Risks of population extinction from demographic and environmental stochasticity and random catastrophes. *American Naturalist* 142:911-927.

Landweber, L. F. and A. P. Dobson (eds.). 1999. *Genetics and the Extinction of Species: DNA and the Conservation of Biodiversity.* Princeton University Press.

Langefors, A. H. 2005. Adaptive and neutral genetic variation and colonization history of Atlantic salmon, Salmo salar. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 74:297-308.

Lantis, D. W., R. Steiner, A. E. Karinen. 1981. *California: Land of Contrast*. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Leder, E. H., R, G, Danzmann, and M. M. Terguson. 2006 The candidate gene clock localizes to a strong spawning time Quantitative Trait Locus region in Rainbow trout. *Journal of Heredity*. 97(1):74-80.

Lee, L., P. Fiedler, P. Stewart, R. Curry, D. Partridge, J. Mason, E. Inlander, R. Almy, D. Aston, and M. Spencer. 2001. *Guidebook for Reference-Based Assessment of the Functions of Riverine Waters/Wetland Ecosystems in the South Coast Region of Santa Barbara County, California.* Prepared for Santa Barbara County Water Agency.

Leipper, D. F. 1994. Fog on the U.S. West Coast: a review. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 75(2): 229-240.

Lenihan, J. M. D. Bachelet, R. Drapek, and R. P. Neilson. 2006. *The Response of Vegetation Distribution, Ecosystem Productivity, and Fire in California to Future Climate Scenarios Simulated by the MC1 Dynamic Vegetation Model*. California Climate Change Center.

Leitritz, E. 1970. *A History of California Fish Hatcheries: 1870-1960. Fish Bulletin* No. 150. California Department of Fish and Game.

Leung, L. R., Y. Qian, X. D. Bian, W. M. Washington, J. G. Han, and J. O. Roads. 2004. Mid-century ensemble regional climate change scenarios for the western United States. *Climate Change* 62:75-113.

Levin, P. S., M. H. Schiewe. 2001. Preserving salmon biodiversity. *American Scientist* 89:220-227.

Levin, S. A. (ed.). 2009. *The Princeton Guide to Ecology.* Princeton University Press.

Levin, S. A. and J. Lubchenco. 2008. Resilience, robustness, and marine ecosystem-based management. *BioScience* 58:27-32.

Levin, P. S., J. J. Fogarty, S. A. Murawski, and D. Fluharty. 2009. Integrated ecosystem assessments: developing the scientific basis for ecosystem based management of the ocean. *PLoS* 7:23-28.

Lewis, W. M., Jr. (ed.). 2003. *Water and Climate in the West*. University of Colorado Press.

Leydecker, A. and L. Grabowsky. 2006. *Ventura Stream Team 2001-2005: A Review of the Findings of Santa Barbara Channelkeeper's Ventura Stream Team, January 2001-January 2006.* Prepared for Santa Barbara Channelkeeper.

Lichatowich, J. 1999. *Salmon Without Rivers*. Island Press.

Lin, C. J. and R. Ambrose. 2005. Relations between fish assemblages and urbanization in southern California coastal streams. *In:* Brown, L., R. H. Gray, R. Hughes, and M. R. Meador (eds). *Effects of Urbanization on Stream Ecosystems.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 47.

Lindley, S. T. 2003. Estimation of population growth and extrication parameters from noisy data. E*cological Applications* 13(3):806-813.

Little, A. D., Inc. 1998. Guadalupe Oil *Field Remediation and Abandonment Project. Final Environmental Impact Report.* SCH #96051053. Prepared for the County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.

Llanos, A, M. Love, and M. Stoecker. 2009. *Fish Passage Assessment and Recommended Treatment Options for Los Padres National Forest Stream Crossings on Davy Brown and Munch Creeks.* Prepared for South Coast habitat Restoration, Earth Island Institute and Los Padres National Forest.

Loarie, S. R., B. E. Carter, K. Hayhoe, S. McMahon, R. Moe, C. A. Knight, and D. D. Ackerly. 2008. Climate change and the future of California's endemic flora. *PLoS* One 3(6).

Lockmann, R. 1981. *Guarding the Forest of Southern California: Evolving Attitudes Toward Conservation of Watershed, Woodlands, and Wilderness*. Western Land and Waters XII. The Arthur C. Clarke Company.

Lockwood, J. L., M. F. Hoopes, and M. P. Marchetti. 2007. *Invasion Ecology.* Blackwell Publishing.

Logerwell, E. A., N. Mantua, P. W. Lawson, R. C. Francis, and V. N. Agostini. 2003. Tracking environmental processes in the coastal zone for understanding and predicting Oregon coho (Oncorhynchus kisutch) marine survival. *Fisheries Oceanography* 12:554-568.

Lohse, K. A., D. A. Newburn, J. J. Opperman, and A. M. Merenlender. 2008. Forecasting relative impacts of land use on anadromous fish habitat to guide conservation planning. *Ecological Applications* 18(2):467-482.

Lomolino, M. V., B. R. Riddle, and J. H. Brown. 2010. *Biogeography*. Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Loomis, J. B. and D. S. White. 1996. Economic benefits of rare and endangered species: summary and meta-analysis. *Ecological Economics* 18:197-206.

Los Padres National Forest. 2000. *Sisquoc River Watershed Analysis*. Prepared for U.S. Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest.

Love, M. and R. Taylor. 2006. *California Salmonid Stream Habitat restoration Manual, Part 9: Fish Passage Evaluation at Stream Crossings.* Prepared for the California Department Fish and Game.

Love, M. and P. Llanos. 2005. *Stream Channel Assessment for Horse Creek Dam Removal Project.* Michael Love Associates.

LSA Associates, Inc. 1993. *Special Status Species Survey of the Coast Rock Project Site Along the Santa Maria and Sisquoc Rivers.* Prepared for Coast Rock Products.

Lubchenco, J. 1998. Entering the century of the environment: A new social contract for science. *Science* 279:491-497.

Lucas, M. C. and E. Baras. 2001. *Migration of Freshwater Fishes*. Osney Mead, Blackwell Science.

Luers, A. and M. D. Mastrandrea. 2008. *Climate Change in California: Scenarios for Adaptation.* Public Policy Institute of California.

Lufkin, A. (ed.). 1991. *California's Salmon and Steelhead: The Struggle to Restore an Imperiled Resource.* University California Press.

Lytle, D. A. and N. L. Poff. 2004. Adaptation to natural flow regimes. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 94:94-100.

McCullough, D. R. (ed.). 1996. *Metapopulations and Wildlife Conservation.* Island Press.

McEachron, M. 2007. *A Review of Historical Information Regarding Steelhead Trout in the Piru Creek Watershed, Ventura County, California*. Prepared for the United Water Conservation District.

McElhany, P., M. H. Ruckelshaus, M. J Ford, T .C. Wainwright, and E. P. Bjorkstedt. 2000. *Viable Salmonid Populations and the Recovery of Evolutionary Significant Units.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC TM-42.

McElhany, P., E. A. Steel, D. Jensen, and K. K. Avery. 2009. Uncertainty in a complex salmon habitat model. *In:* Knudsen, E. E and J. Hal Michael, R. (eds.). *Pacific Salmon Environmental Life History Models: Advancing Science for Sustainable Salmon in the Future*. American Fisheries Society Symposium 71.

McEwan, D. 2001. Central Valley steelhead. *In:* Brown, R. L. (ed.). *Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Fish Bulletin* No. 179. *California Department of Fish and Game.*

McEwan, D. and T. A. Jackson. 1996. *Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.* California Department of Fish and Game.

McKnight, B. N. (ed.). 1993. *Biological Pollution: The Control and Impact of Invasive Species.* Indian Academy of Sciences.

McLeod, M. 1992. *Vegetation of the Sisquoc and Santa Maria riverbeds in the Coast Rock Products Master Mining and Reclamation Planning Area*. Prepared for Bissell and Karn Consultants, Inc.

McMillan, J. R., S. L. Katz, and G. R. Pess. 2007. Observational Evidence of spatial and temporal structure in a sympatric anadromous (winter steelhead) and resident rainbow trout mating system on the Olympic Peninsula, Washington. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 136:736-748.

McMullen, C. P. and J. Jabbour (eds.). 2010. *Climate Change Science Compendium: 2009*. United Nations Environment Programme.

McNeil, W. J. and D. C. Himsworth (eds.). *Salmonid Ecosystems of the North Pacific. O*regon State University Press.

McPhee, M. V., F. Utter, J. A. Stanford, K. V. Kuzishchin, K. A. Savvaitova, D. S. Pavlov, F. W. Allendorf. 2007. Population structure and partial anadromy in *Oncorhynchus mykiss* from Kamchatka: relevance for conservation strategies around the Pacific Rim. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* 16:539-547.

McRae, K. S. 1999. *Soxtonokmu' (CA-SBa-167): An Analysis of Artifacts and Economic Patterns from Late Period Village in the Santa Ynez Valley*. University of Texas.

MacArthur, R. H. and E. O. Wilson. 1967. *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Monographs in Population Biology. No. 1. Princeton University Press.

MacDonnell, L., T. Rice, and S. Shupe. 1989. *Instream Flow Protection in the West.* Natural Resources Law Center, University of Colorado School of Law.

Madriñan, L. F. S. White, B. Feist, R. Faux, S. Heppell, J. Feldhaus, G. R. Giannico, H. W. Li. 2009. Temperature as an index of juvenile red band/steelhead trout carrying capacity in a semi-arid basin (in press). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*.

Mahrdt, C., T. Oberbauer, J. Rieger, J. Verfaillie, B. Browning, and J. Speth. 1976. *Natural Resources of Coastal Wetlands in Northern Santa Barbara County.* Coastal Wetland Series #14. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Malanson, G. P. 1963. *Riparian Landscapes.* Cambridge University Press.

Malcolm, I. A. A. F. Youngson, and C. Soulsby. 2003. Survival of salmonid eggs in gravel bed streams: effects of groundwater-surface water interactions. *River Research Applications* 19:303-316.

Malibu Creek Watershed Advisory Council. 2005. *Final Malibu Creek Watershed Monitoring Program.* Prepared by CDM for the City of Calabasas.

Mangel, M. and W. H. Satterthwaite. 2008. Combining proximate and ultimate approaches to understand life history variation in salmonids with application to fisheries, conservation, and aquaculture. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 83:107-130.

Mantua, N. J., S. R. Hare, Y. Zhang, J. M. Wallace, and R. C. Francis. 1997. A Pacific interdecadal climate oscillation with impacts on salmon production. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 78:1069-1079.

Mantua, N. J. and S. R. Hare. 2002. The Pacific decadal oscillation. *Journal of Oceanography* 58:35-44.

Mantua, N. J. I. Tohver, and A. Hamlet. 2010. Climate change impacts on streamflow extremes and summertime stream temperature and their possible consequences for freshwater salmon habitat in Washington state. *Climate Change* 102:187-223.

Mantua. N. J. 2011. The Pacific Decadal Oscillation. *In:* T. Munn (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Global Climate Change.* 5 Vols. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Marks, J. C., G. A. Haden, M. O'Neill, and C. Pace. 2010. Effects of flow restoration and exotic species removal on recovery of native fish: lessons dam decommissioning. *Restoration Ecology* 18(6):934-943.

