SALMON METHODOLOGY REVIEW

Each year, the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) completes a methodology review to help assure new or significantly modified methodologies employed to estimate impacts of the Council's salmon management use the best available science. This review is preparatory to the Council's adoption, at the November meeting, of all proposed changes to be implemented in the coming season, or, in certain limited cases, of providing directions for handling any unresolved methodology problems prior to the formulation of salmon management options the following March. Because there is insufficient time to review new or modified methods at the March meeting, the Council may reject their use if they have not been approved the preceding November.

The Methodology Review is also used as a forum to review Experimental Fishing Permit (EFP) proposals, which allows the Council to approve permits at the November meeting and allows adequate time for planning fisheries in the subsequent year.

At its April 2008 meeting, the Council identified a list of potential subjects for the methodology review. These subjects and the responsible agencies were identified in a reminder email dated July 16, 2008, which requested agencies prepare to speak to the status of the subjects in terms of completeness and priority (Agenda Item D.1.a, Attachment 1).

All materials for review are to be received at the Council office at least two weeks prior to the scheduled review meeting of the SSC Salmon Subcommittee and Salmon Technical Team (STT), which is scheduled for mid-to-late October, 2008.

Council Action:

1. **Determine if topics identified for review will be ready for the joint SSC Salmon Subcommittee - STT meeting in October.**
2. **Set priorities for review of methodologies and/or experimental fishing permit proposals**.

Reference Materials:

1. Agenda Item D.1.a, Attachment 1: Email to the agencies from Chuck Tracy dated July 16, 2008.
2. Agenda Item D.1.b, NMFS Letter: May 19 Letter from D. Robert Lohn to Coalition of Salmon Communities.
3. Agenda Item D.1.c, STT Report: Salmon Technical Team Report on Salmon Methodology Review.

Agenda Order:

a. Agenda Item Overview — Chuck Tracy
b. Agency and Tribal Comments
c. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies
d. Public Comment
e. **Council Action**: Establish Final Methodology Review Priorities for 2009 Salmon Season

PFMC
08/19/08

Agenda Item D.1.a
Attachment 1
September 2008

Subject: Salmon Methodology Review
From: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>
Date: Wed, 16 Jul 2008 15:48:16 -0700
To: Sandy Zeiner <szeiner@nwifc.org>, Keith Lutz <lutz@nwifc.org>, Robert Kope <Robert.Kope@noaa.gov>, Dell Simmons <Dell.Simmons@noaa.gov>, Doug Milward <milwadam@dfw.wa.gov>, Craig Foster <Craig.A.Foster@state.or.us>, Henry Yuen <henry_yuen@fws.gov>, Allen Grover <AGROVER@dfg.ca.gov>, Michael Mohr <Michael.Mohr@noaa.gov>, Wendy Beeghley <BeeghWLB@dfw.wa.gov>, Melodie Palmer-Zwahlen <mpalmer@dfg.ca.gov>, Eric Schindler <Eric.D.Schindler@state.or.us>, Mike O'Farrell <michael.ofarrell@noaa.gov>, Dell Simmons <Dell.Simmons@noaa.gov>, Allen Grover <AGROVER@dfg.ca.gov>, Larrie LaVoy <LaVoyLWL@dfw.wa.gov>, Jim Packer <PackeJFP@dfw.wa.gov>, Ethan Clemons <Ethan.R.Clemons@state.or.us>, Andy Rankis <ARankis@nwifc.org>, Rishi Sharma <ShaR@CRITFC.org>, Henry Yuen <henry_yuen@fws.gov>, Bob Conrad <bconrad@nwifc.org>, Shannon Davis <shannon_davis@class.orednet.org>, Angelika Hagen-breaux <hagenafh@dfw.wa.gov>, Joe Dazey <jdazey@centurytel.net>, Peter Lawson <Peter.W.Lawson@noaa.gov>, David Sampson <David.Sampson@oregonstate.edu>, Bob Conrad <bconrad@nwifc.org>, Owen Hamel <owen.hamel@noaa.gov>, Shizhen Wang <szwang@qwest.net>, Charlie Petrosky <cpetrosky@idfg.idaho.gov>, Peter Dygert <Peter.Dygert@noaa.gov>, Sarah McAvinchey <Sarah.McAvinchey@noaa.gov>, Jennifer Ise <Jennifer.Ise@noaa.gov>, George Nandor <george_nandor@psmfc.org>, Ron Boyce <BoyceR@state.or.us>, Stephen Williams ODFW <Stephen.H.Williams@state.or.us>, Phil Anderson <ANDERPMA@dfw.wa.gov>, Marija Vojkovich <mvojkovich@dfg.ca.gov>

Hi All:

This is just a reminder to agencies and involved individuals that the Council will be establishing priorities for salmon methodology review by the SSC and STT at the September Council meeting. The review itself will be scheduled for mid-October.

A list of potential subjects was considered at the April Council meeting (see below), and it will be useful to have updates on the priorities and whether some of the projects are suitably complete for review.

It is unlikely that the SSC will have time to review all the subjects this year, or that all will be ready for review. Please discuss these projects with appropriate parties and have recommendations ready for the September Council meeting.

The Council adopted the following priority candidate items that the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) may consider for the 2008 Salmon Methodology Review. Source entities to deliver detailed reports for review are included in parentheses with each candidate item.

1. Sensitivity analyses of the Chinook and Coho Fishery Regulation Assessment Models to major assumptions, including sensitivity to parameters related to mark-selective fisheries. Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW)
2. A new stock abundance forecast model for Sacramento River fall Chinook. Salmon

Technical Team (STT)

3. The harvest forecast model for Sacramento River fall Chinook. (STT)
4. September 1 maturity boundary ("birth date") for Klamath River fall Chinook. (Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and STT)
5. Lower Columbia River natural coho ESA consultation standard. (NMFS NWR)

--
Chuck Tracy
Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101
Portland, Oregon 97220-1384
Voice 503-820-2280
Toll Free 866-806-7204
FAX 503-820-2299
e-mail Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov
URL www.pcouncil.org
<")\}}}}>< <")\}}}}>< <")\}}}}>< <")\}}}}><

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Northwest Region
7600 Sand Point Way N.E., Bldg. 1
Seattle, WA 98115

MAY 19 2008

Coalition of Salmon Communities
P.O. Box 56
Astoria, OR 97103-0056

Dear Sirs:

Thank you for your letter of April 21, 2008 regarding the management of Lower Columbia River coho. As indicated in our 2008 Guidance letter to the Pacific Fishery Management Council, I support the use of abundance based harvest strategies such as the one developed by Oregon for Lower Columbia River coho. Oregon's harvest matrix is keyed to the status of the Clackamas and Sandy River populations. However, it is not clear if or how the matrix addresses the needs of other populations in the Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU). We have highlighted similar concerns in earlier guidance letters beginning in 2006 and in earlier correspondence since the ESU was first listed. Because of these and other related uncertainties, we have taken a conservative approach to applying the matrix in recent years. Additional work needs to be done before we can be confident that the matrix is properly calibrated to the needs of the ESU.

The most important next step is development of a recovery scenario that identifies the target status for all populations, including those that need to be managed for high viability. Once this scenario is complete, the harvest matrix should be reviewed, and revised if necessary, to insure that it is responsive to the needs of all the populations in the ESU, particularly those designated for high viability. We support development of these recovery scenarios through the recovery planning process. Recovery planning provides the opportunity for the state agencies and their associated stake holders to take the lead on these important decisions.

As you know, the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board developed an Interim Regional Recovery Plan that includes preliminary recommendations on a recovery scenario for Lower Columbia River coho on the Washington side of river. The state of Oregon is now working with their stakeholders on a recovery plan for the Oregon side. NOAA Fisheries is working with Oregon on their recovery plan. We encourage you to work with Oregon and their stakeholders to encourage timely completion of their recovery plan products, and to insure that the plan provides the necessary guidance with respect to Lower Columbia River coho. Ideally, the plan will describe a recovery scenario that identifies the priority populations for the ESU, and specifies how harvest and other key factors should be managed to achieve recovery. Because Oregon and Washington have worked independently on their recovery initiatives, it will also be necessary to integrate the

Printed on Recycled Paper

comprehensive plan that addresses the full Lower Columbia River coho ESU. Your input during the recovery planning process can also help facilitate the necessary timely integration of the joint plans.

I appreciate your concern and interest in clarifying how fisheries will be managed in the future for Lower Columbia River coho. As indicated above, I intend to work through the recovery planning process to resolve the outstanding issues as quickly as possible.

If you have further questions, please contact me or Peter Dygert of my staff (206-526-6734).

Sincerely,

for D. Robert Lohn
Regional Administrator

cc:
Don McIsaac, PFMC
Jeff Koenings, WDFW
Guy Norman, WDFW
Roy Elicker, ODFW
Bruce McIntosh, ODFW
Jeff Rodgers, ODFW
Jeff Breckel, LCFRB

08-027

SALMON TECHNICAL TEAM REPORT ON SALMON METHODOLOGY REVIEW

A list of priority candidate items that the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) may consider for the 2008 Salmon Methodology Review was adopted by the Council at the April meeting. The current status of these items is described as follows:

1. Sensitivity analysis of Chinook and Coho Fishery Regulation Assessment Models to major assumptions, including sensitivity to parameters related to mark-selective fisheries.
   - The Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW) has been working on this and is expected to have a report for the work session.

2. Development of a new stock abundance forecast for Sacramento River fall Chinook.
   - A report is in preparation and will be presented to the SSC.

3. Harvest forecast model for Sacramento River fall Chinook.
   - A report is in preparation and will be presented to the SSC.

4. September 1 maturity boundary ("birth date") for Klamath River fall Chinook.
   - There has been no progress on this topic. The Salmon Technical Team is interested in this topic, however other priorities precluded work to date; the tag recovery data for the system is still in the process of being validated.

5. Lower Columbia River natural coho Endangered Species Act consultation standard.
   - The STT is not aware of any products that will be available for SSC review.

PFMC
8/19/08

PROGRESS REPORT ON CAUSES OF THE 2008 SALMON FAILURE

Returns of several west coast Chinook and coho salmon stocks were lower than expected in 2007, and low jack returns in 2007 for some stocks suggested that 2008 would probably be worse. The most prominent example is Sacramento River fall Chinook (SRFC) salmon, for which spawning escapement in 2007 is estimated to have been 88,000, well below the escapement conservation goal (122,000-180,000) for the first time since the early 1990s, continuing a declining trend since the recent peak escapement of 775,000 spawners in 2002. In addition, the 2007 jack returns for SRFC were an order of magnitude below the previous record low return in 2006. Similar low returns have been documented for some coastal coho salmon. As a result of the low returns in 2007 and even lower forecasts for 2008, the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) adopted the most restrictive salmon fisheries in the history of the west coast.

In response to these severe restrictions, the Council requested the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) convene a scientific forum to investigate the potential causes of the decline in the status of Council related salmon stocks, in particular SRFC, and if possible make recommendations on how to improve the advance forecasting of salmon abundance. The NMFS Northwest and Southwest Science Centers convened the 2008 West Coast Salmon Work Group (Work Group), which was made up of scientists from Federal, State, and Tribal agencies and Universities to begin investigating the cause of the 2008 salmon failure. The Work Group met July 29 and 30 in Santa Cruz for an organizational meeting. Drs. Churchill Grimes and John Stein from the Southwest and Northwest Science Centers will present a report from the Work Group (Agenda Item D.2.b, Work Group Report).

The Work Group also convened an August 29 biological technical meeting in Sacramento to gather additional information from other agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the public that would provide context or insight into the possible causes for the sharp decline in SRFC spawning escapement experienced in 2007 and forecast for 2008. Attachment 1 is the announcement for that meeting.

Council Task:

1. Discuss process and timeline for completing the Work Group objectives.

Reference Materials:

1. Agenda Item D.2.a, Attachment 1: Biological Technical Meeting Announcement.
2. Agenda Item D.2.b, Work Group Report: Progress Report to the Pacific Fishery Management Council on Deliberations of the Scientific Working Group to Evaluate the Decline in Sacramento River fall Chinook and other West Coast Salmon.
3. Agenda Item D.2.e, Public Comment.

Agenda Order:

a.	Agenda Item Overview	Chuck Tracy
b.	West Coast Salmon Workgroup Progress Report	John Stein, Churchill Grimes
c.	Agency and Tribal Comments	
d.	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies	
e.	Public Comment	
f.	Council Discussion and Guidance	

PFMC
08/20/08

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

August 13, 2008

SUBJECT: Biological Technical Meeting regarding the low returns of Sacramento River fall Chinook in 2007 and projected for 2008.

Dear Colleague:

In April 2008 the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) adopted the most restrictive salmon fisheries in the history of the west coast, in response to the sudden collapse of Sacramento River fall Chinook (SRFC) salmon and the poor status of many west coast coho salmon populations. The PFMC adopted a complete closure of commercial and recreational Chinook fisheries south of Cape Falcon, Oregon, allowing only for a mark-selective hatchery coho recreational fishery of 9,000 fish from Cape Falcon, Oregon, to the Oregon/California border. In response to these severe restrictions, the PFMC requested that NOAA Fisheries convene a scientific forum to investigate potential causes of the precipitous decline in status of the SRFC stock. As a secondary concern, the PFMC also requested analysis of the potential depression of other salmon stocks that contribute to west coast marine fisheries. A biological working group (WG) has therefore been convened to conduct an assessment of the SRFC collapse.

During previous salmon and marine fish status reviews, the agency has had success obtaining new and useful information from biologists familiar with the species or stock under review. This information can play an important role in the subsequent WG assessment. To that end, we have scheduled a public biological technical meeting to be held on August 29, 2008, in the Stanford room of the John E. Moss Federal Building, 650 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814. We will begin the meeting at 10:00 AM and conclude by 4:30 PM. Following opening remarks by a representative of the WG, we wish to hear from co-managers, and others, with scientific information on SRFC or other Chinook or coho stocks that would provide context or insight into the possible causes for the sharp decline in SRFC spawning escapement experienced in 2007 and forecast for 2008. If it is possible for you to attend, please be prepared to discuss the following topics:

I. Information and data directly related to diminished survival and/or production of the 2004 and 2005 broods of SRFC, including (if known) their source(s), severity, geographic scope, and relative contribution. The attached questions are provided for your consideration of existing threats.

II. Information and data directly related to the effectiveness of current mitigation strategies designed to ameliorate current threats to the stock.

If you have any questions or comments about this meeting or wish to arrange to make a Powerpoint or other type of presentation (strict limit of 10 minutes in length) at the meeting, please contact Tommy Williams at (831)-420-3912 or by e-mail at Tommy.Williams@noaa.gov. We would also appreciate it if you would email Tommy Williams to let us know whether or not you, or a representative, are planning to attend. Thanks for your consideration and we hope to see you at the meeting.

Please note, cameras, including cell phones with cameras are not allowed in this Federal facility.

Sincerely,

John E. Stein
Churchill Grimes
Leads, SRFC WG

Attachment

cc: Donald McIsaac, PFMC
Norm Bartoo, SWFSC
Usha Varanasi, NWFSC
SRFC WG

ATTACHMENT

QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE STATUS OF THE 2004 AND 2005 BROODS (MAJORITY OF ADULTS RETURNED IN 2007 AND 2008) OF THE SACRAMENTO FALL CHINOOK SALMON

Freshwater Biological Focus

1) Was there a disease event in the egg incubation, fry emergence, rearing, or downstream migration phases?
2) Was there a change in recovery, spawning and/or release strategies during hatchery operations?
3) Was there a change in the methodology or operations of the San Francisco Bay net pen 'acclimation' program for trucked hatchery fish?
4) Were there any problems with fish food or chemicals used at hatcheries?

Freshwater Habitat Areas Focus

1) Were there drought or flood conditions during the spawning, incubation, or rearing phases?
2) Was there any pollution event where juveniles were present?
3) Was there anything unusual about the flow conditions below dams during the spawning, incubation, or rearing phases?
4) Were there any in-water construction events (bridge building, etc.) when this brood was present in freshwater or estuarine areas?
5) Was there anything unusual about the water withdrawals in the rivers or estuary areas when this brood was present?
6) Was there any unusual temperature or other limnological conditions when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?
7) Was there any unusual population dynamics of typical food or prey species used by juvenile Chinook salmon in the relevant freshwater and estuarine areas?
8) Was there anything unusual, in the same context as above for juvenile rearing and outmigration phases, about habitat factors during the return of the 2 year olds from this brood?
9) Was there a change in the recovery of juvenile outmigrants observed in the USFWS mid-water trawl surveys and other monitoring programs in the Delta.

Freshwater Species Interactions Focus

1) Was there any unusual striped bass population dynamics or behavior when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?
2) Is there a relationship between declining Delta smelt, longfin smelt, and threadfin shad populations in the Delta and Central Valley Chinook survival?

Marine Biological Focus

1) Was there anything unusual about the ocean migration pattern of the 2004 and 2005 broods?

2) Was there anything unusual about the recovery of tagged fish groups from the 2004 and 2005 broods the ocean salmon fisheries?

Marine Habitat Areas Focus

1) Were there periods of reduced upwelling or other oceanographic physical conditions during the period of smolt entry into the marine environment, or during the period of marine residence up to the return to freshwater of the jacks?
2) Were plankton levels depressed off California, especially during the smolt entry periods?
3) Oceanography: temperature, salinity, upwelling, currents, ~~red tide~~, etc.

Marine Species Interactions Focus

1) Were there any unusual population dynamics of typical food or prey species used by juvenile Chinook salmon in marine areas? (plankton, krill, juvenile anchovy or sardines, etc.)
2) Was there an increase in bird predation on juvenile salmonids caused by a reduction in the availability of other forage food?
3) Was there increased predation on salmonids by other finfish species (e.g., lingcod)?

Cumulative Ecosystem Effects Focus

1) Were there other ecosystem effects?
2) Were there synergistic effects of significant factors?