Marmulla, G. and R. Welcomme (eds.). 2002. *Fish Passes: Design, Dimensions and Monitoring.* Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations.

Martìnez, A., J. C. Garza, and D. E. Pearse. 2011. A microsatellite genome screen identifies chromosomal regions under differential selection in steelhead and rainbow trout. *Transaction of the American Fisheries Society* 140:829-842.

Mastrandrea, M., D. C. Tebaldi, C. P. Snyder, and S. H. Schneider. 2009. *Current and Future Impacts of Extreme Events in California.* California Climate Change Center, University of California, Berkeley.

Matthews, K. R. and N. H. Berg. 1997. Rainbow trout responses to water temperature and dissolved oxygen stress in two southern California stream pools. *Journal of Fish Biology* 50:50-67.

Maurer, E. P., S. Gibbard and P. B. Duffy. 2006. Amplification of streamflow impacts of El Niño by increased atmospheric greenhouse gases. *Geophysical Research Letters.* 33(2):L02707. 10.1029/2005GL025100.

Maurer, E. P., H. G. Hildalgo, T. Das, M. D. Dettinger, and D. R. Cayan. 2010. Assessing climate change impacts on daily streamflow in California: the utility of daily large-scale climate data. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions* 2010(7):1209-1243.

May, C. L. and R. E. Gresswell. 2004. Spatial and temporal patterns of debris-flow deposition in the Oregon Coast Range, USA. *Geomorphology* 57:135-149.

May, C. L. and D. C. Lee. 2004. The relationships among in-channel sediment storage, pool depth, and summer survival of juvenile salmonids in Oregon Coast Range streams. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 24:761-774.

Mayer, K. E. and W. F. Laudenslayer, Jr. 1988. *A Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California.* California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Mayr, E. 1963. *Animal Species and Evolution.* Harvard University Press.

MEC Analytical Systems, Inc. 2002. *Preliminary Plan Formulation Report: Rincon Creek Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Santa Barbara/Ventura County, California*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District. Contribution. No. DACW09-01-D-0007.

Medellin-Azuara, J. C. R. Connel, K. Madani, J. R. Lund, and R. E. Howitt. 2009. *Water Management Adaptation with Climate Change.* California Climate Change Center, University of California, Berkeley.

Mertes, L., W. R. Ferren, Jr., J. Hawksworth, and M. H. Capelli. 1995. Hydrogeomorphic classification and functional assessment of the wetlands of the Ventura River Watershed. *In:* Ferren, W. R., Jr., P. Fiedler, and R. Leidy (eds.). *Wetlands of Central Southern California and Coastal Wetlands.* U.S. Environ. Prot. Agency, Region 9.

Meyer Resources, Inc. 1988. *Benefits from Present and Future Salmon and Steelhead Production in California.* A Report to the California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead.

Michael, J. 2010. Business Forecasting Center. Eberhardt School of Business, University of the Pacific.

Michael Love & Associates and Stoecker Ecological. 2007. *Gaviota Creek Fish Passage and Geomorphic Assessment.* Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Michael Love & Associates. 2009. Fish Passage *Assessment and Recommended Treatment Options for Los Padres National Forest Stream Crossings on Davy Brown and Munch Creeks.* Prepared for South Coast Habitat Restoration Earth Island Institute and Los Padres National Forest.

Miller, R. R. 2005. *Freshwater Fishes of Mexico*. University Chicago Press.

Miller, N. L. and N. J. Schlegel. 2006. Climate change projected fire weather sensitivity: California Santa Ana wind occurrence. *Geophysical Research Letters* 33(15):L15711.

Millstein, R. L. 2010. The concepts of population and metapopulation evolutionary biology and ecology. *In:* Bell, M. A., D. J. Futuyama, W. F. Eanes, and J. S. Levinton. *Evolution Since Darwin: The First 150 Years.* Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Minnich, R. 1989. Climate, fire, and landslides in southern California. *In*: Sadler, P. and D. Morton (eds.). *Landslides in a Semi-Arid Environment, with an Emphasis on the Inland Valleys of Southern California*. Publications of the Inland Geologic Society. Vol. 2.

Mitsch, W. J. and J. G. Gosselink. 2007. *Wetlands.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mobrand, L. E., J. A. Lichatowich, L. C. Lestelle, and T. S. Vogel. 1997. An approach to describing ecosystem performance "through the eyes of salmon". *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 54:2964-2973.

Mohseni, O. and H. G. Stefan. 1999. Stream temperature/air temperature relationship: a physical interpretation. *Journal of Hydrology* 218:128-141.

Mohseni, O., T. R., Erikson, and H. G. Stefan. 1999. Sensitivity of stream temperatures in the U.S. to air temperatures projected under a global warming scenario. *Water Resources Research* 35(12):3723-3733.

Mohseni, O., H. G. Stefan, and J. G. Eaton. 2003. Global warming and potential changes in fish habitat in the U.S. streams. *Climate Change* 59:389-409.

Moir, H. J., C. N. Gibbons, C. Soulsby, and J. Webb. 2004. Linking channel geomorphic characteristics to spatial patterns of spawning activity and discharge use by Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) *Geomorphology* 60:21-35.

Monsma, B. J. 2004. *The Sespe Wild: Southern California's Last Free River.* University of Nevada Press.

Montgomery, D. R. 1999. Process domains and the river continuum. *Water Resources Bulletin* 301:432-454. American Water Resources Association.

Montgomery, D. R. 2003. *King of fish: the Thousand-Year Run of Salmon*. Westview Press.

Montgomery, D. R. and J. M. Buffington. 1997. Channel-reach morphology in mountain drainage basins. *Geological Society of America Bulletin.* 109:596-611.

Montgomery, D. R. and L. H. MacDonald. 2002. Diagnostic approach to stream channel assessment and monitoring. *Water Resources Bulletin* 38:1-16. American Water Resources Association.

Montgomery Watson Harza. 2001a. *Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study, Phase II Technical Report: Hydrology, Hydraulics and Geomorphology Engineering information.*

Montgomery Watson Harza. 2001b. *Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study, Phase II Technical Report: Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Geomorphology Opportunities and Constraints.*

Moore, M. R. 1980a. *Factors Influencing the Survival of Juvenile Steelhead Rainbow Trout (Salmo gairdneri gairdneri) in the Ventura River, California*. Master's Thesis, Humboldt State University.

Moore, M. R. 1980b. *An Assessment of the Impacts of the Proposed Improvements to the Vern Freeman Diversion on Anadromous fishes of the Santa Clara River System, Ventura County, California.* Prepared for the Ventura County Environmental Resources Department, Contract 670.

Moore, M. R. 1980c. *Stream survey: Ojai Ranger District.* U.S. Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest.

Morbey, Y. E. C. E. Brassil, and A. P. Hendry. 2005. Rapid senescence in Pacific salmon. *American Naturalist* 166:556-778.

Morbey, Y. E. and A. Hendry. 2008. Adaptation of salmonids to spawning habitat. *In:* Sear, D. and P. DeVries (eds.). *Salmonid Spawning Habitat in Rivers: Physical Controls, Biological Responses, and Approaches to Remediation.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 65.

Moritz, M. A., M. E. Marais, L. A. Summerell, J. M. Carlson, and J. Doyle. 2005. Wildfires, complexity, and highly optimized tolerance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102:17912-17917.

Mount, J. F. 1995. *California Rivers and Streams.* University of California Press.

Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority. 2002a. *Technical Report: Water Quality in the Arroyo Seco Watershed.*

Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority. 2002b. *Recreation and Open Space in the Arroyo Seco watershed.*

Moyle, P. B. 2002. *Inland Fishes of California*, 2nd ed. University of California Press.

Moyle, P. B., R. Yoshiyama, J. Williams, and E. Wikramanayake. 1995. *Fish Species of Special Concern in California*, 2nd ed. California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Division.

Moyle, P. B. and J. J. Cech, Jr. 2004. *Fishes: An Introduction to Ichthyology,* 5th ed. Prentice Hall.

Moyle, P. B., J. A. Israel, and S. E. Purdy. 2008. *Salmon, Steelhead, and Trout in California: Status of an Emblematic Fauna.* University of Californian, Davis Center for Watershed Sciences.

Moyle, P. B., J. V. E. Katz, R. M. Quinones. 2011. Rapid decline of California's native inland fishes: a status assessment. *Biological Conservation* 144(2011):2414-2423.

Mueter, F. J., F.M. Peterman, and B.J. Pyper 2002. Opposite effects of ocean temperature on survival rates of 120 stocks of Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) in northern and southern areas. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 59:456-463.

Munz, Philip A. 1974. *A Flora of Southern California.* University of California Press.

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

Myers, K. W. K., Y. Aydin, R. V. Walker, S. Fowler, and M. L. Dahlberg. 1996. Known ocean ranges of stocks of Pacific salmon and steelhead as shown by tagging experiments, 1956-1995. North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission. University of Washington.

Myers, K. W., R. V. Walker, H. R. Carlson, and J. H. Helle 2000. Synthesis and review of US research on the physical and biological factors affecting ocean production of salmon. *North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission Bulletin* 2:1010.

Myers. R. A., S. A. Levin, R. Lande, F. C. James, W. W. Murdoch, R. T. Paine. 2004. Hatcheries and Endangered Salmon. *Science* 303:1980.

Naiman, R. J. and K. H. Rogers. 1997. Large animals and the maintenance of system-level characteristics in river corridors. *BioScience* 47:521-529.

Naiman, R. J. and R. E. Bilby (eds.). 1998. *River Ecology and Management: Lessons from the Pacific Coastal Ecoregion. S*pringer-Verlag.

Naiman, R. J., H. Decamps, and M. E. McClain, 2005. Riparia: *Ecology, Conservation, and Management of Streamside Communities.* Elsevier/Academic Press.

Narum, S. R., C. Contor, A. Talbot, and M. S. Powell. 2004. Genetic divergence of sympatric resident and anadromous forms of *Oncorhynchus mykiss* in the Walla Walla River, U.S.A. *Journal of Fish Biology* 65:471-488.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1996a. *Factors for Decline – A Supplement to the Notice of Determination for West Coast Steelhead Under the Endangered Species*. National Marines Fisheries Service, Northwest and Southwest Regions, Protected Resources Divisions.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1996b. *Steelhead Conservation Efforts: A supplement to the Notice of Determination for West Coast Steelhead Under the Endangered Species Act*. National Marines Fisheries Service, Northwest and Southwest Regions, Protected Resources Divisions.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1997a. *Characterization of on Ongoing Watershed-Scale Conservation Efforts within Four Proposed Steelhead Evolutionary Significant Units (ESU) in California.*

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1997b. *Aquatic Properly Functioning Condition Matrix (Species Habitat Needs Matrix).*National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Habitat Conservation Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2000a. *Cachuma Project Biological Opinion: U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Operation and Maintenance of the Cachuma Project on the Santa Ynez River in Santa Barbara County, California.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2000b. *Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings.* National Marine Fisheries, Southwest Region, Habitat Conservation Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2001a. *Southern California Steelhead ESA: Current and Historic Stream Habitat Distribution Tables.* (http://swr.ucsd.edu/hcd/soCalDistrib.html).

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2001b. Letter to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission re: First Phase Consultation Document for the re-licensing of the Santa Felicia Hydroelectric Project. February 5, 2001.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2003. *Final Biological Opinion for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's proposed Robles Diversion Fish Passage Project, Ventura River, Ventura County, California.* March 31, 2003. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2004a. *Biennial Report to Congress on the Recovery Program for Threatened and Endangered Species: October 1, 2002 – September 30, 2004.* National Marine Fisheries Service., Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2004b. Letter to Bureau of Reclamation, re: U.S. Bureau Reclamation Biological Opinion and Section 7 Consultation, United Water Conservation District's Vern Freeman Diversion Dam and Fish Ladder, Santa Clara River, Ventura County, California. November 29, 2004.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2005a. Letter to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission re: Scoping Document 1, Santa Felicia Hydroelectric Project. May 16, 2005.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2005b. Response to United Water Conservation District letter of April 25, 2005 re: ongoing consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation and operation of United Water Conservation District's Freeman Diversion Dam, Santa Clara River, Ventura County. California. May 19, 2005.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2005c. *Status Review of West Coast Steelhead From Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC TM-66.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2005d. *2005 Report to Congress: Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund FY 2000-2005.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2006a. *Protected Resources Division Strategic Plan.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2006b. *Biennial Report to Congress on the Recovery Program for Threatened and Endangered Species: October 1, 2004 – September 30, 2006.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2006c. 2006 *Report to Congress: Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund FY 2000-2005.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007a. 2007 *Federal Recovery Outline for the Distinct Population Segment of Southern California Steelhead*. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007b. Steelhead recovery workshops: Public input from steelhead recovery action workshops for the Conception Coast, Monte Arido, and Santa Monica Mountains Biogeographic Population Group watersheds, held in Ventura, Ventura County, California on April 4-5, 2007 and May 31, 2007.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007c. Steelhead recovery workshops: Public input from recovery action workshops for Santa Catalina Gulf Coast and Mojave Rim Biogeographic Population Group watersheds, held in Carlsbad, San Diego County, California on April 12-13, 2007 and June 1, 2007.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007d. 2007 *Report to Congress: Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund FY 2000-2005.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007e. *Final Biological Opinion for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Matilija Dam Ecosystem Restoration Project. March 29, 2007.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2008a. *Final Biological Opinion for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Proposal to Issue a New License of the United Water Conservation District for Operation of the Santa Felicia Hydroelectric Project, Piru Creek, Ventura County (P-2153-012).* May 5, 2008. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2008b. *Final Biological Opinion for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's proposal to operate the Vern Freeman Diversion and Fish Passage Facilities, Santa Clara River, Ventura County*. July 23, 2008. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2008c. *2008 Report to Congress: Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund FY 2000-2005.* National Marine Fisheries Service., Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2008d. *Final Biological Opinion for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service's proposal to apply eight long-term fire retardants to all USFS Lands.* July 25, 2008. National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2009a. *Endangered Species Act Section 10(a)(1)(A) Permit for Take of Listed Species for Research and Enhancement Purposes. Southern California Distinct Population Segment of Steelhead* (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Permit No. 14159. June 1, 2009. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2009b. 2009 *Report to Congress: Pacific Coastal Salmon recovery Fund FY 2000-2008.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2010a. *Interim Recovery Planning Guidance for Federally Threatened and Endangered Species*. Version 3.1 June 2010. National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Marine Fisheries Service 2010b. *Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2008.* United States Department of Commerce. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-109.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2010c. 2010 *Report to Congress: Pacific Coastal Salmon recovery Fund FY 2000-2009.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

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*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and Environmental Protection Agency. 1991a. *Susceptibility and status of West Coast estuaries to nutrient discharges: San Diego Bay to Puget Sound.* Prepared by NOAA/EPA Team on Near Coastal Waters.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1991b. *Distribution and Abundance of Fishes and Invertebrates in the West Coast Estuaries*. Vol. II: *Species Life History Summaries.* National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Ocean Survey.

National Research Council. 2002. *Riparian Areas.* Committee on Riparian Zone Functioning and Strategies for Management, Water Science and Technology Board, Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology, Division on Earth and Life Studies. National Academy Press.

National Research Council. 2004. *Adaptive Management for Water Resources Planning.* Panel on Adaptive Management for Resource Stewardship, Committee to Assess the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Methods of Analysis and Peer Review for Water Resources Project Planning, Water Science and Technology Board, Ocean Studies Board, Division on Earth and Life Studies. National Academy Press.

National Research Council. 2010. *Ocean Acidification: A National Strategy to Meet the Challenges of a Changing Ocean*. Committee on the Development of an Integrated Science Strategy for Ocean Acidification Monitoring, Research, and Impacts Assessment. Ocean Studies Board. Division on Earth and Life Studies. National Academy Press.

Nautilus Environmental, Inc. 2005. *Comprehensive Analysis of Enhancements and Impacts Associated with Discharge of Treated Effluent from the Ventura Water Reclamation Facility to the Santa Clara River Estuary.* Prepared for the Ventura Water Department, City of San Buenaventura.

Neelin, D. J. 2011. *Climate Change and Climate Modeling.* Cambridge University Press.

Nehlsen, W., J. E. Williams, and J. A. Lichatowich. 1991. Pacific salmon at the crossroads: stocks at risk from California, Oregon, Idaho and Washington. F*isheries* 16(2):4-21.

Nelson, K. C. and M. A. Palmer. 2007. Stream temperature surges under urbanization and climate change: data, models, and responses. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 43(2):440-452.

Nemeth, J. D. and R. B. Kiefer. 1999. Snake river spring and summer Chinook salmon – the choice for recovery. *Fisheries* 24:16-23.

Newcombe, C. P. 2003. Impact assessment model for clear water fishes exposed to excessively cloudy water. *Water Resources Bulletin* 35:529-544. American Water Resources Association.

Newcombe, C. P. and D. D. McDonald. 1991. Effects of suspended sediments on aquatic ecosystems. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 11:72-82.

Newcombe, C. P. and J. Jensen. 1996. Channel suspended sediment and fisheries: synthesis for quantitative assessment of risk and impact. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 16(4):1-34.

Newson, M. D. and A. R. Large. 2006. 'Natural' rivers, 'hydromorphological quality' and river restoration: a challenging new agenda for applied fluvial geomorphology. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 31:1606-1624.

Nichols, K. M., W. P. Young, R. G. Danzmann, B. D. Robinson, C. Rexroad, M. Noakes, R. B. Philips, P. Bentzen, I. Spies, K. Knudsen, F. W. Allendorf, B. M. Cunningham, J. Brunelli, H. Zhang, S. Ristow, R. Drew, K. H. Brown, P. A. Wheeler, and G. H. Thorgaard. 2002. A consolidated linkage map for rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Animal Genetics* 34:102-115.

Nielsen, J. L. 1994. *Molecular Genetics and Stock Identification in Pacific Salmon (Oncorhynchus mykiss).* Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Biology, University of California, Berkeley.

Nielsen, J. L. 1999. The evolutionary history of steelhead *Oncorhynchus mykiss* along the US Pacific coast: developing a conservation strategy using genetic diversity. I*CES Journal of Marine Science* 56:449-458.

Nielsen, J. L., C. Gan, and W. Thomas. 1994a. Differences in genetic diversity of mtDNA between hatchery and wild population of *Oncorhynchus*. *Canadian Journal Fisheries and Aquatic. Sciences* 51(Suppl. 1):290-297.

Nielsen, J. L., T. E. Lisle, and V. Ozaki. 1994b. Thermally stratified pools and their use by steelhead in northern California streams. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 123:613-626.

Nielsen, J. L., C. Gan, J. Wright, D. Morris, and W. Thomas. 1994c. Biogeographic distribution of mitochondrial and nuclear markers for southern steelhead. *Molecular Marine Biology and Biotechnology* 3(5):281-293.

Nielsen, J. L., T. Lisle, and V. Ozaki. 1994c. Thermally stratified pools and their use by steelhead in northern California streams. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Societ*y 123:613-626.

Nielsen, J. L., 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. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 126:397-417.

Nielsen, J. L. and M. C. Fountain. 1999. Microsatellite diversity in sympatric reproductive ecotypes of Pacific steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss)* from the Middle Fork Eel River, California. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* 8:159-168.

Nielsen, J. L., E. L. Heine, C. A. Gan, and M. C. Fountain. 2000. Molecular analysis of population genetic structure and recolonization of rainbow trout following the Cantara spill. *California Fish and Game* 86:21-40.

Nielsen, J. L., J. M. Scott, J. L. Aycrigg. 2001. Endangered species and peripheral populations: cause for conservation. *Endangered Species Update* 18(5):194-197.

Nielsen, J. L., C. E. Zimmerman, J. B. Olsen, T. C. Wiacek, E. J. Kretschmer, G. M. Greenwald, and J. K. Wenburg. 2003. *Population Genetic Structure of Santa Ynez Rainbow Trout – 2001 Based on*

Microsatellite and mtDNA Analyses. Report prepared for U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California/Nevada Operations Office.

Nielsen, J. L., T. C. Wiacek, and S. L. Graziano. 2005. *Population Genetics Structure of Rainbow Trout in the Upper Ventura River Watershed Based on Microsatellite and mtDNA Analyses.* Report prepared for United State Geological Survey, Western Fisheries Research Center, Seattle.

Nielsen, J. L. and G. T. Ruggerone. 2009. Climate change and dynamic ocean carrying capacity: growth and survival of Pacific salmon at sea. *In:* Knudsen, E. E. and J. Hal Michael, Jr. (eds.). *Pacific Salmon Environmental Life History Models: Advancing Science for Sustainable Salmon in the Future*. American Fisheries Society Symposium 71.

Nielsen-Pincus, M. and C. Moseley. 2010. *Economic Employment Impacts of Forest Watershed Restoration in Oregon*. Ecosystem Workshop Program. Working Paper 24. Institute for a Sustainable Environment. University of Oregon.

Noga, E. 2000. *Fish Disease: Diagnosis and Treatment.* Iowa State University. Press.

Normandeau Associates. 2011. *Steelhead Population Assessment for the Ventura River/Matilija Creek Basin: 2010 Data Summary*. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game and Surfrider Foundation, June 30, 2011.

Norris, R. M. 2003. *The Geology and Landscape of Santa Barbara County, California and its Offshore Islands.* Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Norris, R. M. and R. W. Webb. 1990. *Geology of California.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

North East Trees and Arroyo Seco Foundation. 2002. *Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study, Vol. 1: Project Report, Los Angeles County, California.* Prepared for California the Coastal Conservancy.

North East Trees and Arroyo Seco Foundation. 2002. *Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study, Summary Report: Phase I, Los Angeles County, California.* Prepared for California Coastal Conservancy and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy/Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority.

Northcote, T. G. 1958. Effect of Photoperiodism on response of juvenile trout to water currents. *Nature* 191:4618):1283-84.