PROGRESS REPORT TO THE PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON DELIBERATIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP TO EVALUATE THE DECLINE IN SACRAMENTO RIVER FALL CHINOOK AND OTHER WEST COAST SALMON

In April 2008 the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) adopted the most restrictive salmon fisheries in the history of the west coast, in response to the rapid collapse of Sacramento River fall Chinook (SRFC) salmon and the poor status of many west coast coho salmon populations. In response to these severe restrictions, the PFMC requested that NOAA Fisheries convene a scientific forum to investigate potential causes of the precipitous decline in status of the SRFC stock. As secondary concerns, PFMC also requested analysis of a potential depression of other salmon stocks that contribute to west coast marine fisheries, and if possible, make recommendations on how to improve the advance forecasting of salmon abundance.

NOAA Fisheries Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) and Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) assembled a scientific working group consisting of:

- Leads – Churchill Grimes (SWFSC) and John Stein (NWFSC)
- NOAA members – Daniel Bottom (NWFSC), John Ferguson (NWFSC) , Peter Lawson (NWFSC), Steven Lindley (SWFSC), Bruce MacFarlane (SWFSC), William Peterson (NWFSC), Carlos Garza (SWFSC), Michael Mohr (SWFSC), Brian Wells (SWFSC), Robert Kope (NWFSC), Robin Webb (Earth System Research Lab), Tracy Collier (NWFSC), and Frank Schwing (SWFSC)
- PFMC – Chuck Tracy
- CDFG – Alice Low, Melodie Palmer-Zwahlen, and Allen Grover
- ODFW –Kelly Moore
- WDFW – Craig Busak
- USFWS-CA – James Smith
- Academia – Loo Botsford, UC Davis, David Hankin, Humboldt State University, and James Anderson, University of Washington.

On July 29 and 30, 2008 the first meeting of the working group was held at the NOAA Fisheries SWFSC laboratory in Santa Cruz, CA. All working group members were in attendance except Hankin, Garza and Bottom, and Webb participated via teleconference/webcast. The principal goals of the meeting were to review and agree upon the timeline for completion of work, review background information via presentations and discussions, discuss focus areas, develop a list of data needs, agree upon an outline for the working group report, organize into sub-teams to carry out the work and make work assignments.

The following presentations were made, and extensive discussion followed:

- Biology of Central Valley Fall Chinook and Local Patterns and Trends (S. Lindley)
- Biology of Coastal Coho and Regional Patterns and Trends (Lawson)
- Central Valley Freshwater and Estuarine System and Recent Trends (J. Smith)
- Central Valley Freshwater and Delta Survival Studies (MacFarlane)

- West Coast Regional-Scale Freshwater Events (CA to Canada) (Webb, via webcast)
- California Current Large Marine Ecosystem Recent Conditions, Trend, and Forecasting: Northern CA Current (B. Peterson) Southern CA Current (B. Wells)
- Current PFMC Predictors of Ocean Stock Abundance and Recent Trends (Mohr)

The working group agreed upon a draft outline of the report and divided into three work teams: 1) Grimes, Stein, Tracy, Mohr, Kope and Grover 2) Peterson, Moore, Lawson, Busack, Webb and Schwing and 3) Lindley, Ferguson, Botsford, Wells, Smith, Low, Palmer-Zwahlen, Bottom, MacFarlane and Collier). Each group developed a list of assignments to complete. The full working group developed a preliminary list of data needs and agreed to complete the report according to the timeline laid out in the TOR (attached).

The working group also reviewed the list of possible focus areas identified by the Council in March, 2008, and attached to the TOR. The review consisted primarily of determining which potential factors identified could be eliminated from further consideration. The initial decision to eliminate an item was based on a consensus recommendation and expert knowledge of the working group members. The rationale and supporting data for eliminating an item from the list are not presented at this time; however, the working group intends to provide them in the final report.

The next meeting of the working group will be a public biological technical meeting to be held on August 29, 2008, in the Stanford room of the John E. Moss Federal Building, 650 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814. The meeting will begin at 10:00 AM and conclude by 4:30 PM. Following opening remarks by a representative of the working group, the working group will hear from co-managers, and others, with scientific information on SRFC or other Chinook or coho stocks that would provide context or insight into the possible causes for the sharp decline in SRFC spawning escapement experienced in 2007 and forecast for 2008.

Terms of Reference for NOAA Fisheries Scientific Forum: 2008 Collapse of the Sacramento Fall Chinook Stock and Decline of other West Coast Salmon Stocks

Introduction

In April 2008 the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) adopted the most restrictive salmon fisheries in the history of the west coast, in response to the sudden collapse of Sacramento River fall Chinook (SRFC) salmon and the poor status of many west coast coho salmon populations. The PFMC adopted a complete closure of commercial and recreational Chinook fisheries south of Cape Falcon, Oregon, allowing only for a mark-selective hatchery coho recreational fishery of 9,000 fish from Cape Falcon, Oregon, to the Oregon/California border. Salmon fisheries off California and Oregon typically have been robust, involving seasons that span from May 1 to October 31 and averaging over 800,000 Chinook caught per year from 2000 to 2005. Fisheries north of Cape Falcon were also severely restricted in 2008, with coho quotas less than 20 percent of the 2007 season for non-Indian fisheries and about 50 percent of 2007 levels for treaty-Indian fisheries. Although Chinook quotas in this area were similar to 2007, depressed natural coho stocks constrained access of commercial fisheries to Chinook stocks. The situation was so drastic that west coast Governors asked for $290 million in disaster relief and Congress approved $170 million.

In response to these severe restrictions, the PFMC requested that NOAA Fisheries convene a scientific forum to investigate potential causes of the precipitous decline in status of the SRFC stock. As secondary concerns, PFMC also requested analysis of a potential depression of other salmon stocks that contribute to west coast marine fisheries, and if possible, make recommendations on how to improve the advance forecasting of salmon abundance. This document describes the process NOAA Fisheries has developed in response to this request and provides some background information on the problem.

Background

Returns of several west coast Chinook and coho salmon stocks were lower than expected in 2007, and low jack returns in 2007 for some stocks suggested that 2008 would be at least as bad. The most prominent example is SRFC salmon, for which spawning escapement in 2007 is estimated to have been 88,000, well below the escapement conservation goal (122,000 - 180,000) for the first time since the early 1990s, continuing a declining trend since the recent peak escapement of 775,000 spawners in 2002. The return of jacks in 2007 was at a level in order of magnitude less than the prior record low; the 2008 spawner escapement is projected to be only 59,000 despite the complete closure of coastal and freshwater Chinook salmon fisheries. Low returns have also been documented for coastal coho salmon. For California, coho salmon returns in 2007 averaged 27 percent of parent stock abundance in 2004, with a range from 0 percent (Redwood Creek) to 68 percent (Shasta River). In Oregon, spawner estimates for the Oregon Coast natural (OCN) coho salmon were 30 percent of parental spawner abundance. These returns are the lowest since 1999, approaching the low abundances of the 1990s. Columbia River coho and Chinook stocks experienced mixed returns in 2007 and mixed forecasts for abundance in 2008.

DRAFT

For coho salmon there was a clear north-south gradient, with returns improving to the north. California and Oregon coastal returns were down sharply, while Columbia River hatchery coho were down only slightly. Washington coastal coho returns were similar to 2006. Even within the OCN region, there was a clear north-south pattern, with the north coast region (predominantly Nehalem River and Tillamook Bay populations) returning at 46 percent of parental abundance while the mid-south coast region (predominantly Coos and Coquille populations) returned at only 14 percent of parental abundance. The Rogue population was at only 21 percent of parental abundance. The low 2007 jack returns for these three stocks in particular suggest a continuing severe problem in 2008. In addition, Columbia River coho salmon jack returns were also near record lows.

There have been exceptions to this generally poor status. Klamath River fall Chinook (KRFC) experienced a very strong 2004 brood, despite parent spawners well below the current estimates of the maximum sustainable yield level. Columbia River spring Chinook production from the 2004 and 2005 broods will be at historically high levels, according to age class returns to date. The 2008 forecasts for Columbia River fall Chinook "tule" stocks are significantly improved over 2007. Curiously, Sacramento River winter Chinook returns in 2007 showed strong improvement, while the fall Chinook stock fell to record low levels in the same basin.

What caused the observed general pattern of low salmon returns? To answer this, we need to recognize that salmon exhibit complex life histories, with potential influences on their production at a variety of life stages in freshwater, estuarine, and marine habitats. Thus, salmon typically have high variation in adult returns, which may be explained by a variety of human and environmental factors. Available freshwater habitat suitable for supporting salmon spawning and rearing has been drastically reduced in many west coast rivers and streams such that only remnant populations with lower resilience remain, but the level of degradation varies by watershed and thus individual stocks can differ in their productivity. However, when short-term patterns in salmon productivity are coherent over broad geographic areas, it is likely that they are caused by regional environmental variation. This could include such events as widespread drought or floods affecting hydrologic conditions (river flow and temperature), or regional variation in ocean conditions (temperature, production, predator abundance). Given the observed pattern of widespread low returns for two species in 2007, and a gradient from California to British Columbia, some type of regional environmental variation is the most likely candidate cause.

In freshwater, the major recent regional event that would likely affect hydrologic conditions in a number of basins was the severe California drought in 2007, which extended (with less severity) into southern Oregon. The geographic extent of this event is consistent with observed low returns, but its timing is not: the drought occurred after this year's returning salmon had migrated to the ocean. There are, however, many other possible causes contributing to the declines in the Central Valley in particular and other river basins in general that need to be addressed as possible causes or contributing factors to the low returns (Attachment I contains a list compiled for the PFMC by the California Department of Fish and Game). For the SRFC stock, an aggregate of hatchery and natural production, freshwater withdrawals (including pumping of water from the delta estuary area), elimination of net-pen acclimation facilities coincident with the two failed brood years, and large scale bridge construction at Benitez during

DRAFT

the smolt outmigration have been particularly suggested as prime freshwater candidates for the poor returns.

For ocean factors, two efforts are underway to develop and use ocean environmental indicators to explain variations in salmon marine survival. The Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) is using a number of physical and biological indicators for the Oregon and Washington coasts to provide qualitative predictions of coho and Chinook salmon returns. At the Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC), estimates of zooplankton, rockfish, seabirds, and 15 other ocean variables have been combined into a composite productivity index to describe variation in ocean production for the central California coast. Although the relationship between this index and California salmon population dynamics has not yet been fully tested, preliminary analyses indicate it tracks the Central Valley Chinook population indexes fairly well over the past 15 years.

For the spring and summer of 2005 (the ocean-entry year for 2004 brood fall Chinook and 2003 brood coho), both approaches indicated very poor conditions for juvenile salmon entering the ocean, indicating poor returns for coho in 2006 and age three fall Chinook in 2007. Coast-wide observations showed that 2005 was quite an unusual year for the northern California Current, with delayed onset of upwelling, anomalously high surface temperatures, and very low zooplankton biomass. However, the very strong production from the KRFC 2004 brood appears to be a curiosity. For the 2006 ocean-entry year, the SWFSC index was also poor, while the indicators used by the NWFSC provided a mixed assessment, which may explain the north-south trend observed in coho returns in 2007. Taken together, these poor ocean conditions, reflected in the indicators, provide a plausible partial explanation for the observed low returns of coho salmon in 2006 and 2007, and the low SRFC adult returns in 2007. However, it is notable the ocean indicators in 2006 alone would not have predicted the order of magnitude record low SRFC jack returns of the 2005 brood.

The current set of ocean stock abundance predictors used by PFMC has in many cases successfully forecast the declining trends in abundance and escapement (many are based on preceding year jack returns), but even so, realized escapements in 2007 were, in some cases, well below their forecast. For example, SRFC escapement was 33 percent of that forecast and OCN escapement was 25 percent of that forecast. Why did the predictors for these stocks fail to capture the full extent of this environmental signal, and can their performance be improved? The answer is probably different for the two predictors, given the different methods employed.

The SRFC predictor uses a sibling-type regression model to predict ocean stock abundance (predominantly age-3 fish) from the return of age-2 jacks the previous year. A sibling-type regression directly accounts for variation in freshwater and early ocean mortality because it is conditional on observed cohort abundance following these stages, but does not ordinarily account for variation in the maturation schedule. Research has shown that the maturation schedule in Chinook salmon is determined in part by coincident ocean conditions. Thus, incorporating an appropriately defined index of ocean conditions in a sibling regression has the potential to improve its predictive power. The SWFSC is evaluating the merits of this approach for forecasting KRFC and SRFC ocean abundance.

DRAFT

In contrast, in recent years the OCN rivers coho salmon predictor has been based on a regression model that does include two environmental indices (January sea-surface temperature and spring upwelling anomalies) that has a moderately good statistical fit using data from 1970 to the present. However, for 2008 predictions, the Oregon Production Index Technical Team (OPITT) adopted a revised data series starting in 1986. The environmental relationship was not statistically significant using the shorter time series so OPITT adopted an alternative method. The poor statistical fit of this predictor in recent years may indicate that the processes controlling early ocean survival for coho are no longer adequately reflected by these two variables or that other factors, such as the spawner to recruit relationship or freshwater factors, can over-ride the predictive relationship of ocean conditions to a large extent in some years. More inclusive indices may provide improved prediction. The multivariable approaches cited above, incorporating biological and environmental data, may more completely characterize ocean ecosystem conditions of the California Current at the appropriate scale affecting salmon early marine survival and their maturation schedules.

Scientific Forum Objective and Approach

NOAA Fisheries will convene an expert scientific working group to consider potential causes of the recent collapse of SRFC, and what may be a broader depression of salmon productivity for stocks involved in west coast fisheries from the Sacramento River north to Puget Sound. The working group will also assess whether the performance of current stock predictors can be improved by incorporating ocean environmental information.

The approach to investigating the sudden failure of SRFC will be to examine potential factors that could have contributed to the low survival of the 2004 and 2005 brood years (see Attachment 1), and attempt to identify possible causative factors. This effort will be the primary focus of the forum.

The approach on questions of broader salmon productivity depression will be to address the issue from the perspective of identifying and characterizing carrying capacity/productivity degradation by suites of anthropogenic impacts, climate effects or other effects that may have made salmon populations less productive and less resilient to poor environmental conditions. While ocean conditions may have been a proximate cause in recent years, current populations are vulnerable to precipitous decline from any number of factors. Thus, restoring the productivity of various stocks, to the extent feasible, will require a comprehensive approach to address many potential issues. The approach to investigating improvements to abundance forecasting will be to apply various oceanographic data to abundance time series information and to compare results with existing forecasting tools.

Working Group Organization and Composition

The NOAA Fisheries west coast science centers will lead a group of scientists from NOAA Fisheries, the US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish Game, as well as selected academic scientists with specific knowledge of Central Valley salmon populations and the ocean ecology of salmon coast wide. In addition, scientists from Washington and Oregon Departments of Fish and Wildlife, Native American Tribal governments and PFMC will be invited to participate as either members of the Work Group or as observers. Specifically, working group membership is as follows:

- Leads – Churchill Grimes and John Stein

- NOAA members –Daniel Bottom, John Ferguson, Peter Lawson, Steven Lindley, Bruce McFarland, William Peterson, Carlos Garza, Michael Mohr, Brian Wells, Robert Kope, Robin Webb and Tracy Collier
- PFMC (ex-officio) – Chuck Tracy
- CDFG – Alice Low and Melodie Palmer-Zwahlen
- ODFW –Kelly Moore
- WDFW – Phil Anderson or alternate
- USFWS-CA – James Smith
- Tribal –David Hillemeier (invited)
- Academia –Loo Botsford, UC Davis, David Hankin, Humboldt State University and James Anderson, University of Washington.

Charge to the Working Group

(1) Assess possible causes for low returns in 2007 and projected low returns in 2008 of SRFC, including assessing the potential factors described in Attachment 1 and viewing the issue within the context of the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem.

(2) Assess if a regionally broader depression of productivity of salmon populations coast wide has occurred and may persist.

(3) Evaluate new potential oceanographic relationships against current forecasting methods and recommend approaches to improve predictors of ocean abundance of west coast stocks

(4) Develop research and monitoring recommendations relevant to charges one through three above.

(5) Produce an interim and final report to PFMC and submit a paper for publication in a peer reviewed journal.

Process and Schedule

(1) First Working Group Meeting (July 28-29, 2008): Internal organizational meeting to confirm the approach, further develop terms of reference for the Working Group for conducting the analysis and synthesis of available information, identification of information gaps, organize how the report will be developed (e.g., refine proposed outline for the approach, designate subgroups by topic), organize method to collect existing data (e.g., web based), etc.

(2) First Formal Working Group Meeting (August 29, 2008 in Sacramento, California): Conduct a public meeting in a similar manner to a NOAA Fisheries Biological Review or Technical Recovery Team meetings when data and input on the issue from interested individuals and agencies is sought. Knowledgeable parties will be invited and asked to bring data on subjects pertinent to assessing the possible causes for the decline, such as water withdrawals (Bureau of Reclamation and California Department of Water Resources); hatchery operations, e.g., production and release sites (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/California Department of Fish and Game); other pertinent events such as the Benicia bridge construction (permit issuing agencies). An invitation list will be developed in collaboration with the Executive Director of PFMC, Don McIsaac who may provide opening comments.

DRAFT

(3) Status Report to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council at the September 7-12, 2008 meeting in Boise, Idaho. The status report will summarize progress to date. In particular; this report is expected to yield analysis that some potential factors listed in Attachment 1 are not likely explanations for the sudden collapse of the SRFC stock, and will be eliminated from further examination.

(4) A public comment meeting in California (January 2009). This meeting will provide an opportunity for constituent input and comment.

(5) Draft Final Report presented formally at theApril 4-9, 2009 Council meeting in Millbrae, California.

(6) Submission of a manuscript to a scientific journal describing results of the working group analysis and conclusions, Spring 2009.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT 1

FOCUS AREAS OF RESEARCH RELATIVE TO THE STATUS OF THE 2004 AND 2005 BROODS OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY FALL CHINOOK SALMON STOCK

This report was originally submitted to the Pacific Fishery Management Council by the California Department of Fish and Game at the Council's March 2008 meeting (Agenda Item D.1.b., CDFG Report, March 2008). At the July 29-30 Working Group reviewed the list to determine which potential factors identified could be eliminated from further consideration (shown in ~~strikeout~~). The initial decision to eliminate an item was based on a consensus recommendation and expert knowledge of the working group members.