Northcote, T. G. 1997. Why sea run? An exploration into the migratory/residency spectrum of coastal cutthroat trout. In: Hall, J. D. P. A. Bisson, and R. E. Gresswell (eds.). *Sea-Run Cutthroat Trout: Biology Management and Future Conservation.* American Fisheries

Null, S. E., J. H. Viers, and J. F. Mount. 2010. Hydrologic response and watershed sensitivity to climate warming in California's Sierra Nevada. *PLoS* One 5(4).

Ode, P., A. C. Rehn, and J. T. May. 2005. A quantitative tool for assessing the integrity of southern coastal California streams. *Environmental Management* 35(4):493-504.

Oldani, N. O. and C. R. M. Baigum. 2002. Performance of a fishway system in a major South American dam on the Paraná River (Argentina-Paraguay). *River Research and Applications* 18:171-183.

Oldani, N. O., C. R. M. Baigum, J. M. Nestler, and R. A. Goodwin. 2007. Is fish passage technology saving fish resources in the lower La Plata River Basin? *Neotropical Ichthyology* 5(2):89-102.

Olden, J. D. and R. J. Naiman. 2009. Incorporating thermal regimes into environmental assessments: modifying dam operations to restore freshwater ecosystem integrity. *Freshwater Biology* 56:86-107.

Orr, H. G., A. Ar. Large, M. D. Newson, and C. L. Walsh. 2008. A predictive typology for characterizing hydromorphology. *Geomorphology* 100:32-40.

Orsi, J. 2004. *Hazardous Metropolis: Flooding and Urban Ecology in Los Angeles*. University of California Press.

Osgood, K. E. (ed.). 2008. *Climate Impacts on U.S. Living Marine Resources: National Marine Fisheries Service Concerns, Activities and Needs.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO TM-89.

Ostrom, E. 2009a. Design principles of robust property-right institutions: what have we learned? Workshop on Political Theory and Policy Analysis. *In:* Ingram, K. G. and U. Hong (eds.) *Property Rights and Long Policies.* Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Ostrom, E. 2009b. A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science* 325:419-422.

Outland, C. 1971. Letter to Mark Moore re: fishing conditions in the Santa Clara River pre-1946. *Mark H. Capelli Southern California Steelhead Watershed Archive*, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Owens, P. N., R. J. Batalla, A. J. Collins, B. Gomez, D. M. Hicks, A. J. Horwitz, G. M. Kondolf, M. Marden, M. J. Page, D. H. Peacock, E. L. Petticrew, W. Salomons, and N. A. Trustrum. 2005. Fine-grained sediment in river systems: environmental significance and management issue. *River Research and Applications* 21:693-717.

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. 1999. *Conservation and Enhancement of Essential Fish Habitat*. Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission.

Padre Associates, Inc. 2005. *Carpinteria Creek Preservation Program*. Prepared for the City of Carpinteria Planning Department.

Palacios, D. P., S. J. Bograd, R. Mendelssohn, and F. B. Schwing. 2004. Long-term and seasonal trends in stratification in the California Current, 1950-1993. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 109(C10):C10016.

Panel on Adaptive Management for Resource Stewardship. 2011. *Adaptive Management For Water Resource Projects*. National Research Council. National Academy Press.

Paquet, P. J., T. Flagg, A. Appleby, J. Barr, L. Blankenship, D. Campton, M. Delarm, T. Evelyn, D. Fast, J. Gislason, P. Kline, D. Maynard, L. Mobrand, G. Nandor, P. Seidel, and S. Smith. 2011. Hatcheries, conservation and sustainable fisheries – achieving multiple goals: results of the hatchery scientific review group's Columbia River Basin Review. *Fisheries* 36(11):547-561.

Parenti, L. R. and M. C. Ebach. 2009. *Comparative Biogeography: Discovering and Classifying Biogeographical Patterns of a Dynamic Earth.* University of California Press.

Pauly, D. 1995. Anecdotes and the shifting baseline syndrome of fisheries. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 10(10):430.

Pearse, D. E. and J. C. Garza. 2008. *Historical Baseline for Genetic Monitoring of Coastal California Steelhead, Oncorhynchus mykiss. Final Report.* Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game Fisheries Restoration Grant Program. Grant PO5100530.

Pejchar, L. and K. Warner. 2001. A river might run through it again: criteria for consideration of dam removal and interim lessons from California. *Environmental Management* 28:561-575.

Peterson, N., A. Hendry, and T. Quinn. 1992. *Assessment of Cumulative Effects on Salmonid Habitat: Some Suggested Parameters and Target Conditions.* Prepared for the Washington Department Natural Resources and the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee, Timber/Fish/Wildlife Agreement. University of Washington.

Peterson, W. T. and F. F. Schwing. 2003. A new climate regime in Northeast Pacific ecosystems. *Geophysical Research Letters* 30(17)1896.

Philander, S. G. 1990. *El Nino, La Nina, and the Southern Oscillation.* International Geophysics Series. Vol. 46. Academic Press.

Philander, S. G. 2004. *Our Affair with El Nino. How We Transformed an Enchanting Peruvian Current into a Global Climate Hazard*. Princeton University Press.

Pierrehumbert. R. T. 2010. *Principles of Planetary Climate*. Cambridge University Press.

Pilkey, O. H. and R. Young. 2009. T*he Rising Sea*. Island Press.

Pimm, S. L., H. L. Jones, and J. Diamond. 1988. On the risk of extinction. *American Naturalist* 132:757-785.

Pipal, K., M. Jessop, G. Holt, and P. Adams. 2010. *Operation of Dual-Frequency Identification Sonar (DIDSON) to Monitor Adult Steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) in the Central California Coast.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-454.

Pitzer, G. 2003. The Los Angeles River. *Western Water* Nov-Dec: 4-13. The Water Education Foundation.

Pizzuto, J. 2002. Effects of dam removal on river form and process. *BioScience* 52:683-91.

Platts, W. and M. McHenry. 1988. *Density and Biomass of Trout and Char in Western Stream*s. U.S. Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. General Technical Report. INTR-241.

Poff, N. L., J. D. Allan, M. B. Bain, J. R. Karr, K. L. Prestegaard, B. D. Richter, R. E. Sparks, and J. C. Stromberg. 1997. The natural flow regime: a paradigm for river conservation and restoration. *BioScience* 47:769-784.

Poff, N. L., B. D. Richter, A. H. Arthington, S. E. Bunn, R. J. Naiman, E. Kendy, M. Acreman, C. Apse, B. Bledsoe, R. E. Tharme, and A. Warner. 2010. The ecological limits of hydrological alteration (ELOHA): a new framework for developing regional environmental flow standards. *Freshwater Biology* 55:147-170.

Poff, N. L. and J. K. H. Zimmerman. 2010. Ecological responses to altered flow regimes: a literature review to inform the science and management of environmental flows. *Freshwater Biology* 55:194-205.

Pollock, K. H., C. M. Jones, and T. L. Brown. 1994. *Angler Survey Methods and Their Application to Fisheries Management.* American Fisheries Society Special Publication No. 25.

Polyakov, V., A. Fares, and M. H. Ryder. 2005. Precision riparian buffers for the control of nonpoint source pollutant loading into surface water: A review. *Environmental Reviews* 13:129-144.

Pompeu, P. and C. B. Martinez. 2007. Efficiency and selectivity of a trap and truck fish passage system in Brazil. *Neotropical Ichthyology* 5(2):169-176.

Pon, L. B., S. G. Hinch, S. J. Cooke, D. A. Patterson, and A. P. Farrell. 2009. Physiological, energetic and behavioral correlates of successful fishway passage of adult sockeye salmon *Oncorhynchus nerka* in the Seton River, British Columbia. *Journal of Fish Biology* 74:1323-1336.

Poole, G. 2002. Fluvial landscape ecology: addressing uniqueness within the river discontinum. *Freshwater Biology* 47:641-660.

Primack, R. 2008. *A Primer of Conservation Biology,* 4TH ed. Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Project Clean Water. 1999-2011. *Rain Years 1999-2011 Water Quality Analysis Report*. Issued Annually. County of Santa Barbara, Flood Control District.

Project Clean Water. 2004-2011. Urban Runoff Monitoring Reports (San Juan Creek, Santa Margarita River, San Luis Rey River, San Dieguito River, San Diego River, Sweetwater River, Otay River, and Tijuana River). Issued Annually. County of San Diego, San Diego County Water Authority, and City of San Diego.

Pryde, P. 2004. *San Diego: An Introduction to the Region*. Sunbelt Publications.

Punt, A. E. and R. Hilborn. 1997. Fisheries stock assessment and decision analysis: the Bayesian approach. R*eviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 5-63(1997).

Questa Engineering Corporation. 2004. *Arroyo Hondo Culvert Modification/Steelhead Passage Conceptual Design Report.* Prepared for The Land Trust of Santa Barbara County, Santa Barbara.

Quinn, R. D. and Sterling C. Kelley. 2006. *Introduction to California Chaparral.* University of California Press.

Quinn, T. P. 2005. *The Behavior and Ecology of Pacific Salmon and Trout.* American. Fisheries Society and University of Washington Press.

Quinn, T. P. and Meyers, K. W. 2005. Anadromy and the marine migration of Pacific salmon and trout: Rounsefell revisited. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 14:421-42.

Rahmstorf, S. 2007. A semi-empirical approach to projecting future sea-level rise. *Science* 315(5810):368-370.

Raleigh, R., T. Hickman, R. Solomon, and P. Nelson. 1984. *Habitat Suitability Information: Rainbow Trout.* U.S. Fish and Wildlife. Service. FWS/OBS-82/10.60.

Raper, S .C. B. and R. J. Braithwaite. 2006. Low sea level rise projections from mountain glaciers and icecaps under global warming. N*ature* 439:311-313.

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.* Prepared for Greenspace Land Trust.

Reeves, G. H., D. B. Hohler, D. P. Larsen, D. E. Busch, K. Kratz, K. Reynolds, K. F. Stein, T. Atzet, P. Hays, and M. Tehan. 2004. *Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for the Northwest Forest Plan.* General Technical Report. PNW-GTR-577. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland.

Regan, H. M. M. Colyvan, M. A. Burgman. 2000. Fuzzy Set Theory and Threatened Species Classification *Biological Conserva*tion 14(4):1192-1199.

Reid, G. K. and R. D. Wood. 1976. *Ecology of Inland Waters and Estuaries*. D. Van Nostrand Company.

Reid, I. and J. B. Laronne. 1995. Bedload sediment transport in an ephemeral stream and a comparison with seasonal and perennial counterparts. *Water Resources Research* 31:773-781.

Reiser, D. W. 2008. Enhancing salmonid populations via spawning habitat restoration actions. *In:* Sear, D. and P. DeVries (eds.). *Salmonid Spawning Habitat in Rivers: Physical Controls, Biological Responses, and Approaches to Remediation.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 65.

Revelle, R. R. (ed.) 1990. *Sea-Level Change. Studies in Geophysics.* National Research Council. National Academy Press.

Rich, A. and E. A. Keller. 2011. Watershed Controls on the Geomorphology of Small Coastal Lagoons in an Active Tectonic Environment. *Estuaries and Coasts* (14 September 2011):1-19.

Richardson, W. 1959. *Survey of Sisquoc River, Santa Barbara County.* Intraoffice Correspondence. July 16, 1959. California Department of Fish and Game.

Ricklefs, R. E. and G. L. Miller. 1999. *Ecology.* W. H. Freeman and Company.

Riggs, J. A. (ed.). 2002. U.S. *Policy on Climate Change: What's Next?* A Report of the Aspen Institute Environmental Policy Forum. The Aspen Institute.

Riggs, J. A. (ed.). 2004. *A Climate Policy Framework: Balancing Policy and Politics.* A Report of an Aspen Institute Policy Dialogue. The Aspen Institute.

Riley, A. 1998. *Restoring Streams in Cities: A Guide for Planners, Policy Makers, and Citizens.* Island Press, Washington, D.C.

River Watch. 2007a. *Immediate Threats to the San Luis Rey River and Watershed.* www.riverwatchinc.org.

River Watch. 2007b. *San Dieguito River Watershed*. www.projectcleanwater.org.

Roberts, B. and R. White. 1992. Effects of angler wading on survival of trout eggs and pre-emergent fry. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 12:450-459.

Rodgers, T. 2005. Volunteers seeking to restore trout: fish devastated in 2003 wildfires. December 2, 2005. San Diego Union-Tribune.

Rodgers, T. 2007. Hooked on trying to bring back native trout. March 11, 2007. San Diego Union-Tribune.

Roemmich, D. And J. McGowan. 1995. Climatic warming and the decline of zooplankton in the California Current. *Science* 267:1324-1326.

Rogers, K. 2005. The real river management challenge: Integrating scientists, stakeholders and service agencies. *River Research and Applications* 22:1-12.

Rosenberger, A. E. and Dunham, J. B. 2005. Validation of abundance estimates from mark-recapture and removal techniques for rainbow trout captured by electrofishing in small streams. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 25:1395-1410.

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

Rosgen, D. 1998. *A Field Guide for Stream Classification.* Wildlands Hydrology Books.

Ruckelshaus, M., T. Klinger, N. Knowlton, and D. R. Demaster. 2008. Marine ecosystem-based management in practice: scientific and governance challenges. *BioScience* 58:53-63.

Rucker, E. and E. J. Ordall. 1953. Infectious diseases of Pacific salmon. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 83:297-312.

Ruddiman, W. F. 2005. *Plows, Plagues and Petroleum: How Humans Took Control of Climate*. Princeton University Press.

Rundio, D.E. and S. T. Lindley. 2008. Seasonal patterns of terrestrial and aquatic prey abundance and their use by *Oncorhynchus mykiss* in a coastal basin with a Mediterranean climate. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Socie*ty 137:467-480.

Rundio, D. E. 2009. Community-habitat relationships in coastal streams in Big Sur, California, USA: travertine influences macroinvertebrate abundance and community structure. *Hydrobiologia* 620:91-108.

Ruse, M. and J. Travis. 2009. *Evolution: The First Four Billion Years.* Harvard University Press.

Ryan, G., and L. E. Burch. 1992. An analysis of sundowner winds: A California downslope wind event. Sixth Conference on Mountain Meteorology, American Meteorological Society, Portland.

Santa Ana Sucker Conservation Team. *Santa Ana Sucker Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2002-03 (September 1, 2002 to September 1, 2003). A Component of the Santa Ana Sucker Conservation Program with the Santa Ana River Watershed*. Prepared for the Santa Ana River Watershed Project Authority.

Santa Ana Sucker Conservation Team. *Santa Ana Sucker Annual Report for Covered Activities (September 1, 2009 to September 1, 2010).* Prepared for the Santa Ana River Watershed Project Authority.

Santa Barbara Channelkeeper. 2005. *Goleta Stream Team 2002-2005: A Review of the Finding of Santa Barbara Channel Keeper Goleta Stream Team June 2001 – June 2006.*

Santa Barbara Channelkeeper. 2006. *Ventura River Stream Team 2001-2005: A Review of the Finding of Santa Barbara Channel Keeper Ventura Stream Team January 2001 – January 2006*, updated and revised October 2005 – 2006.

Santa Barbara Channelkeeper. 2010. *Habitat Restoration Opportunities for the Lower Ventura River.*

Santa Barbara Channelkeeper and Matilija Coalition. 2002. *Ventura River Watershed Monitoring Project: Status of the River 2001.* Prepared for the City of San Buenaventura.

Santa Ynez River Technical Advisory Committee. 1997. *Synthesis and Analysis of Information Collected on the Fishery Resources and Habitat Conditions of the Lower Santa Ynez River: 1993-1996.* Prepared in compliance with Provision 2.C of the 1996 MOU.

Santa Ynez River Adaptive Management Committee. 2009. *Summary and Analysis of Annual Fishery Monitoring in the Lower Santa Ynez River 1993-2004.* Prepared for the Cachuma Conservation and Release Board.

Santa Ynez River Technical Advisory Committee. 2000. *Lower Santa Ynez River Fish Management Plan.* Prepared for Santa Ynez River Consensus Committee, Cachuma Project. 2 Vols.

Satterthwaite, W. H., M. P. Beakes, E. M. Collins, D. R. Swank, J. E. Merz, R. G. Titus, S. M. Sogard, and M. Mangel. 2009. Steelhead life history on California's central coast: insights from a state-dependent model. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 138:532-548.

Satterthwaite, W. H., M. P. Beakes, E. M. Collins, D. R. Swank, J. E. Merz, R. G. Titus, S. M. Sogard, and M. Mangel. 2010 State-dependent life history models in a changing (and regulated) environment: steelhead in the California Central Valley. *Evolutionary Applications* 3(210):221-243.

Sawyer, John O. and T. Keeler-Wolf. 1995. *A Manual of California Vegetation*. California Native Plant Society.

Sax, D. F., J. J. Stachowicz, and S. D. Gaines. 2005. *Species Invasion: Insights into Ecology, Evolution, and Biogeography.* Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Schindler, D. E., X. Auger, E. Fleishman, N. Mantua, B. Riddell, M. Ruckelshaus, J. See, and M. Webster. 2008. Climate change, ecosystem impacts, and management for Pacific salmon. *Fisheries* 33(10):502-506.

Schluter, D. 2000. *Ecology of Adaptive Radiation*. Oxford University Press.

Schwing, F., S. Lindley, E. Danner, and D. Boughton. 2010. *Climate Change in California: Implications for the Recovery and Protection of Pacific Salmon and Steelhead.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC TM-451.

Science Applications International Corp. 2003. *Proposed Final Santa Maria River Estuary Enhancement and Management Plan*. Prepared for The Dunes Center.

Scott, R. W. and W. T. Gill. 2008. *Oncorhynchus mykiss: Assessment of Washington State's Steelhead Population Programs*. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia Washington.

Sear, D. and P. DeVries (eds.). 2008. *Salmonid Spawning Habitat in Rivers: Physical Controls, Biological Responses, and Approaches to Remediation.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 65.

Sear, D., L. B. Frostick, G. Rollinson, and T. E. Lisle. 2008. The significance and mechanics of fine-sediment infiltration and accumulation in gravel spawning beds. *In:* Sear, D. and P.

DeVries (eds.). *Salmonid Spawning Habitat in Rivers: Physical Controls, Biological Responses, and Approaches to Remediation.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 65.

Service, R. F. 2011. Will busting dams boost salmon? *Science* 334:888-892.

Shalowitz, A. L. 1964. *Shore and Sea Boundaries: With Special Reference to Interpretation and Use of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Data.* 2 Vols. U.S. Department of Commerce. Coast and Geodetic Survey. Publication 10-1.

Shapovalov, L. 1944. *Preliminary Report on the Fisheries of the Santa Maria River System, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and Ventura counties, California.* Bureau of Fish Conservation, California Department Fish and Game, Administrative Report No. 44-14.

Shapovalov, L. 1945. *Report on Relation of Maintenance of Fish Resources on Proposed Dams and Diversions in Santa Barbara County, California.* California Department. Fish and Game, Bureau of Fish Conservation.

Shapovalov, L., and A. C. Taft. 1954. *The Life Histories of the Steelhead Rainbow trout (Salmo gairdneri gairdneri) and Silver Salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) with Special Reference to Waddell Creek, California, and Recommendations Regarding their Management. Fish Bulletin No.* 98. California Department of Fish and Game.

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

Shaw, R. M., L. Pendleton, D. Cameron, B. Morris, G. Bratman, D. Bachelet, K. Lausmeyer, J. Mackenzie, D. Conklin, J. Lenihan, E. Haunreiter, and C. Daly. 2009. *The Impact of Climate Change on California's Ecosystem Services.* California Climate Change Center, University of California, Berkeley.

Shere, V. 2007. A brief history of Malibu wildfires. November 25, 2007. *Malibu Times.*

Simpson, G. G. 1944. *Tempo and Mode in Evolution. Columbia* University Press.

Sleeper, J. 2002. *A Historical Survey of Steelhead Stocking and Runs in Orange and Northern San Diego Counties.* Unpublished Report.

Smith, J. J. and H. W. Li. 1983. Energetic factored influencing foraging tactics of juvenile steelhead trout, *Salmo gairdneri*. *In:* Noakes, D. L. G., D. G. Lindquist, G. S. Helfman, and J. A. Word (eds.). *Predators and Prey in Fishes*. Dr. W. Junk Publishers, The Hague, The Netherlands.

Smith, J. 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.* Report prepared under Interagency Agreement 84-04-324, between the Trustees for California State University and the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Smith, L. W., E. Dittmer, M. Prevost, and D. R. Burt. 2000. Breaching of a small irrigation dam in Oregon: a case history. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 20:205-219.

Snyder, M. A., J. L. Bell and L. C. Sloan. 2002. Climate responses to a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide for a climatically vulnerable region. *Geophysical Research Letters.* 29(11): 10.1029/2001GL014431.

Snyder, M. A., L. C. Diffenbaugh, N. S., and J. L. Bell.. 2003. Future Climate change and upwelling in the California Current. *Geophysical Research Letters* 30(15):1823.

Snyder, M. A. and L. C. Sloan. 2005. Transient future climate over the western United States using a regional climate model. *Earth Interactions* 9(11).

Sogard, S. M., T. H. Williams, and H. Fish. 2009. Seasonal patterns of abundance, growth, and site fidelity of juvenile steelhead in a small coastal California stream. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 138:549-563.

Sogard, S. M., J. E. Merz, W. H. Satterthwaite, M. P. Beakes, D. R. Swank, E. M. Collins, R. G. Titus, and M. Mangel. 2011. Contrasts in habitat characteristics and life history patterns of *Oncorhynchus mykiss* in California's central coast and Central Valley (in press). *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*.

Sokal, R. and F. J. Rohlf. 1995. *Biometry: The Principles and Practices of Statistics in Biological* Research. W. H. Freeman.

Solomon, S., G. Plattner, R. Knutti, and P. Friedlingstein. 2009. Irreversible climate change due to carbon dioxide emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the United States of America* 106:1704-1709.