Freshwater Biological Focus

~~1) Was the level of parent spawners too low, for natural or hatchery populations?~~
~~2) Was the level of parent spawners too high, for natural or hatchery populations?~~
~~3) Was there a disease event in the hatchery or natural spawning areas?~~
4) Was there a disease event in the egg incubation, fry emergence, rearing, or downstream migration phases?
~~5) Was there any disease event during the return phase of the 2 year old jacks?~~
~~6) Were there mortalities at the time of trucking and release of hatchery fish?~~
~~7) Was there a change in the pattern of on-site release of hatchery fingerlings compared to trucked downstream release?~~
8) Was there a change in recovery, spawning and/or release strategies during hatchery operations?
~~9) Did thermal marking occur for any hatchery releases? What were the effects of this or other studies (e.g. genetic stock identification of parental broodstock)?~~
10) Was there a change in the methodology or operations of the San Francisco Bay net pen 'acclimation' program for trucked hatchery fish?
11) Were there any problems with fish food or chemicals used at hatcheries?

Freshwater Habitat Areas Focus

1) Were there drought or flood conditions during the spawning, incubation, or rearing phases?
2) Was there any pollution event where juveniles were present?
3) Was there anything unusual about the flow conditions below dams during the spawning, incubation, or rearing phases?
4) Were there any in-water construction events (bridge building, etc.) when this brood was present in freshwater or estuarine areas?
5) Was there anything unusual about the water withdrawals in the rivers or estuary areas when this brood was present?
~~6) Was there an oil spill in the estuary when the 2005 brood was present, as juveniles or jacks?~~
7) Was there any unusual temperature or other limnological conditions when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?

DRAFT

8) Was there any unusual population dynamics of typical food or prey species used by juvenile Chinook salmon in the relevant freshwater and estuarine areas?
9) Was there anything unusual, in the same context as above for juvenile rearing and outmigration phases, about habitat factors during the return of the 2 year olds from this brood?
10) ~~Were there any deleterious effects caused by miscellaneous human activities (e.g., construction, waterfront industries, pollution) within the delta and San Francisco bay areas?~~
11) Was there a change in the recovery of juvenile outmigrants observed in the USFWS mid-water trawl surveys and other monitoring programs in the Delta.

Freshwater Species Interactions Focus

1) ~~Was there any unusual predation by bird species when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?~~
2) ~~Was there any unusual sea lion abundance or behavior when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?~~
3) Was there any unusual striped bass population dynamics or behavior when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?
4) ~~Were northern pike present in any freshwater or estuarine areas where this brood was present?~~
5) Is there a relationship between declining Delta smelt, longfin smelt, and threadfin shad populations in the Delta and Central Valley Chinook survival?
6) ~~Was there additional inriver competition or predation with increased hatchery steelhead production?~~

Marine Biological Focus

1) Was there anything unusual about the ocean migration pattern of the 2004 and 2005 broods?
2) Was there anything unusual about the recovery of tagged fish groups from the 2004 and 2005 broods the ocean salmon fisheries?
3) ~~Has the bycatch in non-salmonid fisheries (e.g., whiting, groundfish) increased?~~

Marine Habitat Areas Focus

1) Were there periods of reduced upwelling or other oceanographic physical conditions during the period of smolt entry into the marine environment, or during the period of marine residence up to the return to freshwater of the jacks?
2) ~~Were there any effects to these fish from the 'dead zones' reported off Oregon and Washington in recent years?~~
3) Were plankton levels depressed off California, especially during the smolt entry periods?
4) ~~Was there a relationship to an increase in krill fishing worldwide?~~
5) Oceanography: temperature, salinity, upwelling, currents, red tide, etc.
6) ~~Were there any oil spills or other pollution events during the period of ocean residence?~~
7) ~~Was there any aquaculture occurring in the ocean residence area?~~
8) ~~Was there any offshore construction in the area of ocean residence, for wave energy or other purposes?~~

DRAFT

Marine Species Interactions Focus

1) Were there any unusual population dynamics of typical food or prey species used by juvenile Chinook salmon in marine areas? (plankton, krill, juvenile anchovy or sardines, etc.)
2) Was there an increase in bird predation on juvenile salmonids caused by a reduction in the availability of other forage food?
3) ~~Was there an increase of marine mammal predation on these broods?~~
4) ~~Was there predation on salmonids by Humboldt squid?~~
5) Was there increased predation on salmonids by other finfish species (e.g., lingcod)?

Cumulative Ecosystem Effects Focus

1) Were there other ecosystem effects?
2) Were there synergistic effects of significant factors?

DRAFT

Agenda Item D.2.e
Public Comment
September 2008

Gabriel Motola

68 Colgate Rd.

Great Neck, NY 11023

6/5/08

Pacific Fishery Management Council

7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101

Portland, Oregon 97220-1384

RECEIVED
JUN 19 2008
PFMC

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council,

I am writing to address the issue of the sudden decline in salmon in the Chinook Valley, in California. Recently, legislation was enacted banning the fishing of the salmon to preserve them. In my opinion, I believe that more action than a ban is needed to solve the problem. To get the Chinook Salmon fish population back up to a normal level, the source of the problem must be targeted.

The decline of Pacific Salmon has been predicted for some time now, at least as early as 1998, according to an article written by Nigel Williams of *Science* magazine. All predictions I found target global warming as the culprit behind the salmons' disappearance. Global Warming will increase the ocean temperature. Even a fraction of a degree in the average temperature difference can have drastic effects. Some problems include premature salmon eggs hatching due to warmer temperatures, water flow changes confusing salmon on where to lay eggs, and an increase in winter floods. The way to stop the salmon decline is in addition to the ban, pass more legislation slowing down Global Warming. The decline of the salmon is just another effect of global warming, one amongst many.

A copy of this letter has been sent to Governor Schwarzenegger to prompt further action.

From,

Gabe Motola, 15

Great Neck North High School

New York

CENTRAL VALLEY SALMON RECOVERY PLAN

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) requested that the Council and its advisory bodies provide comments on the Co-Manager Review Draft Recovery Plan for Endangered Species Act (ESA) Listed Sacramento Winter Chinook, Central Valley Spring Chinook, and Central Valley Steelhead (CVRP). The executive summary and winter Chinook stressor matrix of the CVRP is included as Attachment 1, while the entire CVRP is on the CD version of the September 2008 briefing book.

The comment period for the Co-Manager Review Draft CVRP ended June 30, 2008; however, because the public review draft would not be released in time for comments to be developed prior to the September Council meeting, and the expected comment deadline was before the November Council meeting, NMFS requested the Council comment on the Co-Manager draft and submit comments under the public draft comment period.

NMFS has asked that comments focus primarily on the overall approach of the recovery strategy, the threats identification and prioritization process, and the Central Valley-wide and watershed specific recovery actions. The CVRP was distributed to the Salmon Technical Team (STT), Habitat Committee (HC), and Council staff in June to provide an opportunity to review the document over the summer and to provide some comments with the briefing materials to assist in Council and advisory body deliberations (Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 2; Agenda Item D.3.c, STT Report). Comments addressing specific points are provided in the format requested by NMFS.

Council Tasks:

1. **Consider comments and recommendations developed by staff and advisory bodies.**
2. **Provide guidance on submitting comments and recommendations to NMFS.**

Reference Materials:

1. Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 1: Co-Manager Draft CVRP (Executive Summary and winter Chinook stressor matrix only in hard copy).
2. Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 2: Council Staff Comments On the Co-Manager Draft Central Valley Salmon Recovery Plan.
3. Agenda Item D.3.d, STT Report: Salmon Technical Team Report on the Central Valley Recovery Plan.

Agenda Order:

a. Agenda Item Overview — Chuck Tracy
b. NMFS Report — Mark Helvey
c. Agency and Tribal Comments
d. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies
e. Public Comment
f. Council Comments

PFMC
08/20/08

(Full Version on Web and CD Only)

RECOVERY PLAN

FOR THE EVOLUTIONARILY SIGNIFICANT UNITS OF SACRAMENTO RIVER WINTER-RUN CHINOOK SALMON AND CENTRAL VALLEY SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON AND THE DISTINCT POPULATION SEGMENT OF CENTRAL VALLEY STEELHEAD

CO-MANAGER REVIEW DRAFT

Version: May 2008

Southwest Regional Office
National Marine Fisheries Service
Sacramento, CA

DISCLAIMER

Recovery plans delineate such reasonable actions as may be necessary, based upon the best scientific and commercial data available, for the conservation and survival of listed species. Plans are published by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), sometimes prepared with the assistance of recovery teams, contractors, State agencies and others. 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. Recovery plans are guidance and planning documents only; identification of an action to be implemented by any public or private party does not create a legal obligation beyond existing legal requirements. 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 dictated by new findings, changes in species status, and the completion of recovery actions.

LITERATURE CITATION:

This co-manager review draft should not be cited nor distributed to non-governmental or non-tribal entities.

ADDITIONAL COPIES MAY BE OBTAINED FROM:

National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Protected Resources
1315 East-West Highway, 13th floor
Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-713-1401 or 301-713-2322

Final Recovery plans can be downloaded from the NMFS website:

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank and acknowledge participants in the Central Valley Technical Recovery Team, in particular Steve Lindley, whom provided much of the technical information used in the development of this Recovery Plan, and the Sacramento Area Water Forum for providing technical assistance. We also would like to acknowledge the staff of the Southwest Regional office of the National Marine Fisheries Service including Howard Brown, Brian Ellrott, Nancy Fisher, Letia Gathright, Madelyn Martinez, Shawn Martin, Jeff McLain (currently with USFWS), Bruce Oppenheim, Maria Rea, Rhonda Reed (on assignment from CALFED), Rosalie del Rosario, Erin Strange, Eric Theiss, Mike Tucker, Shirley Witalis, and Diane Windham for their contributions in preparation of this plan. This recovery plan could not have been completed without the hard work of HDR/SWRI staff including Paul Bratovich, John Cornell, Carol Brown, and Adrienne Moore. Thank you to Thomas Dunklin for providing the cover picture of spring-run Chinook salmon in Butte Creek.

The authors also would like to extend recognition to all of the many individuals who have worked over the years to conserve and protect anadromous salmonids and their habitat in the Central Valley. This recovery plan builds on the dedication of these individuals and their efforts to preserve an invaluable natural resource.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction: Implementation of this Recovery Plan for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU), Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and Central Valley steelhead Distinct Population Segment (DPS) is vital to the continued persistence and recovery of these species. This Recovery Plan serves as a guideline for achieving recovery goals by describing the steps that must be taken to achieve viable ESUs/DPS.

This Recovery Plan is organized into six chapters. The introductory chapter provides an overview of many important facets of this Recovery Plan, and in particular describes the collaborative processes of the plan. The second chapter provides background including the current regulatory status, a description of the population trends and distribution of each species, and a description of the life history and habitat requirements for each species. Next, the Recovery Strategy Chapter presents and justifies the recommended recovery program for each species. This chapter also describes the key facts, concepts and assumptions upon which the recovery program is based, the primary focus and objectives of the recovery effort, and the overarching objectives and recovery actions of the plan and their relative priorities. Following the Recovery Strategy Chapter is a chapter describing the recovery goals, objectives, and criteria. The recovery actions necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of this Recovery Plan are then presented. Lastly, the Implementation Schedule and Cost Estimates Chapter is presented.

Background: The rivers draining the Great Central Valley of California ("Central Valley") and adjacent Sierra Nevada and Cascade Range once were renowned for their production of large numbers of Pacific salmon (Clark 1929; Skinner 1962 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). The Central Valley system historically has been the source of most of the Pacific salmon produced in California waters (CDFG 1950, 1955; Fry and Hughes 1951; Skinner 1962; CDWR 1984 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Chinook salmon *(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)* historically were, and remain today, the only abundant salmon species in the Central Valley system (Eigenmann 1890; Rutter 1908 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998), although small numbers of other salmon species also have occurred occasionally in its rivers (Collins 1892; Rutter 1904a, 1908; Hallock and Fry 1967; Moyle *et al.* 1995 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Anadromous steelhead (*O. mykiss)* apparently were common in Central Valley tributaries (USFC 1876; Clark 1973; Latta 1977; Reynolds *et al.* 1993 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998), but records for them are few and fragmented, partly because they did not support commercial fisheries (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998).

Since European settlement of the Central Valley in the mid-1800s, populations of native Chinook salmon and steelhead have declined dramatically. California's salmon resources began to decline in the late 1800s, and continued to decline in the early 1900s, as reflected in the decline of commercial harvest. The total commercial catch of Chinook salmon in 1880 was 11 million pounds, by 1922 it had dropped to seven million pounds, and reached a low of less than three million pounds in 1939 (Lufkin 1996).

In addition to commercial harvest, another major factor affecting Chinook salmon and steelhead during this period was hydraulic gold mining, which began in the 1850s. By 1859, an estimated 5,000 miles of mining flumes and canals diverted streams used by salmonids for spawning and nursery habitat. Habitat alteration and destruction also resulted from the use of hydraulic cannons, which leveled hillsides and sluiced an estimated 1.5 billion yd^3 of debris into the streams and rivers of the Central Valley (Lufkin 1996).

Despite the prohibition of hydraulic mining in 1894, habitat degradation continued. Habitat quantity and quality have declined due to construction of levees and barriers to migration, modification of natural

hydrologic regimes by dams and water diversions, elevated water temperatures, and water pollution (Lufkin 1996). Although the effects of habitat degradation on fish populations were evident by the 1930s, rates of decline for most anadromous fish species increased following construction of major water project facilities (USFWS 2001), which primarily occurred around the mid- 1900s. Many of these water development projects completely blocked the upstream migration of Chinook salmon and steelhead to spawning and rearing habitats, and altered flow and water temperature regimes downstream from terminal dams. As urban and agricultural development of the Central Valley continued, numerous other stressors to anadromous salmonids emerged and continue to affect the viability of these fish today. Three of the more important stressors include continued commercial and recreational harvest, predation from introduced species such as striped bass, and high demand for limited water supply resulting in reduced instream flows and highly altered hydrology in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Recovery Strategy: A broadly focused strategic framework is necessary to serve as a strategic planning guide to integrate the actions contributing to the overarching goal of recovery of the two Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS, which contain a mixture of hatchery and wild fish. Because of the complexity associated with the multi-faceted considerations for these recovery efforts within the Central Valley Domain, this strategic planning framework incorporates the concepts of viability at both the population and ESU/DPS levels, and the identification of recovery units and management units.

Recovery units are established based on the Central Valley Technical Recovery Team's identification of four Diversity Groups that Chinook salmon historically inhabited in the Central Valley. The Central Valley TRT defined a "basalt and porous lava" Diversity Group that comprises the streams that historically supported winter-run Chinook salmon. The northwestern California Diversity Group includes streams that enter the Sacramento River from the west. The southern portion of the Cascades region (i.e., the drainages of Mill, Deer, and Butte creeks) is added to the Sierra Nevada region, but the Sierra Nevada region is divided into northern and southern areas (split somewhat arbitrarily south of the Mokelumne River). This split reflects the greater importance of snowmelt runoff in the southern area, and distinguishes tributaries to the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. Historically, the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU was composed of four populations within the basalt and porous lava diversity group and the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU was represented in all four of the diversity groups, with as many as 18 or 19 total populations. The Central Valley steelhead DPS has two additional historic Diversity Groups: the Suisun Bay region which consists of tributaries to or near Suisun Bay and the Central Western California region, which contains west-side San Joaquin Valley tributaries.

For this Recovery Plan, individual extant populations within the Diversity Groups are delineated as management units. Within the Central Valley Domain, therefore, a single recovery unit encompasses multiple management units. Each recovery unit (i.e., Diversity Group) must be conserved to ensure the long-term viability of the species. Currently, the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is composed of a single population and the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is composed of 3 diversity groups with fish exhibiting spring-run Chinook salmon life histories occurring in 12 watersheds. The current distribution of steelhead is less well understood, but the DPS is composed of at least four diversity groups and at least 26 populations.

Recovery will be expensive and time-consuming, and will require changes in the management and monitoring of aquatic resources and habitats. Because of these challenges, the Recovery Plan requires an achievable strategy to select and implement recovery actions.

This Recovery Plan establishes a "directional" strategic approach to recovery. Because recovery of the two Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS will require implementation over an extended period of time, a stepwise strategy has been adopted, based on the threats assessment process and identification of priority threats, which first addresses more urgent near-term needs, upon which to build toward full recovery. As this Recovery Plan is implemented over time, additional information will become available to help determine whether the threats have been abated, to further develop understanding of the linkages between threats and Chinook salmon and steelhead population responses, and to evaluate the viability of Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain. There will be a thorough review of the recovery actions implemented, and population and habitat condition responses, at the 5- and 10-year status reviews of the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS.

The general near-term strategic approach to recovery includes the following elements:

- *Secure all extant populations*. Both ESUs and the DPS are far short of being viable, and extant populations, even if not presently viable, may be needed for recovery. The Central Valley TRT recommends that every extant population be viewed as necessary for the recovery of the ESU and DPS. Wherever possible, the status of extant populations should be improved.

- *Begin collecting distribution and abundance data for O. mykiss in habitats accessible to anadromous fish*. This is fundamental to designing effective recovery actions and eventual delisting. Of equal importance is assessing the relationship of resident and anadromous forms of *O. mykiss*, including the role the resident fish play in population maintenance and persistence.

- *Minimize straying from hatcheries to natural spawning areas*. Even low levels of straying from hatchery populations to wild ones works against the goal of maximizing diversity within ESUs and populations. Current mark and recovery regimes do not generally allow reliable estimation of contributions of hatchery fish to natural spawning, so the Central Valley TRT recommends that all hatchery fish be marked in some way. A number of actions could reduce straying from hatcheries to natural areas, including replacing off-site releases with volitional releases from the hatchery, allowing all fish that attempt to return to the hatchery to do so, and reducing the amount of fish released (see CDFG and NMFS (2001), for a review of hatchery issues).