Southwick Associates. 2009. *Calculation of the Projected Economies and Jobs Impact of Salmon Recovery in California.* June 24, 2009. Fish and Wildlife Economics and Statistics. http:/www.asafishing.org./newsroom/documents/salmon_recovery_economics.pdf.

Southwood, T. R. E. 1977. Habitat, the template for ecological strategies? *Journal of Animal Ecology* 46:337-365.

Spanne, L. 1975. Seasonal variability in the population of Barbareno Chumash villages: an explanatory model. *In: Papers on the Chumash.* San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society Occasional Paper No. 9.

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

Spina, A. P. and K. Johnson. 1999. *Habitat Characteristics of Solstice Creek: Implications for Steelhead.* National. Marine Fisheries Service, Habitat Conservation Division.

Spina, A. P. and D. R. Tormey. 2000. Post-fire sediment deposition in geographically restricted steelhead habitat. *North American. Journal Fishery Management* 20:562-569.

Spina, A. P., M. A. Allen, and M. Clarke. 2005. Downstream migration, rearing abundance and pool habitat associations of juvenile steelhead in the lower mainstem of a south-central California stream. *North American Journal of Fish Management* 25:919-930.

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

Spina, A. P. 2007. Thermal ecology of juvenile steelhead in a warm-water environment. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 80:23-34.

Stanford, J. A., J. V. Ward, C. A. Frissell, R. N. Williams, J. A. Lichatowich, and C. C. Countant. 1996. A general protocol for restoration of regulated rivers. *Regulated Rivers Research and Management* 12:391-413.

Stanley, E. H. and M. W. Doyle. 2003. Trading off: the ecological effects of dam removal. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*1 1:15-22.

Stanley, S., J. Brown, and S. Grigsby. 2005. *Protecting Aquatic Ecosystems: A guide for Puget Sound Planners to Understand Watershed Processes.* Ecology Publication #05-06-027. Washington State Department. of Ecology.

Stasiunaite, P. and N. Kazlauskiene. 2002. Impact of municipal wastewater chemicals on the rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss)* in its early development. *Ekologija* 2:58-64.

Stater, K. 1980. *Surveys of Upper and Middle Manzana Creek, Davey Brown Creek, Munch Canyon, White Ledge Canyon, and South Fork Sisquoc River.* U. S. Forest Service Stream Survey, Los Padres National Forest, Santa Lucia District.

Stein, E. D., S. Dark, T. Longcore, N. Hall, M. Beland, R. Grossinger, J. Casanova, M. Sutula. 2007. *Historical Ecology and Landscape Change of the San Gabriel River and Floodplain.* Southern California Water Research Project Report #499.

Stephenson, J. and G. Calcarone. 1999. *Southern California Mountains and Foothills Assessment: Habitat and Species Conservation Issues. General* Technical Report GTR-PSW-172. U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station.

Stern, N. *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review.* Cambridge University Press.

Stocking, R.W. and J. L. Bartholomew. 2004. *Assessing Links Between Water Quality, River Health and Ceratomyxosis of salmonids in the Klamath River System.* Department of Microbiology, Oregon State University.

Stoecker, M. W. 2001. *Preliminary Evaluation of Native Fisheries Restoration on the Arroyo Seco, Los Angeles River Watershed, Los Angeles County, California.* Stoecker Ecological.

Stoecker, M. W. 2004. *Steelhead Migration Barrier Inventory and Recovery Opportunities for the Santa Ynez River, California*. Prepared for Community Environmental Council. Stoecker Ecological.

Stoecker, M. W. 2009. *Las Llagas Creek Steelhead Assessment and Recovery Project, Gaviota Coast, California.* Prepared for Steve Doty, Rancho Arroyo Alamar. Stoecker Ecological.

Stoecker, M. W. and S. Allen. 1998. *How the Regional GIS Database Can be Useful to Southern California Steelhead Recovery*. Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Marine Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Stoecker, M. W. and Conception Coast Project. 2002. *Steelhead Assessment and Recovery Opportunities in Southern Santa Barbara County, California.* Prepared for the Conception Coast Project. Stoecker Ecological.

Stoecker, M. W. and J. Stoecker. 2003. *Steelhead Migration Barrier Assessment and Recovery Opportunities for the Sisquoc River, California.* Prepared for the California Coastal Conservancy. Stoecker Ecological.

Stoecker, M. W. and E. Kelley. 2005. *Santa Clara River Steelhead Trout: Assessment and Recovery Opportunities.* Prepared for The Nature Conservancy and The Santa Clara River Trustee Council. Stoecker Ecological.

Storrer, J. 1994. *Natural Environment Study Report, Garey Bridge Replacement Project, Santa Barbara County, California.* Prepared for County of Santa Barbara, Department of Public Works.

Stouder, D. J., P. A. Bisson, and R. J. Naiman (eds.). 1997. *Pacific Salmon and Their Ecosystems: Status and Future Option*s. Chapman and Hill.

Suffet, I. and S. Sheehan. 2000. Eutrophication. *In*: Ambrose, R.F. and A.R. Orme (eds.). *Lower Malibu Creek and Lagoon Resource Enhancement and Management: Final Report.* Prepared for the California Coastal Conservancy.

Sugihara, N. *G.*, J. W. Van Wagtendonk, K. E. Shaffer, J. Fites-Kaufman, and A. E. Thode (eds.). 2006. *Fire in California's Ecosystems*. University. California Press.

Sumpter, J. P. and A. C. Johnson. 2005. Lessons from endocrine disruption and their application to other issues concerning trace organics in the aquatic environment. *Environmental Science Technology* 39:431-4332.

Sunderstrom, S., C. Mosely, M. Nielsen-Pincus, and E. J. Davis. 2011. *Quick Guide to Monitoring Economic Impacts of Ecosystem Restoration and Stewardship.* Ecosystem Work Program. Summer 2011. Institute for a Sustainable Environment. University of Oregon.

Sweet, S. 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.* Prepared for U.S. Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest.

Swezy, S. L. and R. F. Heizer. 1977. Ritual management of salmonid fish resources in California. *The Journal of California Archaeology* 4:7-29.

Swift, C. C. 1975. *Survey of the Freshwater fishes and their Habitats in the Coastal Drainages of Southern California.* Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

Swift, C. C. 2000. *Final Steelhead Habitat Evaluation Report for Shuman Canyon, San Antonio, Honda Canyon, Canada de Jolloru, and Jalama Creeks on Vandenberg Air Force Base.* Prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. for Vandenberg Air Force Base, Environmental Services Division, USAF Contract No. Fo4684-95-C-00.

Swift, C. C., T. Haglund, and M. Ruiz. 1990. *Status of Freshwater Fishes of Southern California with Recommendations for Preserves to Maintain their Existence*. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Branch. Section of Fishes. Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

Swift, C. C., T. Haglund, M. Ruiz, and R. Fisher. 1993. *The Status and Distribution of the Freshwater Fishes of Southern California. Southern California Academy Sciences Bulletin* 92(3):101-172.

Swift, C. C. and S. R. Howard. 2009. Current Status and Distribution of the Pacific Lamprey South of Point Conception, Southern California. *In*: Brown, L. R., S. D. Chase, M. G. Mesa, R. J. Beamish, P. D. Moyle (eds.). *Biology, Management, and Conservation of Lampreys in North America.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 72.

Swezey, S. L. and R. L. Heizer. 1977. Ritual management of salmonid fish resources in California. *The Journal of California Anthropology* 4:7-29.

Tague, C., M. Farrell, G. Grant, S. Lewis, and S. Rey. 2007. Hydrogeologic controls on summer stream temperatures in the McKenzie River Watershed, Oregon. *Hydrological Processes* 21:3288-3300.

Tague, C., G. Grant, M. Farrell, J. Choate, and A. Jefferson. 2008. Deep groundwater mediates streamflow response to climate warming in the Oregon Cascades. *Climate Change* 86:189-210.

Tague, C., L. Seaby, and A. Hope. 2009. Modeling the eco-hydrologic response of a Mediterranean type ecosystem the combined impacts of projected climate change and altered fire frequencies. *Climatic Change* 93:137-155.

Tainter, J. A. 1975. Hunter-gatherer territorial organization in the Santa Ynez Valley. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 11(2):2740.

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

Tallis, H., P. S. Levin., M. Ruckelshaus, S. E. Lester. K. L. McLeod, D. L. Fluharty, and B. S. Halpern. 2010. The many faces of ecosystem-based management: making the process work today in real places. *Marine Policy* 34:340-348.

Tatara, C. P., S. C. Riley, B. A. Berejikian. 2011a. Effects of hatchery fish density on emigration, growth, survival, and predation risk of natural steelhead parr in an experimental stream channel. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 31:224-235.

Tatara, C. P., B. A. Berejikian. 2011b. Mechanisms influencing competition between hatchery and wild juvenile anadromous Pacific salmonids in freshwater and their relative competitive abilities. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* DOI:10.1007/s10641-01109906-z

Temple, G. M. and Pearsons, T. N. 2006. Evaluation of the recovery period in mark-recapture population estimates of rainbow trout in small streams. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 26:941-948.

Tetra Tech, Inc. 2007. *Final Rincon Creek Watershed Plan.* Prepared for Santa Barbara County Water Agency. California Department of Fish and Game Fisheries Restoration Grant Program, Grant Agreement PO350017.

The Nature Conservancy. 2000. *The Five-S Framework for Site Conservation: A Practitioner's Handbook for Site Conservation Planning and Measuring Conservation Success,* 2nd ed. Vol. 1.

The Nature Conservancy. 2007. *Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Basic Practice Workbook: Developing Strategies, Taking Action, and Measuring Success at Any Scale.* January 12, 2007. http://www.conserveonline.org/workspaces/cbdgateway/cbdmain/cap/practices.

Thomas, L. P., M. D. DeBacker, J. R. Boetsch, and D. G. Peitz. 2001. *Conceptual Framework, Monitoring Components and Implementation of a NPS Long-Term Ecological Monitoring Program – Prairie Cluster Prototype Program Status Report.* U.S. National Park Service.

Thomas R. Payne and Associates. 2003. *Assessment of Steelhead Habitat in the Upper Matilija Creek Basin: Stage One Qualitative Stream Survey*. Prepared for Ventura County Watershed Protection District, June 9, 2003.

Thomas R. Payne and Associates. 2004. *Assessment of Steelhead Habitat in the Upper Matilija Creek Basin: Stage One and Stage Two Qualitative Stream Survey*. Prepared for Ventura County Watershed Protection District, June 9, 2003 and January 30, 2004.

Thomas R. Payne and Associates. 2007. *Steelhead Population and Habitat for the Ventura River/ Matilija Creek Basin: 2006 Final Report*. Prepared for Ventura County Watershed Protection District, June 30, 2007.

Thomas R. Payne and Associates. 2008. *Steelhead Population and Habitat for the Ventura River/ Matilija Creek Basin: 2007 Final Report*. Prepared for Ventura County Watershed Protection District, June 30, 2008.

Thomas R. Payne and Associates. 2009. *Steelhead Population Assessment in the Ventura River/ Matilija Creek Basin: 2008 Summary Report*. Prepared for Ventura County Watershed Protection District, California Department of Fish and Game, and Matilija Coalition/Surfrider Foundation, July 30, 2009.

Thomas R. Payne and Associates. 2010. *Steelhead Population Assessment for the Ventura River/ Matilija Creek Basin: 2009 Data Summary*. Prepared for the Matilija Coalition, January 11, 2010.

Thomas R. Payne and Associates and S. P. Cramer & Associates, Inc. 2005. *The Importance of Resident and Anadromous Life Histories to the Viability of Oncorhynchus Populations*. Thomas R. Payne and Associates and S. P. Cramer and Associates.

Thompson, C. J. and C. Pinkerton. 2008. Habitat *Restoration Cost References for Salmon Recovery Planning.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMF-SWFSC TM-425.

Thompson, L. C., J. L. Voss, R. E. Larsen, W. D. Tietje, R. A. Cooper, and P. B. Moyle. 2008. Role of hardwood in forming habitat for southern California steelhead. *In*: Merenlender, A., D. McCreary, K. L. Purcell (eds.) *Proceedings of the Sixth California Oak Symposium: Today's Challenges, Tomorrow's Opportunities.* General Technical Report PSW-GTR-217. U. S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station.

Thompson, L. C. J. L. Voss, R. E. Larsen, W. D. Tietje, R. A Cooper, and P. D. Moyle. 2011. Southern steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), hard woody debris, and temperature in a California central coast watershed (in press). *Transaction of the American Fisheries Society*.

Thorgaard, G. H. 1983. Chromosomal differences among rainbow trout populations. *Copeia* 1983(3):650-662.

Thorp, J. H., M. C. Thomas, and M. D. Delong. 2006. The riverine ecosystem synthesis: biochemistry in river networks across space and time. *River Research and Applications* 22:123-147.

Thrower, F. P. and J. E. Joyce. 2004a. Effects of 70 years of freshwater residency on survival, growth, early maturation, and smolting in a stock of anadromous rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss)* from southeast Alaska. *In: Uses of Propagated Fish in Resource Management.* American Fisheries Society Symposium 44.

Thrower, F. P., C. Guthrie, III, J. Nielsen, and J. Joyce. 2004b. A comparison of genetic variation between and anadromous steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, population and seven derived

populations sequestered in freshwater for 70 years. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 69:111-125.

Thrower, F. P., J. J. Hard, and J. E. Joyce. 2004c. Genetic architecture of growth and early life-history transitions in anadromous and derived freshwater populations of steelhead. *Journal of Fish Biology* 65(SupA):286-307.

Thrower, F. P., J. E. Joyce, A. G. Celewycz, and P. W. Malecha. 2008. The potential importance of reservoirs in the western United States for recovery of endangered populations of anadromous steelhead. American Fisheries Society Symposium 62.

Thrower, F. P. and J. J. Hard. 2009. Effects of a single event of close inbreeding on growth and survival of steelhead. *Conservation Genetics* 10:1299-1307.

Titus, R., D. Erman, and W. Snider. 2010. History and status of steelhead in California coastal drainages south of San Francisco Bay. In draft for publication in *Fish Bulletin.* California Department of Fish and Game.

Tononi, G., O. Sporns, and G. M. Edelman. 1999. Measures of degeneracy and redundancy in biological networks. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 96:3257-3262.

Trenberth, K. E. 1999. Conceptual framework for changes of extremes of the hydrological cycle with climate change. C*limatic Change* 42:327-339.

Tri-County Fish Team. 2006. *Recommended Barrier and Watershed Priority Ranking Methodology for San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties, CA.* Prepared for Conception Coast Project.

United States Air Force. 2011. *Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Vandenberg Air Force Base.* U.S. Department of Defense.

United States Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Water Control Manual, Prado Dam and Reservoir, Santa Ana River, California.* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District.

United States Army Corps of Engineers. 2002. *Final Baseline Conditions: EIS/EIR (F3 Milestone) for the Matilija Dam Ecosystem Restoration Project.* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District.

United States Bureau of Reclamation. 2000. *Biological Assessment for Cachuma Project Operations and the Lower Santa Ynez River.* Prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

United States Bureau of Reclamation. 2011. *2008 Annual Monitoring Report and Trend Analysis for 2005-2008 for the Biological Opinion for the Operation and Maintenance of the Cachuma Project on the Santa Ynez River in Santa Barbara County, California.* Prepared by the U.S Bureau of Reclamation, South-Central California Area Office for the National Marine Fisheries Service. Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 1981. *Santa Margarita River Estuary Resource Values and Management Recommendations.* Prepared for U.S. Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Ecological Services.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 1985. *Revised Unarmored Threespine Stickleback Recovery Plan.* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998a. *Southern Steelhead, Oncorhynchus mykiss, Habitat Suitability Survey of the Santa Margarita River, San Mateo and San Onofre Creeks on Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.* Prepared for Assistant Chief of Staff, Environmental Security, U.S. Marine Corps. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Coastal California Fish and Wildlife Office.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998b. *Draft Recovery Plan for the least Bell's vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus).* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. *Arroyo Southwestern Toad (Bufo microscaphus californicus) Recovery Plan.* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California/Nevada Operation Office.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. *Recovery Plan for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus).* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California/Nevada Operation Office.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2003. *Recovery Plan for the California Red-Legged Frog (Rana aurora draytonii).* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California/Nevada Operation Office.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. *Recovery Plan for the Tidewater Goby (Eucyclogobius newberryi).* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California/Nevada Operation Office.

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

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2007. *Recovery Plan for the Pacific Coast Population of the Western Snowy Plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus).* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California/Nevada Operation Office.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. *Best Management Practices to Minimize Adverse Effects to Pacific Lamprey (Entosphenus tridentatus).* United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Forest Service, United States Bureau of Reclamation.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011. *Santa Ana Sucker (Catostomus santaanae) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation.* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office.

United States Forest Service. 1997. *Sespe Watershed Analysis.* U.S. Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest, Ojai Ranger District.

United States Forest Service. 2000. Los Padres National Forest, Sisquoc River Watershed Analysis. www.r5.fs.fed.us/lospadres/news/reports_ea_eis_analysis/watersheds_2000.html.

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.* U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Report No. R5-MB-053.

United States Forest Service. 2005a. *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. U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region Report No. R5-MB-085.

United States Forest Service. 2005b. *Land Management Plan, Part 1: Southern California National Vision; Part 2: Forest Strategy; Part 3: Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests: Angeles National Forest, Cleveland National Forest, Los Padres National Forest, San Bernardino National Forest.* U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region R5-MB-075, R5-MB-078, and R5-MB-080.

United States Geological Survey. 2001. *Floods in the Cuyama Valley, California, February 1998.* USGS Fact Sheet 162-00. http://water.usgs.gov/pubs/FS/fs-162-00.

United States Geological Survey. 2011. Website: http://water.usgs.gov/data.html.

United States Marine Corps. 2007. *Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton*. U.S. Department of Defense.

United Water Conservation District 2007. *Fish Passage Monitoring and Studies, Vern Freeman Diversion Facility, Santa Clara River. Annual Report 2007 Monitoring Season.*

United Water Conservation District 2008. *Fish Passage Monitoring and Studies, Vern Freeman Diversion Facility, Santa Clara River. Annual Report 2008 Monitoring Season.*

United Water Conservation District 2009. *Fish Passage Monitoring and Studies, Vern Freeman Diversion Facility, Santa Clara River. Annual Report 2009 Monitoring Season.*

United Water Conservation District. 2010a. *Fish Passage Monitoring and Studies, Vern Freeman Diversion Facility, Santa Clara River. Annual Report 2010 Monitoring Season.*

United Water Conservation District. 20010b. *Vern Freeman Dam Fish Passage Conceptual Design Report.* Prepared by Vern Freeman Dam Fish Passage Panel. September 15, 2010.

URS Corporation. 2000. *Creek Inventory and Assessment Study: City of Santa Barbara Clean Water and Creek Restoration Program.* Prepared for City of Santa Barbara, Parks and Recreation Department.

URS Corporation. 2002. *Inventory of Algal Growth in Lower Ventura River and San Antonio Creek.* Prepared for Ojai Valley Sanitation District. December 2001, updated December 2002.

Vadas, R. L., Jr. 2000. Instream flow needs for anadromous salmonids and lamprey on the Pacific coast, with special reference to the Pacific southwest. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 64:331-358.

Ventura County Fish and Game Commission. 1973. *The Ventura River Recreational Area and Fishery: A Preliminary Report and Proposal*. Prepared for the Ventura County Board of Supervisors.

Ventura County. 2006. *Guide to Native and Invasive Streamside Plants: Restoring Riparian Habitats in Ventura County and Along the Santa Clara River in Los Angeles County.* Ventura County Planning Division.

Vermeij, G. J. 2004. *Nature: An Economic History.* Princeton University Press.

Waisanen, P. J. and N. B. Bliss. 2002. Changes in population and agricultural land in coterminous United States counties, 1790-1997. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 16(4):1-18.

Walters, C. 1997. Challenges in adaptive management of riparian ecosystems. *Conservation Ecology* 1(2):1.

Walters, C. 1996. *Adaptive Management of Renewable Resources*. Blackburn Press.

Waples, R. S. 1991a. Pacific salmon, *Oncorhynchus spp*., and the definition of "species" under the Endangered Species Act. *Marine Fisheries Review* 53(3):11-22.

Waples, R. S. 1991b. *Definition of "Species" Under the Endangered Species Act: Application to Pacific Salmon.* NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/NWC-194.

Waples, R. S. 1995. Evolutionarily significant units and the conservation of biological diversity under the Endangered Species Act. Evolution and the aquatic ecosystem: Defining unique units in population conservation. American Fisheries Society Symposium 17.

Waples, R. S. 1998. Evolutionarily Significant Units, Distinct Population Segments, and the Endangered Species Act: Reply to Pennock and Dimmick. C*onservation Biology* 12(3):718-721.

Waples, R. S. 2010. Captive breeding and the Evolutionary Significant Unit. *In:* Levin, S. A. (ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Biodiversity*. Princeton University Press.

Waples, R. S. and J. Drake. 2004. Risk/benefit considerations for marine stock enhancement: a Pacific salmon perspective. *In:* Leber, K. M., S. Kitadi, H. L. Blankenship, and T. Svasand (eds.). *Stock Enhancement and Sea Ranching: Developments, Pitfalls, and Opportunities.* Oxford University Press. Waples, R. and G. R. Pess, and T. Beechie. 2008. Evolutionary history of Pacific salmon in dynamic environments. *Evolutionary Applications* 1(2):1869-206.

Waples, R. S., T. Beechie, G. R. Pess. 2008a. Evolutionary history, habitat disturbance regimes, and anthropogenic changes: what do these mean for resilience of Pacific salmon populations? *Ecology and Society* 14(1):3.

Waples, R. S., G. R. Pess, and T. Beechie. 2008b. Evolutionary history of Pacific salmon in dynamic environments. *Evolutionary Applications* 1:189-206.

Waples, R. S., A. E. Punt, J. M. Cope. 2008c. Integrating genetic data into management of marine resources: how can we do it better? *Fish and Fisheries* 9:423-449.