- *Conduct critical research on fish passage, reintroductions, and climate change*. To recover Central Valley salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS, some populations will need to be established in areas now blocked by dams or insufficient flows. Assuming that most of these dams will remain in place for the foreseeable future, it will be necessary to facilitate the movement of fish around the dams in both directions.

- *Listed salmonid ESUs are likely to be conservation-reliant (*Scott *et al*. 2005*)*. It seems highly unlikely that enough habitat can be restored in the foreseeable future such that Central Valley salmonid ESUs (and DPS) could be expected to persist without continued conservation management. Rather, it may be possible to restore enough habitat such that ESUs (and DPS) can persist with appropriate management, which should focus on maintaining ecological processes at the landscape level.

The long-term strategic, directional approach to recovery includes the following elements:

- Every extant Diversity Group that should have a high probability of persistence.

- Until all ESU viability criteria have been achieved, no population should be allowed to deteriorate in its probability of persistence.
- High levels of recovery should be attempted in more populations than identified in the Diversity Group viability criteria because not all attempts will be successful.
- Individual populations within a Diversity Group should have persistence probabilities consistent with a high probability of Diversity Group persistence.
- Within a Diversity Group, the populations restored/maintained at viable status or above should be selected to:
    - Allow for normative meta-population processes, including the viability of "core" populations, which are defined as the most productive populations.
    - Allow for normative evolutionary processes, including the retention of the genetic diversity represented in relatively unmodified historic gene pools.
    - Minimize susceptibility to catastrophic events.

In addition to the general near- and long-term strategies, applying the viable salmonid population guidelines and recovery criteria presented in this recovery plan results in specific recovery needs for each species. In summary, a program that ultimately results in re-establishing viable populations in at least two of the four historic winter-run Chinook salmon populations (i.e., Little Sacramento, Pit River, McCloud River, and Battle Creek) will be needed to recover the ESU. Passage past Shasta and Keswick dams will be required to achieve this criterion, as well as criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead. In general, recovery for all three species depends on achieving two or more viable populations in each extant diversity group. Because the basalt and porous lava diversity group for spring-run Chinook salmon and for steelhead is currently limited to dependent populations in the Sacramento River below Keswick Dam and in Battle Creek, successful passage programs above Keswick and Shasta dams also will be needed for recovery of the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU and the Central Valley steelhead DPS.

Additionally, to achieve spring-run Chinook salmon recovery, currently viable populations (i.e., Deer, Mill, and Butte creeks) in the northern Sierra diversity group will need to be maintained. It should be noted that, based on the relative amount of historic habitat, the Deer, Mill, and Butte creek populations were likely small compared to the Feather River system, and therefore, reestablishment of a viable population in the Feather River system would substantial improve the status of the ESU. Viable populations in the Northwestern California diversity group must be re-established; Clear Creek and the Cottonwood/Beegum Creek watershed appear to have the most potential for this. Although spring-run Chinook salmon were extirpated from the southern Sierra Nevada diversity group and this region is not included in the listed ESU, re-establishing wild populations in the San Joaquin River system would certainly contribute to the viability of spring-run Chinook salmon in the Central Valley.

For Central Valley steelhead, improved distribution and abundance data are needed to identify specific recovery strategies for the DPS and its diversity groups. It is equally important to better understand the role that resident O. mykiss play in population maintenance and persistence. Clearly, considering that approximately 80 percent of the habitat that was historically available to anadromous steelhead is now

behind impassable dams (Lindley et al., 2006), restoring access to historic habitat is needed to recover the DPS.

Recovery Goals, Objectives, and Criteria: The overarching goal of this Recovery Plan is the removal of the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and Central Valley steelhead DPS in the Central Valley Domain from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (50 C.F.R. 17.11). The objectives and criteria to accomplish this goal builds upon the technical input and guidance provided by the Central Valley TRT, and much of the following discussion is taken directly from information developed by the TRT (Lindley et al. 2004; 2006; 2007).

The threatened and endangered species recovery planning guidance (NMFS 2006) describes the recovery planning goal as recovery and long-term sustainability of an endangered or threatened species and, therefore, delisting of the species. Further, NMFS (2006) states that goals usually can be subdivided into discrete component objectives which, collectively, describe the conditions (criteria) necessary for achieving the goal. Simply stated, recovery objectives are the parameters of the goal, and criteria are the values for those parameters. The objectives and related criteria, representing the components of the recovery goal, identify mechanisms for pursuing the goal (including necessary recovery actions) and allows confirmation when the goal has been reached.

In order for the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS to achieve recovery, each Diversity Group must be represented, and population redundancy within the groups must be met to achieve Diversity Group recovery. Therefore, Diversity Group objectives include: (1) a minimum of two viable populations of winter-run Chinook salmon within the winter-run Chinook salmon Diversity Group; (2) a minimum of two viable populations of spring-run Chinook salmon within each of the four spring-run Chinook salmon Diversity Groups, with the exception of the Northwestern California Diversity Group which historically did not contain independent spring-run Chinook salmon populations. For the Northwestern California Diversity Group, observed occupancy will suffice rather than viability, as defined; and (3) a minimum of two viable steelhead populations within each of six the steelhead Diversity Groups.

In addition to population considerations, in order for the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS to achieve recovery each Diversity Group must meet habitat objectives:

- The spatial distribution and productive capacity of freshwater, estuarine, and marine habitats should be sufficient to maintain viable populations identified for recovery

- The diversity of habitats for recovered populations should resemble historic conditions given expected natural disturbance regimes (wildfire, flood, volcanic eruptions, etc.). Historic conditions represent a reasonable template for a viable population; the closer the habitat resembles the historic diversity, the greater the confidence in its ability to support viable populations

- At a large scale, habitats should be protected and restored, with a trend toward an appropriate range of attributes for salmonid viability. Freshwater, estuarine, and marine habitat attributes should be restored and maintained in a non-deteriorating state

The ESA requires that recovery plans, to the maximum extent practicable, incorporate objective, measurable criteria which, when met, would result in a determination in accordance with the provisions of the ESA that the species be removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants (50 CFR 17.11 and 17.12).

While this plan establishes some objective, measurable criteria specific to both population demographics and threat abatement, it is not practicable to provide measurable criteria for all demographic and threat-based factors at this time. Therefore, qualitative delisting criteria are provided in such instances.

In order to delist the winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS, the demographics must be consistent with viable wild populations within their respective Diversity Groups:

- Diversity Group population demographics, including but not limited to total population size, population structure, and geographic distribution, as informed by modeling results, indicating that the ESU or DPS is viable

- Two or more populations within each of the Diversity Groups, as described above, for each ESU and DPS are stable or increasing

Recovery criteria at the population level were established by the Central Valley Technical Recovery Team and are included in this recovery plan as described in Lindley et al. (2007). The Technical Recovery Team incorporated the four viable salmonid population parameters (McElhany et al. 2000) into assessments of population viability, and two sets of population viability criteria were developed, expressed in terms of extinction risk. The first set of criteria deal with direct estimates of extinction risk from population viability models. If data are available and such analyses exist and are deemed reasonable for individual populations, such assessments may be efficient for assessing extinction risk. In addition, the Central Valley TRT also provided simpler criteria. The simpler criteria include population size (and effective population size), population decline, catastrophic rate and effect, and hatchery influence. For a population to be considered at low risk of extinction (i.e., < 5 percent chance of extinction within 100 years), the population viability assessment must demonstrate that risk level or all of the following criteria must be met:

- The effective population size must be > 500 or the population size must be > 2,500

- The population growth rate must show that a decline is not apparent or probable

- There must be no apparent or minimal risk of a catastrophic disturbance occurring

- Hatchery influence must be low, as determined by levels corresponding to different amounts, durations and sources of hatchery strays

Additionally, qualitative threat abatement criteria must be met demonstrating that specific threats have been addressed and alleviated. These threat abatement criteria are established to address threats to, or resulting from, spawning grounds, habitat quality and quantity, overutilization, disease or predation, inadequate regulatory mechanisms, artificial propagation, climate change, water diversions, and non-indigenous aquatic nuisance species.

Recovery Actions: A number of ecosystem and/or anadromous fish enhancement plans for the Central Valley, as well as input received from two recovery planning public workshops, held May 22nd and 24th, 2007 in Sacramento and Redding, respectively, have been used to identify recovery actions. These documents include:

- Final Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (USFWS 2001)

- Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (USFWS 1997)
- AFRP Planning Documents (AFRP Website 2005; AFRP Website 2006a; AFRP Website 2006b)
- Ecosystem Restoration Plan Planning Documents (CALFED 2006; CALFED 2007)
- Summary of Threats and Recovery Actions for Spring-run Chinook salmon and Winter-run Chinook Salmon Recovery Actions. Sacramento Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Workshop (NMFS 2007c)
- Summary of Threats and Recovery Actions for Steelhead. Sacramento Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Workshop (NMFS 2007a)
- Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California (CDFG 1996)
- Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP) (CALFED 1999a)
- CALFED Bay/Delta Program Multi-Species Conservation Strategy. Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix (CALFED 2000a)
- Central Valley Salmon – A perspective on Chinook and Steelhead in the Central Valley of California (Williams 2006)

The recovery actions presented below are general to the Central Valley Domain and are listed in no particular order.

- Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals and implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish, including eradication programs for introduced species (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass).
- Promote State and local initiatives and programs to improve water conservation
- Decrease ocean harvest of winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon
- Conduct Central Valley-wide assessment of keystone dams and passage opportunities and implement programs to restore access to properly functioning habitat that was historically available
- Increase integration of the State and Federal water projects through shared storage and conveyance agreements
- Replenish spawning gravel and restore riparian habitat below dams
- Assist the State in efforts to avoid losses of juvenile anadromous fish resulting from unscreened or inadequately screened diversions
- Use pulse flows to increase migratory fish survival
- Eliminate fish losses due to flow fluctuations of the CVP

- ❑ Maintain suitable water temperatures for anadromous fish survival by controlling or relocating the discharge of irrigation return flows and sewage effluent, and by restoring riparian forests

- ❑ Evaluate passage at small dams or other man-made obstructions and implement fish passage per NMFS criteria

- ❑ Support programs to provide educational outreach and local involvement in restoration, including programs like Salmonids in the Classroom, Aquatic Wild, and Adopt a Watershed and school district environmental camps

- ❑ Develop programs to educate the public about anadromous fish issues, such as the effects of poaching and environmental contaminants, especially contaminants in urban runoff

- ❑ Reduce toxic chemical and trace element contamination

- ❑ Provide additional funding for increased law enforcement to reduce illegal take of anadromous fish, stream alteration, and water pollution and to ensure adequate protection for juvenile fish at pumps and diversions

    - Evaluate the need to revise harvest regulations to increase spawning escapement of naturally produced Chinook salmon

    - Evaluate the potential to modify hatchery procedures to benefit native stocks of salmonids

- ❑ Evaluate and avoid potential competitive displacement of naturally produced juvenile salmonids with hatchery-produced juveniles by implementing release strategies for hatchery-produced fish designed to minimize detrimental interactions

- ❑ Evaluate and implement specific hatchery spawning protocols and genetic evaluation programs to maintain genetic diversity in hatchery and natural stocks

- ❑ Evaluate a program to tag and fin-clip all or a significant portion of hatchery-produced fish as a means of collecting better information regarding harvest rates on hatchery and naturally produced fish and effects of hatchery-produced fish on naturally produced fish

- ❑ Evaluate the direct and indirect effects of contaminants on production of anadromous fish

- ❑ Evaluate the effects of exotic species on production of anadromous fish

- ❑ Encourage the restoration of small tributaries by evaluating the feasibility of screening or relocating diversions, switching to alternative sources of water for upstream diversions, restoring and maintaining a protected riparian zone, limit excessive erosion, enforcing dumping ordinances, removing toxic materials or controlling their source, replacing bridge and ford combinations with bridges or larger culverts and installing siphons to prevent truncation of small streams at irrigation canals

- ❑ Identify and evaluate different procedures of physically separating spawning fall-run and spring-run Chinook salmon to minimize introgression

- Implement conjunctive use program where appropriate
- Modify/improve existing gravel supplies and condition
- Regulate point source discharges
- Transfer fish to new "opened" habitat, where it is unlikely that fish would spontaneously recolonize it
- Reduce the E/I water quality control standard in the Delta from 65 percent to 35 percent in January in order to promote higher survival during juvenile salmonid outmigration (per CVPIA Delta Action 8 salmon survival studies)
- Establish a new flow standard at Vernalis using all San Joaquin tributaries to meet the standard to protect Central Valley steelhead and a future spring-run Chinook salmon population(s)
- Establish a new flow standard at Rio Vista to improve or maintain upstream and downstream migration conditions
- Implement the Vernalis Adaptive Management Program beyond the 2011 sunset date to improve juvenile outmigration for steelhead and future spring-run Chinook salmon
- Reclaim/restore floodplain and riparian habitat throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, and the Delta
- Take climate change into account when prioritizing restoration actions
    - Prefer restoration activities that will benefit multiple species or ecosystems over those that are specific to salmonid, especially along streams where water temperatures are less likely to remain tolerable for salmon.
    - Take into consideration change in the amount and distribution of precipitation when designing restoration projects to match historical hydrology
    - Resist temptation to allow uncertainty regarding precisely how climate will change to be used to justify not taking future climate change into account in restoration planning.

To help establish a road map to recovery for each species, a detailed and comprehensive ESU/DPS-specific threats assessment was conducted to identify and prioritize life stage- and location-specific threats within each extant Diversity Group and population. The threats assessment and the resultant Diversity Group-specific prioritization of threats were used to develop priority recovery actions that will most effectively improve the status of each species. Watershed- or site-specific recovery actions have been identified for each specific threat that was considered to be most important within a particular diversity group (spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead) or population (winter-run Chinook salmon) (**Appendix B**).

Although providing a tremendous challenge, many complex and inter-related biologic, economic, social, and technological issues must be addressed in order to recover winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain. It should be noted that societal value shifts

and associated policy changes will likely be necessary to implement many of the recovery actions identified in this recovery plan. For example, without substantial strides in water conservation throughout the Central Valley and in southern California, flow and water temperature conditions for Central Valley anadromous salmonids will likely prohibit recovery. Similarly, recovery is unlikely without programs to restore properly functioning historic habitat and access to that habitat. Other actions with high societal costs needed to recover anadromous salmonids in the Central Valley include reduced ocean harvest and a programmatic commitment to control striped bass populations.

Implementation and Cost Estimates: It is a challenging undertaking to facilitate a change in practice and policy that reverses the path towards extinction of a species to one of recovery. This change can only be accomplished with effective outreach and education, strong partnerships, focused recovery strategies and solution-oriented thinking that can shift agency and societal attitudes, practices and understanding.

Implementation of the recovery plan by NMFS will take many forms and is generally and specifically described in the NMFS Protected Resources Division Strategic Plan 2006. The Recovery Planning Guidance (NMFS 2006) 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" (NMFS 2006). 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:

1. Formalizing recovery planning goals on a program-wide basis to prioritize work load allocation and decision-making (to include developing the mechanisms to make implementation (*e.g.*, restoration) possible).
2. Conduct an aggressive outreach and education program.
3. Facilitate a consistent framework for research, monitoring, and adaptive management that can directly inform recovery objectives and goals.
4. Establish an implementation tracking system that is adaptive and pertinent to support the annual reporting for the Government Performance and Results Act, Bi-Annual Recovery Reports to Congress and the 5-Year Review.

NMFS' efforts must be as far-reaching (beyond those under the direct regulatory jurisdiction of NMFS) as the issues adversely affecting the species. Thus, to achieve recovery, NMFS will need to promote the recovery plan and provide needed technical information and assistance to other entities that implement actions that may impact the species' recovery. For example, NMFS will work with key partners on high priorities such as facilitating passage assessment and working with Counties to ensure protective measures consistent with recovery objectives are included in their General Plans.

An implementation schedule describing time frames and costs associated with individual recovery actions is under development and will be included in the public draft recovery plan. Estimates of near-term (1-5 years) total costs associated with recovery will be available once the implementation schedule is complete. Total cost to recovery is much more challenging, if not impossible to estimate because the

biological response of many of the recovery actions is uncertain, achieving recovery will be a long-term effort likely requiring at least a few decades, and new stressors may emerge over time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION **1**
- **The Great Central Valley of California** **2**
- **Salmon & Steelhead at Risk** **2**
- **The Recovery Planning Process** **4**
  - A Collaborative Effort 5
    - Central Valley Technical Recovery Team 5
    - Public Participation 5
    - Existing Efforts 5
- **Recovery Plan Content** **6**

BACKGROUND **8**
- **Winter-run Chinook Salmon** **8**
  - Brief Overview/Status of the Species 8
  - Species Description and Taxonomy 9
  - Life History 9
  - Abundance Trends and Distribution 11
  - Habitat Characteristics/Ecosystem 23
    - Adult Immigration and Holding 23
    - Spawning 23
    - Embryo Incubation 24
    - Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 24
  - Critical Habitat 25
  - Reasons for Listing/Threats Assessment 26
  - Conservation Measures 29
  - Biological Constraints and Needs 30
- **Spring-run Chinook Salmon** **31**
  - Brief Overview/Status of the Species 31
  - Species Description and Taxonomy 32
  - Abundance Trends and Distribution 34
  - Habitat Characteristics/Ecosystem 37
  - Critical Habitat 37
  - Reasons for Listing / Threats Assessment 40
  - Conservation Measures 43
  - Biological Constraints and Needs 44
- **Steelhead** **44**
  - Brief Overview/Status of the Species 44
  - Species Description and Taxonomy 45
  - Life History 47
  - Abundance Trends and Distribution 49
  - Habitat Characteristics/Ecosystem 49
    - Adult Immigration and Holding 51
    - Adult Spawning 51
    - Embryo Incubation 51
    - Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 51
  - Critical Habitat 52
  - Reasons for Listing / Threats Assessment 54

Conservation Measures 56
Biological Constraints and Needs 56
RECOVERY STRATEGY 58
Strategic Framework 58
Population Viability 58
ESU Viability 60
Diversity Groups 61
Recovery and Management Units 61
Strategy for Success 64
Foundational Principles 64
Implementation Approach 65
Local Initiatives 65
Public Support 66
Adaptive Management and Monitoring 66
System-wide, Watershed and Population Monitoring 66
Action-Specific Monitoring 68
Applied Strategic Framework 72
Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon 72
Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon 72
Central Valley Steelhead 73
Recovery Plan Strategy 73
Near-term Strategic Approach 74
Long-term Strategic, Directional Approach 74
Strategies for Achieving Recovery at the ESU/DPS Level 74
Strategies for Achieving Recovery at the Diversity Group Level 75
RECOVERY GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA 76
Recovery Goals 76
ESU (and DPS) Diversity Group and Population Objectives 77
ESU/DPS and Diversity Group Objectives 77
Population Objectives 78
Productivity and Abundance 78
Within-Population Spatial Structure 78
Within-Population Diversity 78
Recovery Criteria 79
Biological Recovery Criteria 79
Listing Factors and Threats 82
Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon 82
Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon 87
Central Valley Steelhead 91
RECOVERY ACTIONS 96
General Recovery Actions for the Central Valley 98
IMPLEMENTATION AND COST ESTIMATES 101
Integrating Recovery Into NMFS Actions 101
Section 4 102
Section 5 102
Section 6 102

Section 7 104
Section 9 106
Section 10 107
Fisheries Management and EFH 107
Coordinate with Other NMFS Divisions 108
Technical Assistance 108
Cost Estimate 108
LITERATURE CITED 109

LIST OF FIGURES

PAGE

Figure 1. Central Valley Region of California 2
Figure 2. Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon ESU 10
Figure 3. Estimated Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Run Size (1967-2006) 13
Figure 4. Current and Historical Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Distribution 22
Figure 5. Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat 27
Figure 6. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon ESU 33
Figure 7. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Run Size Estimates (1970–2006) 36
Figure 8. Mill, Deer, and Butte Creek Combined Spawning Run Size Estimates for Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon (1970–2004) 37
Figure 9. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Spawning Run Size Composition (1970–2004) 38
Figure 10. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Current and Historical Distribution 39
Figure 11. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Designated Critical Habitat 40
Figure 12. Central Valley Steelhead Distinct Population Segment[1] (Formerly Evolutionarily Significant Unit) 46
Figure 13. Current and Historical Distribution of Central Valley Steelhead 50
Figure 14. Central Valley Steelhead Designated Critical Habitat 53
Figure 15. Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) Parameters and Their Attributes 59
Figure 16. Diversity Groups for the Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon ESUs in the Central Valley Domain. 62
Figure 17. Diversity Groups for the Central Valley Steelhead DPS in the Central Valley Domain. 63
Figure 18. Extinction Risk Levels Corresponding to Different Amount, Duration and Source of Hatchery Strays 81

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Table 1. The Temporal Occurrence of Adult and Juvenile Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River 12
Table 2. Winter-run Chinook Salmon Juvenile Releases from Livingston Stone National Fish Hatchery (Broodyears 1998-2004) and Delta Recaptures.....21
Table 3. Temporal Occurrence of Adult and Juvenile Sacramento River Spring-run Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River 35
Table 4. The Temporal Occurrence of Adult and Juvenile Sacramento River Steelhead in the Sacramento River 48
Table 5. Hatcheries Producing Steelhead in the Central Valley 54
Table 6. Criteria for Assessing the Level of Risk of Extinction for Populations of Pacific Salmonids, Applied to the Chinook Salmon ESUs and the Steelhead DPS in the Central Valley Domain……..…...80
Table 7. Estimation Methods and Data Requirements for Population Metrics……..…....82
Table 8. Summary of approaches NMFS intends to use when implementing various sections of the ESA and MSFCMA. 103

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A Threats Assessment for the Evolutionarily Significant Units of Winter-run Chinook Salmon *(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)* and Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon *(O. tshawytscha)*, and the Distinct Population Segment of Central Valley Steelhead *(O. mykiss)*

Appendix B Recovery Actions

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AFRP	Anadromous Salmonid Restoration Program
Bay/Delta	San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
BRT	Biological Resource Team
CALFED	CALFED Bay-Delta Program
CAMP	Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program
CBDA	California Bay/Delta Authority
CCWD	Contra Costa Water District
CCWMG	Cow Creek Watershed Management Group
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CMARP	Comprehensive Monitoring Assessment and Research Program
cm	centimeters
cm/sec	centimeters per second
CNFH	Coleman National Fish Hatchery
CVP	Central Valley Project
CVPIA	Central Valley Project Improvement act
CVSEPWT	Central Valley Salmonid Escapement Project Work Team
CWT	Coded Wire Tag
Delta	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DWR	Department of Water Resources
ERP	Ecosystem Restoration Program
ESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
EWA	Environmental Water Account
FL	fork length
FRFH	Feather River Fish Hatchery
ft/sec	feet per second
IEP	Interagency Ecological Program
m	meters
mi^2	square miles
m/sec	millimeters per second
mm	millimeters
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
PCSRF	Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund
PVA	Population Viability Analyses
QC	Quality Control
RBDD	Red Bluff Diversion Dam
Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
RM	River Mile
RST	Rotary Screw Trap
SWP	State Water Project
TRT	Technical Recovery Team
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VSP	Viable Salmonid Population

Introduction

"Salmon was now abundant in the Sacramento. Those which we obtained were generally between three and four feet in length, and appeared to be of two distinct kinds. It is said that as many as four different kinds ascend the river at different periods. The great abundance in which this fish is found gives it an important place among the resources of the country."

- Captain John C. Frémont, memoirs for 30 March-5 April 1846 *in* Yoshiyama et al. 1998

The rivers draining the Great Central Valley of California ("Central Valley") and adjacent Sierra Nevada and Cascade Range once were renowned for their production of large numbers of Pacific salmon (Clark 1929; Skinner 1962 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). The Central Valley system historically has been the source of most of the Pacific salmon produced in California waters (CDFG 1950, 1955; Fry and Hughes 1951; Skinner 1962; CDWR 1984 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998).

Chinook salmon *(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)* historically were, and remain today, the only abundant salmon species in the Central Valley system (Eigenmann 1890; Rutter 1908 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998), although small numbers of other salmon species also have occurred occasionally in its rivers (Collins 1892; Rutter 1904a, 1908; Hallock and Fry 1967; Moyle *et al.* 1995 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Anadromous steelhead (*O. mykiss)* apparently were common in Central Valley tributaries (USFC 1876; Clark 1973; Latta 1977; Reynolds *et al.* 1993 *in* Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998), but records for them are few and fragmented, partly because they did not support commercial fisheries (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998).

Anadromous salmonids, in particular Chinook salmon, have and continue to be an important resource, both revered and harvested by humans. The Native American people depended upon these fishes for subsistence, ceremonial, and trade purposes. Prior to Euro-American settlement, Native Americans within the Central Valley drainage harvested Chinook salmon at estimated levels that reached 8.5 million pounds or more annually (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). With the advent of the California gold rush in the mid-1800s, a commercial Chinook salmon fishery developed in the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta ("Delta") region. Annual catches by the early in-river fisheries commonly reached 4-10 million pounds. The first west coast salmon cannery opened on a scow moored near Sacramento in 1864. Within 20 years, 19 canneries were operating in the Delta region, and processed a peak of 200,000 cases (each case comprised of 48, 1-pound cans) in 1882 (Lufkin 1996). The salmon fishery remained centered in the Delta region until the early 1900s, when ocean salmon fishing began to expand and eventually came to dominate the fishery.

Presently, Chinook salmon continue to be commercially harvested in the Pacific Ocean off the California coast, and support recreational fisheries in the ocean and the Delta. Both Chinook salmon and steelhead provide popular recreational fisheries in the rivers and streams of the Central Valley.

THE GREAT CENTRAL VALLEY OF CALIFORNIA

The northern half of the Central Valley is comprised of the Sacramento River Basin (covering approximately 24,000 square miles [mi^2]), with the southern half (covering approximately 13,540 mi^2) primarily composed of the San Joaquin River Basin (**Figure 1**). The broad expanse of the Central Valley region of California once encompassed numerous salmon-producing streams that drained the Sierra Nevada and Cascade mountains on the east and north and, to a lesser degree, the lower-elevation Coast Range on the west. The large areal extent of the Sierra Nevada and Cascades watersheds, coupled with regular, heavy snowfalls in those regions, provided year-round streamflows for a number of large rivers which supported substantial runs of Chinook salmon (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998).

Figure 1. Central Valley Region of California

In the Sacramento River Basin, most Coast Range streams historically supported regular salmon runs, although their runs were limited by the volume and seasonal availability of streamflows due to the lesser amount of snowfall west of the valley (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). In the San Joaquin River Basin, a number of major streams (e.g., the Merced, Tuolumne, and upper San Joaquin rivers) sustained very large salmon populations, while other streams with less regular streamflows had intermittent salmon runs in years when rainfall provided sufficient flows. All of the westside San Joaquin River Basin streams flowing from the Coast Range were highly intermittent (Elliott 1882) and none are known to have supported anadromous salmonids (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998).

SALMON & STEELHEAD AT RISK

Since settlement of the Central Valley in the mid-1800s, populations of native Chinook salmon and steelhead have declined dramatically. California's salmon resources began to decline in the late 1800s, and continued to decline in the early 1900s, as reflected in the decline of commercial harvest. The total commercial catch of Chinook salmon in 1880 was 11 million pounds, by 1922 it had dropped to 7 million pounds, and reached a low of less than 3 million pounds in 1939 (Lufkin 1996).

In addition to commercial harvest, another major factor affecting Chinook salmon and steelhead during this period was hydraulic gold mining, which began in the 1850s. By 1859, an estimated 5,000 miles of mining flumes and canals diverted streams used by salmonids for spawning and nursery habitat. Habitat alteration and destruction also resulted from the use of hydraulic cannons, which leveled hillsides and sluiced an estimated 1.5 billion yd^3 of debris into the streams and rivers of the Central Valley (Lufkin 1996).

Since hydraulic mining was prohibited in 1894, habitat degradation continued. Habitat quantity and quality have declined due to construction of levees and barriers to migration, modification of natural hydrologic regimes by dams and water diversions, elevated water temperatures, and

water pollution (Lufkin 1996). Although the effects of habitat degradation on fish populations were evident by the 1930s, rates of decline for most anadromous fish species increased following completion of major water project facilities (USFWS 2001) which primarily occurred around the mid- 1900s.

Numerous water development projects blocked the upstream migration of Chinook salmon and steelhead, and altered flow and water temperature regimes downstream from terminal dams. An extensive network of reservoirs and aqueducts has been developed throughout much of California to provide water to major urban and agricultural areas. The largest system of surface reservoirs and aqueducts in California is in the Central Valley. Surface reservoirs collecting runoff in the Central Valley have a combined total capacity of about 29 million acre-feet. The two largest water projects in the Central Valley, the State Water Project (SWP) and the Federal Central Valley Project (CVP), provide a combined average total of about 10 million acre-feet of water annually for urban and agricultural uses (DWR 2006). More than 20 million Californians rely on the SWP and the CVP for at least part of their water supply, and these projects irrigate an average of nearly 3.6 million acres of farmland each year (DWR 2005a).

It has been estimated that 1,126 miles of main stream lengths presently remain of the more than 2,183 miles of Central Valley streams that were originally available to Chinook salmon – indicating an overall loss of at least 1,057 miles (48 percent) of the original total (Yoshiyama *et al.* 2001). The estimated habitat loss includes the lengths of stream used by salmon mainly as migration corridors, in addition to holding and spawning habitat. This estimated loss of habitat does not include the Delta, comprising about 700 miles of river channels and sloughs (USFWS 1995), available to various degrees as migration corridors or rearing areas for Chinook salmon and steelhead.

It is likely that the lower reaches of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers historically were used as rearing areas (at least during some flow regimes) as the juveniles moved downstream, but recently they have been less suitable for rearing due to alterations in channel morphology and other degraded environmental conditions. In terms of only spawning and holding habitat, the proportionate loss of historically available habitat far exceeds 48 percent, much of which was located in upper stream reaches that have been rendered inaccessible by terminal dams (Yoshiyama *et al.* 2001). Excluding the lower stream reaches that were used as adult migration corridors (and, to a lesser degree, for juvenile rearing), it has been estimated that at least 72 percent of the original Chinook salmon spawning and holding habitat in the Central Valley drainage is no longer available (Yoshiyama *et al.* 2001).

The amount of steelhead habitat lost most likely is much higher than that for Chinook salmon, because steelhead were undoubtedly more extensively distributed. Due to their superior leaping and swimming ability, the timing of their upstream migration (which coincided with the winter rainy season), and their less restrictive preferences for spawning gravels, steelhead could have used at least hundreds of miles of smaller tributaries not accessible to even the highest migrating winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon (Yoshiyama *et al.* 2001).

In addition to commercial exploitation, large-scale habitat degradation, blockage of historically available habitat and altered flow and water temperature regimes, other factors that may have adversely affected natural stocks of Chinook salmon and steelhead include overharvest, illegal harvest, hatchery production, entrainment, and introduction of competitors, predators and diseases. Fish populations also vary due to natural events, such as droughts and poor ocean conditions (e.g., El Niño). However, populations in healthy habitats typically recover within a few years after natural events. In the Central Valley, the decline of fish populations has continued through cycles of beneficial and adverse natural conditions, indicating the need to improve habitat (USFWS 2001).

THE RECOVERY PLANNING PROCESS

The Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) mandates the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to develop and implement plans (*i.e.*, recovery plans) for the conservation and survival of NMFS listed species. Winter-run Chinook salmon are listed as endangered under the Federal ESA (as well as the California ESA [CESA]), and spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead are listed as threatened. Implementation of the Recovery Plan for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU), Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and Central Valley steelhead Distinct Population Segment (DPS) is vital to the continued persistence and recovery of these populations. The Recovery Plan serves as a guideline for achieving recovery goals by describing the steps that must be taken to improve the status of the species. Although recovery plans provide guidance, they are not regulatory documents. The success of this Recovery Plan depends upon the cooperation of all stakeholders and regulatory entities to ensure appropriate implementation.

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

- A description of site-specific management actions necessary for recovery;
- Objective, measurable criteria, which when met, will allow delisting of the species; and
- Estimates of the time and cost to carry out the recommended recovery measures.

The purpose of this Recovery Plan is to guide implementation of recovery of the species by resolving the threats to the species and ensuring self-sustaining populations in the wild, and thereby ensuring viable Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS. This Recovery Plan is not a regulatory document - it may be used to inform State and local agency and land use actions, but it may not be deemed to place requirements on such entities.

Past recovery plans generally have focused on the abundance, productivity, habitat and other life history characteristics of a species. While knowledge of these characteristics is certainly important for making sound conservation management decisions, the long-term sustainability of a species in need of recovery can only be ensured by alleviating the threats that are contributing to the status of the species as threatened or endangered. Therefore, the identification of the threats to the species should be a key component of any recovery plan and program (NMFS 2006).

To be most useful for recovery planning, a threats assessment should be used to determine the relative importance of various threats to a species. A threats assessment includes: (1) identifying threats and their sources; (2) evaluating the effects of threats; and (3) ranking each threat based on relative effects. The Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance (NMFS 2006) 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 Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESUs, and the Central Valley steelhead DPS. The prioritized threats are then used to guide the identification of specific recovery actions.

The methodology used in the threats assessment for this Recovery Plan is generally described in the next chapter (Background) and is fully described in Appendix A.

A Collaborative Effort

NMFS believes it is critically important to base ESA recovery plans for Pacific salmon on the many Federal, State, regional, local, and private conservation efforts already underway throughout the region. Local support of recovery plans by those whose activities directly affect the listed species, and whose actions will be most affected by recovery requirements, is essential. NMFS therefore supports and participates in locally-led collaborative efforts to develop recovery plans, involving local communities, State and Federal entities, and other stakeholders.

Central Valley Technical Recovery Team

As part of its recovery planning efforts, the NMFS Southwest Region designated the Central Valley as a "Recovery Domain." The NMFS Southwest Region established the Central Valley Technical Recovery Team (TRT) to provide technical assistance to the recovery planning process for the Central Valley Domain. The NMFS' intent in establishing the Central Valley TRT was to seek unique geographic and species expertise, and to develop a solid scientific foundation for the Recovery Plan. The Central Valley TRT identified unique habitat and biological characteristics in the Central Valley Domain, made technical findings regarding limiting factors and stressors for each ESU and DPS and its component populations, recommended biological viability criteria for each ESU and DPS and its component populations, and provided scientific review of local and regional recovery planning efforts.

The Central Valley TRT, a collaborative body of biologists representing Federal and State agency, stakeholder and academic entities, produced three documents heavily relied upon in preparation of the Recovery Plan: (1) *Population Structure of Threatened and Endangered Chinook Salmon ESUs in California's Central Valley Basin* (Lindley *et al.* 2004); (2) *Historical Population Structure of Central Valley Steelhead and its Alteration by Dams* (Lindley *et al.* 2006); and (3) *Framework for Assessing Viability of Threatened and Endangered Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin* (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

Public Participation

NMFS conducted a series of Recovery Planning Workshops, designed as round-table discussions, to solicit information and promote dialogue as part of the development of the Federal Recovery Plan for winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain. Public workshops were held in Sacramento, California on July 20, 2006, in Redding, California on August 15, 2006, and in Stockton, California on August 17, 2006. At these workshops, NMFS provided a general overview of:

- The Federal Recovery Planning Process;
- Timeline for NMFS Recovery Plan Development;
- Current Understanding of Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Populations and their Habitats; and
- Threats Identified in Original Listing Documents.

Following the overviews, workshop participants were separated into smaller facilitated discussion groups to generate more in-depth dialogue and identify threats to specific Chinook salmon and steelhead populations and their habitats.

Information obtained at the initial series of workshops also was used in additional workshops to develop recovery actions that reduce or eliminate identified threats. These additional workshops were held in Sacramento, California on May 22, 2007 and in Redding, California on May 24, 2007.