Waples, R. S., M. M. McClure, T. C. Wainwright, P. McElhany, and P. Lawson. 2010. Integrating evolutionary considerations in recovery planning for Pacific salmon. *In:* DeWoody, J. A., C. Michler, K. Nichols, G. Rhodes, and K. Waste (eds.). *Molecular Approaches in Natural Resource Conservation and Management.* Cambridge University Press.

Warburton, M. L. C. C. Swift, and R. N. Fisher. 2000. *Status and Distribution of Fishes in the Santa Margarita River Drainage.* The Nature Conservancy, U.S. Geological Services and Department of Biological Sciences, San Diego State University.

Ward, B. R. 2000. Declivity in steelhead trout recruitment at the Keogh River over the past decade. *Canadian. Journal Fisheries Aquatic Science* 57:298–306.

Ward, B. R., P. A. Slaney, A. R. Facchom. and R. W. Land. 1989. Size-based survival in steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*): back-calculated lengths from adults' scales compared to migrating smolts at the Keogh River, British Columbia. *Canadian Journal Fisheries Biology* 44:1853-1858.

Warner, R. and K. Hendrix (eds.). 1984. *California Riparian Systems: Ecology, Conservation, and Productive Management*. University California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Warrick, J. A. and L. A. K. Mertes. 2010. Sediment yield from the tectonically active semiarid Western Transverse Ranges in California. *Geological Society of America Bulletin* 121(7/8):1054-1070.

Waters, T. 1995. *Sediment in Streams: Sources, Biological Effects, and Control*. American Fisheries Society Monograph No. 7.

Watson, J. D., T. A. Baker, S. P. Bell, A. Gann, M. Levine, and R. Losik. 2008. *Molecular Biology of the Gene,* 6th ed. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.

Welch, D. W., M. C. Melnychuk, E. R. Rechisky, A. D. Porter, M. C. Jacobs, A. Ladouceur, R. S. McKinley, and G. D. Jackson. 2009. Freshwater and marine migration and survival of endangered Cultus Lake sockeye salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) smolts using POST, a large-scale acoustic telemetry array. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 66(5):736-750.

Webb, B. W. F. Nobilis. 2007. Long-term changes in river temperature and the influence of climatic and hydrological factors *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 52:74-85.

Wells, A. W., J. S. Diana, and C. C. Swift. 1975. *Survey of the Freshwater Fishes and Their Habitats in the Coastal Drainages of Southern California*. *Final Report*. California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Branch. Contract AB-26.

Wenger, S. 1999. *A Review of the Scientific Literature on Riparian Buffer Width, Extent and Vegetation.* University of Georgia, Institute of Ecology. Office of Public Service and Outreach.

Wenger, S. J., C. H. Luce, A. F. Hamlet, D. J. Isaak, and H. M. Neville. 2010. Macroscale hydrologic modeling of ecologically relevant flow metrics. *Water Resources Research* 46:1-10.

Wegner, S. J., D. J. Isaak, C. H. Luce, H. M. Neville, D. D. Fausch, J. D. Dunham, D. C. Dauwalter, M. K. Young, M. M. Elsner, B. E. Rieman, A. F. Hamlet, and J. E. Williams. 2011. Flow regime temperature, and biotic interactions drive differential declines of trout species under climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*

West-Eberhard, M. J. 2003. *Developmental Plasticity and Evolution.* Oxford University Press.

Westerling, A. L. and B. P. Brant. 2008. Climate change and wildfire in California. *Climate Change* 87(Suppl.1):231-249.

Westerling, A. L., B. P. Bryant, H. K. Preisler, T. P., Holmes, H. G. Hildalgo, T. Das, and S. R. Shrestha. 2009. *Climate Change, Growth, and California Wildfire.* California Climate Change Center, University of California, Berkeley.

Weston Solutions. Inc. 2006. *San Dieguito River Watershed Management Plan: Final Report.* Prepared for City of San Diego, Department Planning and Land Use. 2 Vols.

Wetlands Research Associates, Inc. 1992. *Ventura River Estuary Enhancement: Existing Conditions.* Prepared for the California Department Parks and Recreation and City of San Buenaventura Planning Department.

Whitcare, J. and A. Bender. 2010. Degeneracy: a design principle for achieving robustness and evolvability. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 263:143-153.

Whitton, B. A. (ed.). 1975. *River Ecology. Studies in Ecology*. Vol. 2. University of California Press.

Wicks, B. J., R. Joensen, Q. Tang, and D. J. Randall. Swimming and ammonia toxicity in salmonids: the effect of sub lethal ammonia exposure on the swimming performance of coho salmon and the acute toxicity of ammonia in swimming and resting rainbow trout. *Aquatic Toxicology* 59(2002):55-69.

Wijte, A., S. P. Wechsler, M. G. Adelson, T. I. Sweaney. 2006. *Assessment of Status of Riverine Wetlands in the Santa Ana and San Jacinto River Watersheds. Final Report*. Prepared for Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. U.S. EPA Funding No. 05-101-180-0.

Wilcox, C. and H. Possingham. 2002. Do life history traits affect the accuracy of diffusion approximations for mean time to extinction? *Ecological Applications* 12(4):1163-1179.

Wildermuth Environmental, Inc. 2008. *Recomputation of Ambient Water Quality in the Santa Ana Watershed for the Period 1987-2006. Final Technical Memorandum.* Prepared for Santa Ana Watershed Protection Authority, Basin Monitoring Program Task Force.

Wilkins, J. S. 2009. *Species: A History of An Idea*. University of California Press.

Williams, B. K., J. D. Nichols, and M. J. Conroy. 2001. *Analysis and Management of Animal Populations: Modeling, Estimation, and Decision-Making.* Academic Press.

Williams, G. P. and P. A. Bisson. 2003. Downstream effects of dams on alluvial rivers. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper No. 1286.

Williams, T. H., S. T. Lindley, B. C. Spence, and D. Boughton. 2011. *Status Review Update for Pacific Salmon and Steelhead Listed Under the Endangered Species Act: Southwest Region.* National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Fisheries Ecology Division.

Williamson, M. 1966. *Biological Invasions.* Chapman & Hall.

Wilson, E. O. and W. H. Bossert. 1971. *A Primer of Population Biology.* Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Winter, B. 1987. *Racial Identification of Juvenile Summer and Winter Steelhead and Resident Rainbow Trout (Salmo gairdneri* Richardson*).* Administrative Report No. 87-1. California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Branch.

Woelfel, D. 1991. *The Restoration of San Mateo Creek: A Feasibility Study for a Southern California Steelhead Fishery*. Master's Thesis, Department Biology, California State University, Fullerton.

Wohl, E. E. (ed.). 2000. *Inland Flood Hazards: Human, Riparian, and Aquatic Communities.* Cambridge University Press.

Wohl, E. E. 2001. *Virtual Rivers: Lessons from the Mountain Rivers of the Colorado Front Range*. Yale University Press.

Wohl, E. E. 2004. *Disconnected Rivers: Linking Rivers to Landscapes*. Yale University Press.

Wood, J. W. 1979. *Diseases of Pacific Salmon – Their Prevention and Treatm*ent. State of Washington Department of Fisheries, Hatchery Division.

Woodman, C. F., J. Rudolph, and T. Rudolph. 1991. *Western Chumash Prehistory: Resource Use and Settlement in the Santa Ynez Valley*. Prepared for the Unocal Corporation, Point Pedernales Pipeline Company.

Wooster, J. K. 2003. *Geomorphic Responses Following Dam Removal: A Flume Study.* Master's Thesis, Department of Geological Sciences, University of California, Davis.

World Commission on Dams. 2000. *Dams and Dam Development: A New Framework for Decision Making.* The Report of the World Commission on Dams. Earthscan Publications.

Wright. S. 1978. *Evolution and the Genetics of Populations*: *Variability Within and Among Natural Populations.* Vol. 4. University of Chicago Press.

Wunderlich, R. C., B. D. Winter, and J. H. Meyer. 1994. *Restoration of the Elwha River ecosystem. Fisheries* 19(8):11-20.

Wurster, F. C. J. V. Hall, and E. F. Blok. 2002. Recent changes in the extent of estuarine wetlands in southern California: Pt. Piedras Blancas to Santa Monica. *California and the World Ocean 02: Revising California's Ocean Agenda.*

Yaffee, S. L. Ecosystem management in practice: the importance of human institutions. *Ecological Applications* 6(3):724-727.

Yasutake, W. T. and J. H. Wales. 1983. *Microscopic Anatomy of Salmonids: An Atlas.* United State Fish and Wildlife Service. Resource Publication 150.

Zedler, J., C. Norby, and B. Kus. 1992. *The Ecology of the Tijuana Estuary, California: A National Estuarine Research Reserve.* NOAA Office of Coastal Resource Management, Sanctuaries and Reserves Division.

Zimmerman, C. E. 2005. Relationships of otolith strontium-to-calcium ratios and salinity: experimental validation of juvenile salmonids. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 62:88-97.

Zimmerman, C. E. and G. Reeves. 2000. Population structure of sympatric anadromous and nonanadromous *Oncorhynchus mykiss*: evidence from spawning surveys and otolith microchemistry. *Canadian Journal Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 57:2152-2162.

Zimmerman, C. E., G. W. Edwards, and K. Perry. 2009. Maternal origin and migratory history of steelhead and rainbow trout captured in rivers of the Central Valley, California. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 138:280-291.

Zydlewski, G. B., A. Haro, K. G. Whalen, and S. D. McCormick. 2001 Performance of stationary and portable passive transponder detection systems for monitoring of fish movements. *Journal of Fish Biology* 58:1471-1475.

Zydlewski, G. B., G. Horton, T. Dubeuril, D. Letcher, S. Casey, and J. Zydlewski. 2006. Remote monitoring of fish in small streams: a unified approach using pit tags. *Fisheries* 31:492-502.

FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES CITED

55 FR 24296. 1990. Endangered and Threatened Species: Listing and Recovery Priority Guidelines.

56 FR 224. 1991. Policy Applying the Definition of Species Under the Endangered Species Act to Pacific Salmon.

61 FR 4722. 1996. Policy Regarding the Recognition of Distinct Vertebrate Population Segments Under the Endangered Species Act.

61 FR 56139. 1997. Proposed Rule: Endangered and Threatened Species: Listing of Several Evolutionary Significant Unites (ESUs) of West Coast Steelhead.

62 FR 43937. 1997. Final Rule: Endangered and Threatened Species: Listing of Several Evolutionary Significant Units (ESUs) of West Coast Steelhead.

67 FR 21586. 2002. Final Rule: Endangered and Threatened Species: Range Extension for Endangered Steelhead in Southern California.

68 FR 15100. 2003. Policy for Evaluation of Conservation Efforts when Making Listing Decisions.

70 FR 37204. 2005. Final Policy: Policy on the Consideration of Hatchery-Origin Fish in Endangered Species Act Listing Determinations for Pacific Salmon and Steelhead.

70 FR 52488. 2005. Final Rule: Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for Seven Evolutionarily Significant Units of Pacific Salmon and Steelhead in California.

71 FR 834. 2006. Final Rule: Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Listing Determinations for 10 Distinct Population Segments of West Coast Steelhead.