Existing Efforts

In the Central Valley Domain, NMFS has worked with State, local and other Federal stakeholders to develop a planning forum appropriate to the Domain, which builds to the extent possible on

ongoing, locally-led efforts. The role of these planning forums is to use the TRT reports and other technical products to agree on recovery goals and limiting factor (stressor) threat assessments, then develop locally appropriate and locally supported recovery actions needed to achieve recovery goals.

Local water agencies and irrigation districts, municipal and county governmental agencies, watershed groups, and State and Federal agencies have undertaken major habitat restoration efforts in many parts of the Central Valley and Delta. These actions include the addition of gravel below dams, removal of small dams, riparian revegetation, bank protection structural habitat enhancement, restoration of floodplain and tidal wetlands, development and implementation of new flow and water temperature requirements below dams, and operational constraints in the Delta. Although each of the local watershed efforts are vital to recovery, foremost among these efforts in terms of Central Valley-wide application are the programs established under the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) and the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) of the California Bay/Delta Authority (CBDA, also called CALFED), and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Shared purposes of the AFRP and the ERP are to protect and restore diversity within and among the various naturally-producing populations of Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley, and to restore the habitats upon which the populations depend. The purpose of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan is to help recover endangered and sensitive species and their habitats in the Delta in a way that also will provide for sufficient and reliable water supplies.

The AFRP promotes collaboration between the Department of Interior (USFWS and the Bureau of Reclamation [Reclamation]) with other agencies, organizations and the public to increase natural production of anadromous fish in the Central Valley by augmenting and assisting restoration efforts presently conducted by local watershed workgroups, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and others. Purposes of the CVPIA (Section 3402) relevant to the AFRP are: (1) to protect, restore, and enhance fish, wildlife, and associated habitats in the Central Valley; (2) to address impacts of the CVP on fish, wildlife, and associated habitats; (3) to improve the operational flexibility of the CVP; (4) to contribute to the State of California's interim and long-term efforts to protect the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary; and (5) to achieve a reasonable balance among competing demands for the use of CVP water, including the requirements of fish and wildlife, agricultural, municipal and industrial, and power contractors (USFWS 2001).

CALFED's objective for ecosystem restoration is to improve and increase aquatic and terrestrial habitats and improve ecological functions in the Bay/Delta to support sustainable populations of diverse and valuable plant and animal species. All CALFED elements will contribute in varying degrees, but the ERP is the principal program element designed to restore the ecological health of the Bay/Delta ecosystem. The ERP includes actions throughout the Bay/Delta watershed and focuses on the restoration of ecological processes and important habitats. In addition, the ERP aims to reduce the effects of stressors that inhibit ecological processes, habitats and species (CALFED 1999b).

This Recovery Plan is consistent with the shared purposes of the AFRP, the ERP, and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, and recognizes the need to address populations of winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead, and the habitats upon which they depend.

RECOVERY PLAN CONTENT

This introductory chapter provides an overview of many important facets of this Recovery Plan, and in particular describes the collaborative processes of the plan. The remainder of this Recovery Plan for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU and the Central Valley steelhead DPS is presented in several chapters.

The second chapter provides background including the current regulatory status, a description of the population trends and distribution of each species, and a description of the life history and habitat requirements for each species. A brief description of the reasons for listing and a current threats assessment is then presented (a detailed threats assessment is presented in Appendix A). Finally, current conservation efforts and biological constraints are discussed, including limiting factors that must be considered for the species recovery.

Next, the Recovery Strategy Chapter presents and justifies the recommended recovery program for each species. This chapter also describes the key facts, concepts and assumptions upon which the recovery program is based, the primary focus and objectives of the recovery effort, and the overarching objectives and recovery actions of the plan and their relative priorities.

Following the Recovery Strategy Chapter is a chapter describing the recovery goals, objectives, and criteria. The ultimate goal of the Recovery Plan is delisting of the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS. The recovery objectives basically subdivide the goal into discrete components which collectively describe the conditions necessary for delisting. Recovery criteria are the objective and measurable standards upon which a decision to delist the ESUs and DPS are based.

The recovery actions necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of this Recovery Plan are then presented. Recovery actions are linked to the identified threats (or stressors) individually for specific populations of winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead within the Central Valley Domain, and are prioritized according to the priority of threats addressed.

Lastly, the Implementation Schedule and Cost Estimates Chapter is presented. This chapter is designed to satisfy the requirement under the ESA (Section 4 (f)(1)(A)(iii)) that Recovery Plans must contain "…*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*."

Background

"The requirement for determining that a species no longer requires the protection of the ESA is that the species no longer be in danger of extinction or likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future based on evaluation of the listing factors specified in ESA Section 4(a)(1). Any new factors identified since listing must also be addressed in this analysis to ensure that the species no longer requires protection."

- NMFS Supplement to the Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery and Fish and Wildlife Subbasin Plan 2005

The Central Valley Domain encompasses the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and Central Valley steelhead DPS. Following are descriptions of the current regulatory status, life histories, population trends and distribution, and the habitat requirements for winter- and spring-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead in the Central Valley. A brief description of the reasons for listing and a current threats assessment is then presented (a detailed threats assessment is presented in Appendix A). Finally, current conservation efforts and biological constraints are discussed, including limiting factors that must be considered for recovery of winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead within the Central Valley Domain.

WINTER-RUN CHINOOK SALMON

Brief Overview/Status of the Species

The Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) ESU was listed as a threatened species under emergency provisions of the ESA in August 1989 (54 FR 32085 (August 4, 1989)) and formally listed as a threatened species in November 1990 (55 FR 46515 (November 5, 1990)). In June 1992, NMFS proposed that winter-run Chinook salmon be reclassified as an "endangered"[1] species (57 FR 27416 (June 19, 1992)). NMFS finalized its proposed rule and re-classified winter-run Chinook salmon as an endangered species on January 4, 1994 (59 FR 440 (January 4, 1994)). NMFS concluded that winter-run Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River warranted listing as an endangered species due to several factors, including: (1) the continued decline and increased variability of run sizes since its first listing as a threatened species in 1989; (2) the expectation of weak returns in years as the result of two small year classes (1991 and 1993); and (3) continued threats to the "take" of winter-run Chinook salmon (65 FR 42421 (July 10, 2000)). On June 14, 2004, NMFS issued a proposed rule to reclassify the listing status of winter-run Chinook salmon from endangered to threatened (69 FR 33102 (June 14, 2004)). To prevent further decline of the ESU by preventing take of this species from activities that harm fish and fish habitat, NMFS proposed to apply the ESA Section 9(a) take prohibitions as the Section 4(d) limits to

[1] Under the ESA, an "endangered species" is "…any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range…" (16 USC § 1533(20)).

winter-run Chinook salmon (69 FR 33102 (June 14, 2004)). Following a series of extensions to the public comment period on the proposed listing determinations, the public comment period closed during November 2004 (69 FR 61348 (October 18, 2004)). On June 28, 2005 NMFS issued a final listing determination for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, which concluded that the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is "in danger of extinction" due to risks to the ESU's diversity and spatial structure and, therefore, continues to warrant listing as an endangered species under the ESA (70 FR 37160 (June 28, 2005)). Additionally, the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is listed as "endangered" under the CESA.

The Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU includes winter-run Chinook salmon spawning naturally in the Sacramento River and its tributaries, as well as winter-run Chinook salmon that are part of the artificial propagation program at the Livingston Stone National Fish Hatchery (LSNFH) (70 FR 37160, June 2005). The Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is depicted in **Figure 2**.

The recovery priority number for a species is based on the criteria in the Recovery Priority Guidelines (NMFS 1990, 55 FR 24296) and indicates the priority of the species for recovery plan development and implementation. Recovery priorities range from a high of 1 to a low of 11 and are based on the magnitude of threat (high, moderate, or low), recovery potential (high or low), and conflict with development projects or other economic activity.

The recovery priority number for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is 3 and was set based on a high magnitude of threat due to a single extant population vulnerable to loss of genetic diversity, low abundance, unscreened diversions, high water temperatures, and effects of drought. The recovery potential is low to moderate due to the lack of additional populations, lack of available/suitable habitat (cold water), unscreened diversions/passage problems, and inadequate instream flow. Conflict was determined to be present due to anticipated future development, habitat degradation issues, and increasing demands for Central Valley water supplies.

Species Description and Taxonomy

Chinook salmon, also largely referred to as king salmon in California, are the largest of the Pacific salmon. The following physical description of the species is provided by Moyle (Moyle 2002). Spawning adults are olive to dark maroon in color, without conspicuous streaking or blotches on the sides. Spawning males are darker than females, and have a hooked jaw and slightly humped back. There are numerous small black spots in both sexes on the back, dorsal fins, and both lobes of the tail. They can be distinguished from other spawning salmon by the color pattern, particularly the spotting on the back and tail, and by the dark, solid black gums of the lower jaw. Parr have 6 to 12 parr marks, each equal to or wider than the spaces between them and most centered on the lateral line. The adipose fin of parr is pigmented on the upper edge, but clear at its base. The dorsal fin occasionally has one or more spots on it but the other fins are clear.

Life History

Chinook salmon is the most important commercial species of anadromous fish in California. Chinook salmon have evolved a broad array of life history patterns that allow them to take advantage of diverse riverine conditions throughout the year. Four principal life history variants are recognized and are named for the timing of their spawning runs: fall-run, late fall-run, winter-run, and spring-run. The Sacramento River supports all four runs of Chinook salmon. The larger tributaries to the Sacramento River (American, Yuba, and Feather rivers) and rivers in the San Joaquin Basin also provide habitat for one or more of these runs.



Figure 2. Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon ESU

Winter-run Chinook salmon are unique because they spawn during summer months when air temperatures usually approach their yearly maximum. As a result, winter-run Chinook salmon require stream reaches with cold water sources that will protect embryos and juveniles from the warm ambient conditions in summer. Winter-run Chinook salmon are primarily restricted to the mainstem Sacramento River. They do not occur in the Feather, American or San Joaquin river basins. Adult winter-run Chinook salmon immigration and holding (upstream spawning migration) through the Delta and into the lower Sacramento River occurs from December through July, with a peak during the period extending from January through April (USFWS 1995). Winter-run Chinook salmon are sexually immature when upstream migration begins, and they must hold for several months in suitable habitat prior to spawning. Winter-run Chinook salmon primarily spawn in the mainstem Sacramento River between Keswick Dam (River Mile [RM] 302) and RBDD (RM 243). Spawning occurs between late-April and mid-August, with a peak generally in June. Winter-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation in the Sacramento River can extend into October (Vogel and Marine 1991).

Winter-run Chinook salmon fry rearing in the upper Sacramento River exhibit peak abundance during September, with fry and juvenile emigration past Red Bluff Diversion Dam (RBDD) occurring from July through March (Reclamation 1992; Vogel and Marine 1991), although NMFS (1993; NMFS 1997) report juvenile rearing and outmigration extending from June through April. Emigration (downstream migration) of winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles past Knights Landing, located approximately 155.5 river miles downstream of the RBDD, reportedly occurs between November and March, peaking in December, with some emigration continuing through May in some years (Snider and Titus 2000a; Snider and Titus 2000c). The numbers of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon caught in rotary screw traps (RST) at the Knights Landing sampling location were reportedly dependent on the magnitude of flows during the emigration period (Snider and Titus 2000a; Snider and Titus 2000c).

Table 1 depicts the temporal occurrence of winter-run Chinook salmon life stages in the Sacramento River.

Abundance Trends and Distribution

One of the main threats to the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is that it consists of only one population. Furthermore the one population has a small population size (Good *et al.* 2005). The population declined from an escapement of near 100,000 in the late 1960s to less than 200 in the early 1990s (Good *et al.* 2005). The CDFG estimated that 191 winter-run Chinook salmon returned in 1991 and that 189 returned in 1994 (Arkush *et al.* 1997). Runs increased to 1,361 in 1995 and 1,296 in 1996 (Arkush *et al.* 1997). Escapements increased to 8,120, 7,360 and 8,133 in 2001, 2002 and 2003 respectively (CDFG 2004). More recent population estimates of 8,218 (2004), 15,730 (2005), and 17,153 (2006) show a three-year average of 13,700 returning winter-run Chinook salmon (CDFG Website 2007). **Figure 3** depicts the estimated run sizes of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon for the years 1967 to 2006. A significant portion of these fish are likely returns from the winter-run Chinook salmon propagation program at the LSNFH.

The LSNFH on the upper Sacramento River has been producing and releasing winter-run Chinook salmon since 1998. This program has apparently resulted in a net increase in the numbers of returning adult winter-run Chinook salmon, although hatchery fish make up a significant portion of the population (Brown and Nichols 2003).

Table 1. The Temporal Occurrence of Adult and Juvenile Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River

Location	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Adult												
Sacramento River Basin[1]												
Sacramento River[2]												
Juvenile												
Sacramento River at Red Bluff[3]												
Sacramento River at Red Bluff[2]												
Sacramento River at Knights Landing[4]												
Lower Sacramento River (Seine)[5]												
West Sacramento River (Trawl)[5]												

Sources: [1] Yoshiyama et al. (1998); Moyle (2002); [2] Myers et al. (1998); [3]Martin et al. 2001; [4] Snider and Titus (2000b); [5]USFWS 2001

Relative Abundance: = High = Medium = Low



Figure 3. Estimated Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Run Size (1967 – 2006)

Source: (CDFG 2004; CDFG Website 2007; NMFS 1997; Snider et al. 2001)

Table 2 shows the annual number of winter-run Chinook salmon released from the facility from 1999 through 2005. The fish are marked with coded wire tags (CWT), adipose fin clipped and released as smolts each winter in late January or early February. The table also provides information based on data acquired during mark-recapture studies on the amount of time required by the smolts to reach the Delta.

Winter-run Chinook salmon originally spawned in the upper Sacramento River system (Little Sacramento, Pit, McCloud and Fall rivers) and in Battle Creek. There is no evidence that the winter-run existed in any of the other drainages prior to watershed development (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1996). The unique life history timing pattern of winter-run Chinook salmon, requiring cold summer flows, argues against this run occurring in other than the upper Sacramento system and Battle Creek. Today, watershed development has eliminated all historical spawning habitat above Keswick Dam (approximately 200 river miles) and approximately 47 of the 53 miles of potential habitat in Battle Creek (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1996). **Figure 4** depicts the current and historical distribution of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon.

Currently, winter-run Chinook salmon spawning habitat is likely limited to the reach of the Sacramento River extending from Keswick Dam downstream to the RBDD. Prior to construction of Shasta and Keswick dams, warm water temperatures likely precluded spawning in the mainstem Sacramento River, and it was used only as a migratory corridor. Winter-run Chinook salmon still have access to Battle Creek through the Coleman National Fish Hatchery (CNFH) weir from a fish ladder that is opened during the peak of the winter-run Chinook salmon migration period (Ward and Kier 1999).

Table 2. Winter-run Chinook Salmon Juvenile Releases from LSNFH (Broodyears 1998-2004) and Delta Recaptures

Brood Year	Upper Sacramento River Release Date	Number of Pre-Smolts Released[1]	Initial Delta Recapture Date[2]	Number of Smolts in Delta Recapture[2]
1998	1/28/1999	153,908	3/15/1999	106,142
1999	1/28/2000	30,840	2/22/2000	5,459
2000	2/01/2001	166,495	3/05/2001	37,113
2001	1/30/2002	252,684	3/07/2002	158,285
2002	1/30/2003	233,613	2/14/2003	184,080
2003	2/05/2004	218,517	2/20/2004	171,584
2004	2/03/2005	168,261	2/22/2005	124,409
2005	2/02/2006	173,344		
2006	2/08/2007	196,268		
Source: ([1]USFWS Red Bluff 1998-2006; [2]Kimmerer 2006)				

Currently, if a winter-run Chinook salmon population exists in Battle Creek, its population size is unknown and likely very small. Additionally, a winter-run Chinook salmon migration to the upper Calaveras River occurred between 1972 and 1984, but this population appears to have been extirpated by drought, irrigation diversions, and blocked access by the New Hogan Dam (NMFS 1997; NMFS 1999; NMFS 2003).

The winter-run Chinook salmon population is dependant upon the provision of suitably cool water temperatures during the spawning, embryo incubation, and juvenile rearing period. Water temperatures in the upper Sacramento River are the result of interaction among: (1) ambient air temperature; (2) volume of water; (3) water temperature at release from Shasta and Trinity dams; (4) total reservoir storage; (5) location of reservoir thermocline; (6) ratio of Spring Creek Power Plant release to Shasta Dam release; and (7) tributary inflows (NMFS 1997). Water temperature varies with location and distance downstream of Keswick Dam, and depends upon the annual hydrologic conditions and annual operation of the Shasta-Trinity Division of the CVP (NMFS 1997). In general, water released from Keswick Dam warms as it moves downstream during the summer and early fall months at a critical time for the successful development and survival of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon (NMFS 1997).

Suitable water temperatures for adult winter-run Chinook salmon migrating upstream to spawning grounds range from 57°F to 67°F (NMFS 1997). However, winter-run Chinook salmon are immature when upstream migration begins and need to hold in suitable habitat for several months prior to spawning. The maximum suitable water temperature for holding is 59°F to 60°F (NMFS 1997). Similarly, successful spawning for Chinook salmon occurs at water temperatures below 60°F (NMFS 1997). Prior to 1997, during some years, water temperatures below Keswick Dam began exceeding 60°F in May and during July and August, water temperatures were frequently above 60°F (NMFS 1997). In 1997, a temperature control device was installed at Shasta Dam allowing better management of water temperatures in the Sacramento River. CDFG (2004) reports that the temperature control device is working well and that very low egg loss occurred due to adverse water temperatures in 2002 and 2003.



Figure 4. Current and Historical Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Distribution

Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon may be responding favorably to a number of factors, including wetter than normal winters, changes in ocean harvest regulations since 1995 that have significantly reduced harvests, changes in operations at RBDD, improved water temperature management on the upper Sacramento River (including installation of a cold-water release device on Shasta Dam in 1997), water quality improvements due to remediation of Iron Mountain Mine discharges, changes in the State and Federal water projects, and a variety of other habitat improvements.

Habitat Characteristics/Ecosystem

A description of freshwater habitat requirements for winter-run Chinook salmon is presented in the following sections. Habitat requirements are organized by life stage.

Adult Immigration and Holding

Suitable water temperatures for adult winter-run Chinook salmon migrating upstream to spawning grounds range from 57°F to 67°F (NMFS 1997). However, winter-run Chinook salmon are immature when upstream migration begins, and need to hold in suitable habitat for several months prior to spawning. The maximum suitable water temperature reported for holding is 59°F to 60°F (NMFS 1997). Because water temperatures in the lower Sacramento River below the RBDD generally begin exceeding 60°F in April, it is likely that little, if any, suitable holding habitat exists in the lower Sacramento River. It most likely is only used by adults as a migratory corridor. Following installation of the water temperature control device on Shasta Dam in 1997, it is possible that some deep water pool habitat may exist for a short distance downstream of the RBDD with suitable cold water temperatures for adult holding.

Adult Chinook salmon reportedly require water deeper than 0.8 feet and water velocities less than 8 feet per second (ft/sec) for successful upstream migration (Thompson 1972). Adult Chinook salmon are less capable of negotiating fish ladders, culverts, and waterfalls during upstream migration than steelhead, due in part to slower swimming speeds and inferior jumping ability (Bell 1986; Reiser *et al.* 2006).

Chinook salmon generally hold in pools with deep, cool, well-oxygenated water. Holding pools for adult Chinook salmon have reportedly been characterized as having moderate water velocities ranging from 0.5 to 1.3 ft/sec (DWR 2000).

Spawning

Spawning occurs from mid-April to mid-August, peaking in May and June, in the Sacramento River reach between Keswick Dam and RBDD (Vogel and Marine 1991). Chinook salmon spawn in clean, loose gravel in swift, relatively shallow riffles, or along the margins of deeper river reaches where suitable water temperatures, depths, and velocities favor redd construction and oxygenation of incubating eggs. Winter-run Chinook salmon were adapted for spawning and rearing in the clear, spring-fed rivers of the upper Sacramento River Basin, where summer water temperatures were typically 50°F to 59°F. Water temperature conditions were created by glacial and snowmelt water percolating through porous volcanic formations that surround Mt. Shasta and Mt. Lassen, which cover much of northeastern California. Chinook salmon require clean loose gravel from 0.75 to 4.0 inches in diameter for successful spawning (NMFS 1997). The construction of dams in the upper Sacramento River has eliminated the major source of suitable gravel recruitment to reaches of the river below Keswick Dam. Gravel sources from the banks of the river and floodplain have also been substantially reduced by levee and bank protection measures. Levee and bank protection measures restrict the meandering of the river, which would normally release gravel into the river through natural erosion and deposition processes. Water velocity preferences for Chinook salmon spawning reportedly range from 0.98

ft/sec to 2.6 ft/sec (0.3 to 0.8 meters per second (m/sec)) at a depth of a few centimeters (cm) to several meters (m) (Moyle 2002).

Today, Shasta Dam denies access to historical winter-run Chinook salmon spawning habitats and they persist mainly because water released from Shasta Reservoir during the summer has been, for the most part, cold. Spawning habitat for Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon is restricted to the Sacramento River primarily between RBDD and Keswick Dam.

Embryo Incubation

In the Sacramento River, winter-run Chinook salmon spawning occurs from late April through mid August. Fry emergence occurs from mid-June through mid-October (NMFS 1997). Because the embryo incubation life stage begins with fertilized egg deposition and ends with fry emergence from the gravel, embryo incubation occurs from late April through mid-October. Within the appropriate water temperature range, eggs normally hatch in 40 to 60 days. Newly hatched fish (alevins) normally remain in the gravel for an additional four to six weeks until the yolk sac has been absorbed (NMFS 1997).

Physical habitat requirements for embryo incubation are the same as the requirements discussed above for spawning. However, it is also important that flow regimes remain relatively constant or at least not decrease significantly during the embryo incubation life stage. For example, if spawning adults construct redds during a period of relatively high flows in shallow water, subsequent decreases in flows could dewater the redds, leading to egg desiccation or stranding of alevins.

Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration

Upon emergence from the gravel, fry swim or are displaced downstream (Healey 1991). Fry seek streamside habitats containing beneficial aspects such as riparian vegetation and associated substrates that provide aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates, predator avoidance cover, and slower water velocities for resting (NMFS 1996a). These shallow water habitats have been described as more productive juvenile salmon rearing habitat than the deeper main river channels. Higher juvenile salmon growth rates, partially due to greater prey consumption rates, as well as favorable environmental temperatures have been associated with shallow water habitats (Sommer *et al.* 2001b). Similar to adult salmon upstream movement, juvenile salmon downstream movement is primarily crepuscular. Once downstream movement has commenced, salmon fry might continue this movement until reaching the estuary or they might reside in the stream for a time period that varies from weeks to a year (Healey 1991). Juvenile Chinook salmon migration rates vary considerably, presumably depending on the physiological stage of the juvenile and hydrologic conditions. Kjelson *et al.* (Kjelson *et al.* 1981) found Chinook salmon fry traveled as fast as 30 kilometers (km) per day in the Sacramento River. Sommer *et al.* (Sommer *et al.* 2001b) found travel rates ranging from approximately 0.5 mile, up to more than 6 miles per day in the Yolo Bypass.

As juvenile Chinook salmon grow they move into deeper water with higher current velocities, but still seek shelter and velocity refugia to minimize energy expenditures (Healey 1991). Catches of juvenile salmon in the Sacramento River near West Sacramento by the USFWS (USFWS 1997) exhibited larger juvenile captures in the main channel and smaller-sized fry along the margins. Where the river channel is greater than nine to ten feet in depth, juvenile salmon tend to inhabit the surface waters (Healey 1979). Streamflow and/or turbidity increases in the upper Sacramento River basin are thought to stimulate emigration (Brandes and McLain 2001; Kjelson *et al.* 1981).

Emigration of juvenile Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon past RBDD may begin as early as mid-July, typically peaks in September, and can continue through March in dry years

(NMFS 1997; Vogel and Marine 1991). From 1995 to 1999, all Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon outmigrating as fry passed RBDD by October, and all outmigrating pre-smolts and smolts passed RBDD by March (Martin *et al.* 2001).

As Chinook salmon begin the smoltification stage, they are found rearing further downstream where ambient salinity reaches 1.5 to 2.5 parts per thousand (Healey 1979). Within the Delta, juvenile Chinook salmon forage in shallow areas with protective cover, such as tidally influenced sandy beaches and vegetated zones (Healey 1979). Cladocerans, copepods, amphipods, and larvae of diptera, as well as small arachnids and ants are common prey items (Kjelson *et al.* 1981; MacFarlane and Norton 2002; Sommer *et al.* 2001a).

Juvenile Chinook salmon movements within the estuarine habitat are dictated by the interaction between tidally-driven salt water intrusions through the San Francisco Bay and fresh water outflow from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. Juvenile Chinook salmon follow rising tides into shallow water habitats from the deeper main channels and return to the main channels when the tides recede (Healey 1991). Kjelson *et al.* (1981) reported that juvenile Chinook salmon demonstrated a diel migration pattern, orienting themselves to nearshore cover and structure during the day, but moving into more open, offshore waters at night. The fish also distributed themselves vertically in relation to ambient light. During the night, juveniles were distributed randomly in the water column, but would school up during the day into the upper three meters of the water column. Juvenile Chinook salmon were found to spend about 40 days migrating through the Delta to the mouth of San Francisco Bay, and grew little in length or weight until they reached the Gulf of the Farallon Islands (MacFarlane and Norton 2002).

Juvenile Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon occur in the Delta primarily from November through early May, based on data collected from trawls in the Sacramento River at West Sacramento (RM 57) (USFWS 2001). The timing of migration varies somewhat due to changes in river flows, dam operations, and water year type. Winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles remain in the Delta until they reach a fork length (FL) of approximately 118 millimeters (mm) and are from five to 10 months of age. Emigration to the ocean begins as early as November and continues through May (Fisher 1994; Myers *et al.* 1998). The importance of the Delta in the life history of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon is not well understood.

Central Valley Chinook salmon begin their ocean life in the Gulf of the Farallones, then they distribute north and south along the continental shelf primarily between Point Conception and Washington State. Upon reaching the ocean, juvenile Chinook salmon feed voraciously on larval and juvenile fishes, plankton, and terrestrial insects (Healey 1991; MacFarlane and Norton 2002). Chinook salmon grow rapidly in the ocean environment, with growth rates dependent on water temperatures and food availability (Healey 1991).

Critical Habitat

Critical habitat for listed salmonids is comprised of physical and biological features essential to the conservation of the species including: space for the individual and population growth and for normal behavior; cover; sites for breeding, reproduction and rearing of offspring; and habitats protected from disturbance or are representative of the historical geographical and ecological distribution of the species. The primary constituent elements considered essential for the conservation of listed Central Valley salmonids are: (1) freshwater spawning sites; (2) freshwater rearing sites; (3) freshwater migration corridors; (4) estuarine areas; (5) nearshore marine areas; and (6) offshore marine areas.

On August 14, 1992, NMFS published a proposed critical habitat designation for winter-run Chinook

salmon (57 FR 36626 (August 13, 1992)). The habitat proposed for designation included: (1) the Sacramento River from Keswick Dam, Shasta County (RM 302) to Chipps Island (RM 0) at the westward margin of the Delta; (2) all waters from Chipps Island westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strait; (3) all waters of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge; and (4) all waters of San Francisco Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge (NMFS 1997).

On June 16, 1993, NMFS issued the final rule designating critical habitat for winter-run Chinook salmon (58 FR 33212 (June 16, 1993)). The habitat identified in the final designation is identical to that in the proposed ruling except that critical habitat in San Francisco Bay is limited to those waters north of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. **Figure 5** depicts the designated critical habitat for Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon.

Reasons for Listing/Threats Assessment

Several factors have contributed to the decline of winter-run Chinook salmon through degradation of spawning, rearing, and migration habitats. The primary factors include blockage of historical habitat by Shasta and Keswick dams, warm water releases from Shasta Dam, juvenile and adult passage constraints at RBDD, water exports in the southern Delta, heavy metal contamination from Iron Mountain Mine, high ocean harvest rates and entrainment in a large number of unscreened or poorly screened water diversions (NMFS 1997). Other factors include smaller water manipulation facilities and dams, loss of rearing habitat in the lower Sacramento River and Delta from levee construction, marshland reclamation, interaction with and predation by introduced species, adverse flow conditions, high summer water temperatures and vulnerability to drought (NMFS 1997).

Presumably, there were several independent populations of winter-run Chinook salmon in the Pitt, McCloud, and Little Sacramento rivers and various tributaries to these rivers, such as Hat Creek and the Fall River. These populations merged to form the present single population. If populations ever existed in Battle Creek and the Calaveras River, they have been extirpated (Good *et al.* 2005).

The spatial distribution of spawners has not expanded. The primary reason is that the naturally-spawning population is artificially maintained by cool water releases from Shasta/Keswick dams, and the spatial distribution of spawners is largely governed by water year type and the ability of the CVP to manage water temperatures in the upper Sacramento River. The fact that this ESU is comprised of a single population with very limited spawning and rearing habitat increases its risk of extinction due to local catastrophe or poor environmental conditions. There are no other natural populations in the ESU to buffer it from natural fluctuations. A single catastrophe with effects persisting for four or more years could extirpate the entire Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, which puts the population at a high risk of extinction over the long run (Lindley *et al.* 2007). Such potential catastrophes include volcanic eruption of Mt. Lassen, prolonged drought which depletes the cold water pool in Lake Shasta or some related failure to manage cold water storage, a spill of toxic materials with effects that persist for four years, or a disease outbreak. Another vulnerability to an ESU that is represented by a single population is the limitation in life history and genetic diversity that would otherwise increase the ability of individuals in the population to withstand environmental variation. A second naturally-spawning population is considered critical to the long-term viability of this ESU, and plans are underway to eventually establish a second population in the upper Battle Creek watershed. However, the program has yet to be implemented because of the need to complete habitat restoration efforts in that watershed (Good *et al.* 2005).



Figure 5. Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat

Chief among the threats facing winter-run Chinook salmon is small population size—escapement fell below 200 fish in the 1990s. In 1989, the CDFG estimated that the winter-run Chinook salmon size was only 547 fish. This unexpectedly small return represented nearly a 75 percent decline from the consistent, but low, run size of 2,000 to 3,000 fish that had occurred since 1982. The final run size estimate made by the CDFG for 1991 was 191 fish. Population size declined monotonically from highs of near 100,000 fish in the late 1960s, indicating a sustained period of poor survival (Good *et al.* 2005).

There are questions of genetic integrity due to winter-run Chinook salmon having passed through several "bottlenecks" in the 20th century. Construction of Shasta Dam merged at least four independent winter-run Chinook populations into a single population, representing a substantial loss of genetic diversity, life history variability, and local adaptation. Episodes of critically low abundance, particularly in the early 1990s, for the single remaining population imposed ''bottlenecks'' that further reduced genetic diversity (Good *et al.* 2005).

The use of a hatchery program to supplement winter-run Chinook salmon populations in the Central Valley raises concerns about the genetic integrity and fitness of the population. There is a strong perception that hatchery fish may negatively affect the genetic constitution of wild fish (Allendorf *et al.* 1997; Hindar *et al.* 1991; Waples 1991). One of the main factors contributing to this perception is the observation of a reduction in wild fish populations following the initiation of a hatchery release program (Hilborn 1992; Washington and Koziol 1993). An explanation offered for this observation is that hatchery fish are adapted to the hatchery environment; therefore, natural spawning with wild fish reduces the fitness of the natural population (Taylor 1991). Researchers from the University of California at Davis have documented that hatchery Chinook salmon were more vulnerable to predation by Sacramento pikeminnow as they pass RBDD than were wild Chinook salmon (Lufkin 1996). Recently, NMFS (NMFS 2007b) reports that the rising proportion of hatchery fish among returning adults threatens to shift the population from a low to moderate risk of extinction. Lindley *et al.* (Lindley *et al.* 2007) recommend that in order to maintain a low risk of genetic introgression with hatchery fish, no more than five percent of the naturally-spawning population should be composed of hatchery fish. Since 2001, hatchery origin winter-run Chinook salmon have made up more than five percent of the run, and in 2005 the contribution of hatchery fish exceeded 18 percent (Lindley *et al.* 2007). Potential consequences to wild fish stocks from hatchery production include hybridization and genetic introgression, competition, predation, and increasing fishing pressure (Waples 1991).

A detailed threats assessment was conducted for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU (Appendix A). The threats/stressors affecting each winter-run Chinook salmon life stage are described in that appendix. A stressor matrix[2], in the form of a single Microsoft Excel worksheet, was developed to structure the winter-run Chinook salmon population, life stage, and stressor information into hierarchically-related tiers so that stressors to the ESU could be prioritized. The individual tiers within the matrix, from highest to lowest, are: (1) population; (2) life stage; (3) primary stressor category; and (4) specific stressor. These individual tiers were related hierarchically so that each variable within a tier had several associated variables at the next lower tier, except at the lowest (i.e. fourth) tier.

The general steps required to develop and utilize the winter-run stressor matrix are described as follows:

[2] For winter-run Chinook salmon, a single stressor matrix was developed corresponding to the mainstem upper Sacramento River population, whereas for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead, multiple individual stressor matrices were developed corresponding to each of the extant populations for these species.

- Each life stage within the population was weighted so that all life stage weights in the population summed to one
- Each primary stressor category within a life stage was weighted so that all primary stressor category weights in a life stage summed to one
- Each specific stressor within a primary stressor category was weighted so that all specific stressor weights in a primary stressor category summed to one
- A composite weight for each specific stressor was obtained by multiplying the product of the population weight, the life stage weight, the primary stressor weight, and the specific stressor weight by 100
- A normalized weight for each specific stressor was obtained by multiplying the composite weight by the number of specific stressors within a particular primary stressor group
- The stressor matrix was sorted by the normalized weight of the specific stressors in descending order

Specific information explaining the individual steps taken to generate this prioritized list is provided in Appendix A.

The completed stressor matrix sorted by normalized weight is a prioritized list of the life stage-specific stressors affecting the ESU. Each life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon is affected by stressors of "Very High" importance. These stressors include:

- The barriers of Keswick and Shasta dams, which block access to historic staging and spawning habitat
- Flow fluctuations, water pollution, water temperature impacts in the upper Sacramento River during embryo incubation
- Loss of juvenile rearing habitat in the form of lost natural river morphology and function, and lost riparian habitat and instream cover
- Predation during juvenile rearing and outmigration
- Ocean harvest
- Entrainment of juveniles at the C.W. Jones and Harvey O. Banks pumping plants

The complete prioritized list of life stage-specific stressors to the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is presented in Appendix A.

Conservation Measures

The CVP Section 7 consultations with Reclamation likely contributed to habitat improvements benefiting the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU. Implementation of the 1992 reasonable and prudent alternative has provided substantial benefits to this ESU by improving habitat and fish passage conditions in the Sacramento River and the Delta. Such improvement likely has contributed to increases in abundance and productivity over the past decade through actions such as maintenance of minimum water flows during fall and winter months, establishment of temperature criteria to support spawning and rearing upstream of RBDD (coupled with water releases from Shasta Dam), operation of the RBDD gates for improved adult and juvenile fish passage, and constraints on Delta water exports to reduce impacts on juvenile outmigrants.

In addition, two large, ongoing comprehensive conservation programs in the Central Valley provide a wide range of ecosystem and species-specific protective efforts potentially benefiting

Chinook salmon – the CALFED Bay/Delta Program) and the CVPIA. CALFED is a cooperative effort of more than 20 State and Federal agencies working with local communities to improve water quality and reliability for California's water supplies, and has made efforts to restore the Bay/Delta. Though not fully implemented, CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration Program has funded projects involving habitat restoration, floodplain restoration and protection, instream and riparian habitat restoration and protection, fish screening and passage, research on non-native species and contaminants, research and monitoring of fishery resources, and watershed stewardship and outreach. CALFED established the Environmental Water Account (EWA) to offset losses of juvenile fish at the Delta pumps and to provide higher instream flows in the Yuba, Stanislaus, American, and Merced rivers to benefit native fish, including salmon.

The CVPIA balances the priorities of fish and wildlife protection, restoration, and mitigation with irrigation, domestic water use, fish and wildlife enhancement, and power augmentation. Reclamation and USFWS have conducted studies and implemented hundreds of actions, including modifications of CVP operations, management and acquisition of water for fish and wildlife needs, flow management for fish migration and passage, increased water flows, replenishment of spawning gravels, restoration of riparian habitats, and screening of water diversions. Actions in the Sacramento River tributaries have focused on riparian and shaded riverine aquatic habitat restoration, improved access to available upstream habitat, improved instream flows, and reduced loss of juveniles at diversions. Habitat restoration includes water acquisition for instream flows, channel restoration and enhancement, removal of dams and blockages to migration, gravel replenishment, and construction or modifications of devices to improve instream habitat and to improve access or reduce fish mortalities during migrations (such as fish ladders and screening diversions).

Harvest protective measures benefiting winter-run Chinook salmon include seasonal constraints on sport and commercial fisheries south of Point Arena. In addition, the State has listed winter-run Chinook under the CESA, and has thus established specific in-river fishing regulations and no-retention prohibitions designed to protect this ESU (e.g., management measures for time and area closures, gear restrictions, and zero bag limits in the Sacramento River).

Biological Constraints and Needs

As winter-run Chinook salmon historically were dependent on access to spring-fed tributaries to the upper Sacramento River that remained cool during summer and early fall, the most obvious impact to this ESU was the construction of Shasta Dam. The dam blocked access to the ESU's entire historic spawning habitat. With coldwater releases from Shasta creating conditions suitable for winter-run Chinook salmon 100 feet below the dam, this species was able to survive habitat alteration, but experienced significant impacts. Presumably, there were several independent populations of winter-run Chinook salmon in the Pitt, McCloud, and Little Sacramento Rivers, and in various tributaries to these rivers, such as Hat Creek and the Fall River. These populations merged to form the current single population. Any populations that may have existed in Battle Creek and the Calaveras River have since been extirpated. This ESU continues to be threatened by having only one extant population, low population size (compared to historic levels), vulnerability to drought, inadequately screened or unscreened water diversions, predation at artificial strictures and by non-native species, pollution (e.g., Iron Mountain Mine), adverse flow conditions, high summer water temperatures, unsustainable harvest rates, and passage problems at various structures.

Another potential threat to the winter-run Chinook salmon population is the possible effects of long-term climate change. California's Central Valley is located at the extreme southern limit of

Chinook salmon distribution. The southern limit of Chinook salmon distribution is likely a function of climate. In California, observations reveal trends in the last 50 years toward warmer winter and spring temperatures, a smaller fraction of precipitation falling as snow, a decrease in the amount of spring snow accumulation in lower and middle elevation mountain zones and an advance in snowmelt of 5 to 30 days earlier in the spring (Knowles *et al.* 2006). Given this trend, it is likely that most species, currently at the southern extent of their range, including Chinook salmon will experience less desirable environmental conditions in the future.

If air temperatures in California rise significantly, it will become increasingly difficult to maintain appropriate water temperatures in order to manage coldwater fisheries, including winter-run Chinook salmon. A reduction in snowmelt and increased evaporation could lead to decreases in reservoir levels and, perhaps more importantly, coldwater pool reserves (California Energy Commission 2003). As a result, water temperatures in rivers supporting anadromous salmonids, including winter-run Chinook salmon, could potentially rise and no longer be able to support over-summering life stages (i.e., winter-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation, fry emergence and juvenile emigration). The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) (DWR 2006) suggests that under a warmer climate scenario, water temperature standards in the upper Sacramento River likely could not be maintained. The potential adverse effects of long-term climate change are more thoroughly discussed in Appendix A.

SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON

Brief Overview/Status of the Species

Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*) were proposed as endangered by NMFS on March 9, 1998. NMFS (NMFS 1998) concluded that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU was in danger of extinction because native spring-run Chinook salmon have been extirpated from all tributaries in the San Joaquin River Basin, which represented a large portion of the historic range and abundance of the ESU as a whole. Moreover, the only streams considered to have wild spring-run Chinook salmon at that time were Mill and Deer creeks, and possibly Butte Creek (tributaries to the Sacramento River). These populations were considered relatively small with sharply declining trends. Hence, demographic and genetic risks due to small population sizes were considered to be high. NMFS (NMFS 1998) also determined that habitat problems were the most important source of ongoing risk to this ESU.

On September 16, 1999, NMFS listed the Central Valley ESU of spring-run Chinook salmon as a "threatened" species (64 FR 50394 (September 16, 1999)). Although in the original Chinook salmon status review and proposed listing it was concluded that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU was in danger of extinction (Myers *et al.* 1998), in the status review update, the BRT majority shifted to the view that this ESU was not in danger of extinction, but was likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future. A major reason for this shift was data indicating that a large run of spring-run Chinook salmon on Butte Creek in 1998 was naturally produced, rather than strays from the FRFH (Good *et al.* 2005).

NMFS (64 FR 50394 (September 16, 1999)) determined that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU are at risk of becoming endangered in the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of their range after reviewing the best available information, including public and peer review comments, biological data on the species' status, and an assessment of protective efforts. On March 11, 2002, pursuant to a January 9, 2002 rule issued by NMFS under Section 4(d) of the ESA (15 USC § 1533(d)), the take restrictions that apply statutorily to endangered species began to apply to the

Central Valley ESU of spring-run Chinook salmon (67 FR 1116 (January 9, 2002)). On June 14, 2004, following a five-year species status review, NMFS proposed that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon remain a threatened species based on the BRT strong majority opinion that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook ESU is ''likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.'' The BRT based its conclusions on the greatly reduced distribution of Central Valley spring Chinook ESU and hatchery influences on natural population. In addition, the BRT noted moderately high risk for the abundance, spatial structure, and diversity Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) criteria, and a lower risk for the productivity criterion reflecting positive trends. On June 28, 2005, NMFS reaffirmed the threatened status of the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU (70 FR 37160 (June 28, 2005)). **Figure 6** depicts the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU.

As previously discussed for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, the Recovery Priority Number for a species is based on the criteria in the Recovery Priority Guidelines (NMFS 1990, 55 FR 24296) and indicates the priority of the species for recovery plan development and implementation.

The Recovery Priority Number for the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is 7 and was based on a moderate magnitude of threat, due to: only three remaining extant natural populations with consistent spawning that are in close geographic proximity; the lack of cool water habitat below impassable dams; and the threat to genetic integrity from the Feather River Fish Hatchery (FRFH). The recovery potential is low to moderate due to lack of suitable habitat (cold water, high elevation) below impassable barriers, and the low number (three) of extant natural populations. Conflict was determined to exist due to anticipated future development, habitat degradation issues, and increasing demands for Central Valley water supplies.

Species Description and Taxonomy

The Chinook salmon, also largely referred to as king salmon in California, are the largest of the Pacific salmon. The following physical description of the species is provided by Moyle (Moyle 2002). Spawning adults are olive to dark maroon in color, without conspicuous streaking or blotches on the sides. Spawning males are darker than females, and have a hooked jaw and slightly humped back. There are numerous small black spots in both sexes on the back, dorsal fins, and both lobes of the tail. They can be distinguished from other spawning salmon by the color pattern, particularly the spotting on the back and tail, and by the dark, solid black gums of the lower jaw. Parr have 6 to 12 parr marks, each equal to or wider than the spaces between them and most centered on the lateral line. The adipose fin of parr is pigmented on the upper edge, but clear at its base. The dorsal fin occasionally has one or more spots on it but the other fins are clear. Life History

Adult Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon leave the ocean to begin their upstream migration in late January and early February (CDFG 1998), and enter the Sacramento River between March and September, primarily in May and June (Moyle 2002; Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Spring-run Chinook salmon generally enter rivers as sexually immature fish and must hold in freshwater for up to several months before spawning (Moyle 2002). While maturing, adults hold in deep pools with cold water. Spawning normally occurs between mid-August and early October, peaking in September (Moyle 2002).

The length of time required for embryo incubation and emergence from the gravel is dependant on water temperature. For maximum embryo survival, water temperatures reportedly must be between 41°F and 55.4°F and oxygen saturation levels must be close to maximum (Moyle 2002).



Figure 6. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon ESU

Under those conditions, embryos hatch in 40 to 60 days and remain in the gravel as alevins (the life stage between hatching and egg sack absorption) for another 4 to 6 weeks before emerging as fry (Moyle 2002).

Spring-run Chinook salmon fry emerge from the gravel from November to March (Moyle 2002). Juveniles may reside in freshwater for 12 to 16 months, but some migrate to the ocean as young-of-the-year in the winter or spring months within eight months of hatching (CALFED 2000b). The average size of fry migrants (approximately 40 mm between December and April in Mill, Butte, and Deer creeks) reflects a prolonged emergence of fry from the gravel (Lindley *et al.* 2004). By contrast, studies in Butte Creek (Ward *et al.* 2003) found the majority of spring-run migrants to be fry moving downstream primarily during December, January, and February, and that these movements appeared to be influenced by flow. Small numbers of spring-run juveniles remained in Butte Creek to rear and migrate as yearlings later in the spring. Juvenile emigration patterns in Mill and Deer creeks are very similar to patterns observed in Butte Creek, with the exception that Mill and Deer creek juveniles typically exhibit a later young-of-the-year migration and an earlier yearling migration (Lindley *et al.* 2004). By contrast, data collected on the Feather River suggests that the bulk of juvenile emigration occurs during November and December (DWR and Reclamation 1999; Painter *et al.* 1977). Seesholtz *et al.* (Seesholtz *et al.* 2003) speculate that because juvenile rearing habitat in the Low Flow Channel of the Feather River is limited, juveniles may be forced to emigrate from the area early due to competition for resources. **Table 3** depicts the temporal occurrence of spring-run life stages in the Sacramento River.

Abundance Trends and Distribution

The Central Valley drainage as a whole is estimated to have supported spring-run Chinook salmon runs as large as 600,000 fish between the late 1880s and 1940s (CDFG 1998). More than 500,000 Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon were caught in the Sacramento-San Joaquin commercial fishery in 1883 (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998).

Before construction of Friant Dam, nearly 50,000 adults were counted in the San Joaquin River (Fry 1961). The San Joaquin populations essentially were extirpated by the 1940s, with only small remnants of the run persisting through the 1950s in the Merced River (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Since 1970, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon run size estimates have fluctuated significantly from highs near 30,000 to lows near 3,000. **Figure 7** depicts the estimated spring-run Chinook salmon spawning run size from 1970 through 2006.

Although spring-run Chinook salmon were probably the most abundant salmonid in the Central Valley under historic conditions, large dams eliminated access to almost all historical habitat and the spring-run has suffered the most severe declines of any of the four Chinook salmon runs in the Sacramento River Basin (Fisher 1994).

Historically, spring-run Chinook salmon occurred in the headwaters of all major river systems in the Central Valley where natural barriers to migration were absent. Beginning in the 1880s, harvest, water development, construction of dams that prevented access to headwater areas and habitat degradation significantly reduced the number and range of spring-run Chinook salmon.

Streams that currently support wild, persistent populations of spring-run Chinook salmon in the Central Valley include Mill, Deer and Butte creeks (CDFG 1998). Each of these three populations is small and isolated. Additionally, these populations are genetically distinct from other populations classified as spring-run in the Central Valley (e.g., Feather River) (DWR 2004). Banks *et al.* (Banks *et al.* 2000) suggest the spring-run phenotype in the Central Valley is actually shown by two genetically distinct subpopulations, Butte Creek, and Deer and Mill creeks. Lindley *et al.* (Lindley *et al.* 2007) report that the current

distribution of viable populations makes the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU vulnerable to catastrophic disturbance. All three extant independent populations are in basins whose headwaters lie within the debris and pyroclastic flow radii of Mt. Lassen, an active volcano that USGS views as highly dangerous.

Table 3. Temporal Occurrence of Adult and Juvenile Sacramento River Spring-run Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River

Location	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Adult												
Sacramento River Basin[1,2]												
Sacramento River[3]												
Mill Creek[4]												
Deer Creek[4]												
Butte Creek[4]												
Juvenile												
Sacramento River Tributaries[5]												
Upper Butte Creek[6]												
Mill, Deer, Butte Creeks[4]												
Sacramento River at RBDD[3]												
Sacramento River at KL[7]												
Chipps Island (Trawl)[8*]												

Sources: [1]Yoshiyama et al. 1998; [2]Moyle 2002; [3]Myers et al. 1998; [4]Lindley et al. 2006a; [5]CDFG 1998; [6]McReynolds et al. 2005; Ward et al. 2002, 2003; [7]Snider and Titus 2000, [8]USFWS 2001

Relative Abundance: = High = Medium = Low

* Note: By the time yearly spring-run Chinook salmon reach Chipps Island they cannot be distinguished from fall-year Chinook salmon yearlings.



Figure 7. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Run Size Estimates (1970–2006)

Source: (AFRP GRANDTAB 2007)

Additionally, a fire with a maximum diameter of 30 km, big enough to burn the headwaters of Mill, Deer, and Butte creeks simultaneously, has roughly a 10 percent chance of occurring somewhere in the Central Valley each year. **Figure 8** depicts the combined annual run size estimates for these three populations.

The FRFH was constructed in the mid 1960s by DWR to mitigate for the loss of Chinook salmon and steelhead spawning habitat by construction of Oroville Dam. The FRFH was opened in 1967 (DWR 2002) and is operated by CDFG. The FRFH is the only hatchery in the Central Valley producing spring-run Chinook salmon. The current production target for spring-run Chinook salmon at the FRFH is 5 million smolts.

Prior to 2004, FRFH hatchery staff differentiated spring-run from fall-run by opening the ladder to the hatchery on September 1. Those fish ascending the ladder from September 1 through September 15 were assumed to be spring-run Chinook salmon while those ascending the ladder after September 15 were assumed to be fall-run (Kastner 2003). This practice led to considerable hybridization between spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon (DWR 2004). Since 2004, the fish ladder remains open during the spring months and those fish ascending the ladder are marked with an external tag and returned to the river. This practice allows FRFH staff to identify those previously marked fish as spring-run when they re-enter the ladder in September reducing the potential for hybridization between the spring and fall runs (DWR 2004).

The FRFH also releases a significant portion of its spring-run production into San Pablo Bay. This practice increases the chances that these fish will stray into other Central Valley streams when they return as adults to spawn. This straying has the potential to transfer genetic material from hatchery fish to wild naturally-spawning fish and is generally viewed as an adverse hatchery impact. Of particular concern would be the straying of hatchery fish into Deer, Mill, or Butte creeks, affecting the genetic integrity of the only significantly distinct spring-run Chinook salmon

in the Central Valley (DWR 2004). **Figure 9** shows the total Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon spawning run size estimates broken down by constituent component for the years 1970 through 2004. The figure indicates that since about 1992, the FRFH contribution to the total spring run is almost 100 percent of the Central Valley run excluding Mill, Deer, and Butte creeks. The current and historical distribution of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon is presented in **Figure 10**.

Habitat Characteristics/Ecosystem

Habitat characteristics for spring-run Chinook salmon are the same as those described above for winter-run Chinook salmon. The primary differences in the habitat characteristics between the two runs are the duration and the time of year that the different life stages of the species utilize the habitat.

Critical Habitat

Critical habitat for listed salmonids is comprised of physical and biological features essential to the conservation of the species including: space for the individual and population growth and for normal behavior; cover; sites for breeding, reproduction and rearing of offspring; and habitats protected from disturbance or are representative of the historical geographical and ecological distribution of the species. The primary constituent elements considered essential for the conservation of listed Central Valley salmonids are: (1) freshwater spawning sites; (2) freshwater rearing sites; (3) freshwater migration corridors; (4) estuarine areas; (5) nearshore marine areas; and (6) offshore marine areas.

NMFS proposed new critical habitat for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon on December 10, 2004, (FR Vol. 69, No. 237) December 10, 2004)) and published a final rule designating critical habitat for this species on September 2, 2005 (FR Vol. 70, No. 170 (Friday, September 2, 2005)).



Figure 8. Mill, Deer, and Butte Creek Combined Spawning Run Size Estimates for Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon (1970–2004)

Source: (AFRP GRANDTAB 2007)



Figure 9. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Spawning Run Size Composition (1970–2004)

Source: (AFRP GRANDTAB 2007)

Designated critical habitat for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon includes the: (1) Tehama Hydrologic Unit 5504 (Lower Stony Creek Hydrologic Sub-area 550410 and Red Bluff Hydrologic Sub-area 550420); (2) Whitmore Hydrologic Unit 5507 (Inks Creek Hydrologic Sub-area 550711, Battle Creek Hydrologic Sub-area 550712 and Inwood Hydrologic Sub-area 55072); (3) Redding Hydrologic Unit 5508 (Enterprise Flat Hydrologic Sub-area 550810 and Lower Cottonwood Hydrologic Sub-area 550820); (4) Eastern Tehama Hydrologic Unit 5509 (Big Chico Creek Hydrologic Sub-area 550914, Deer Creek Hydrologic Sub-area 550920, Upper Mill Creek Hydrologic Subarea 55094 and Antelope Creek Hydrologic Subarea 550963); (5) Sacramento Delta Hydrologic Unit 5510 (Sacramento Delta Hydrologic Sub-area 551000); (6) Valley-Putah-Cache Hydrologic Unit 5511 (Lower Putah Creek Hydrologic Sub-area 551120); (7) Marysville Hydrologic Unit 5515 (Lower Yuba River Hydrologic Subarea 551510, Lower Yuba River Hydrologic Subarea 551530, Lower Feather River Hydrologic Sub-area 551540); (8) Yuba River Hydrologic Unit 5517 (Browns Valley Hydrologic Sub-Area 551712 and Englebright Hydrologic Sub-area 551714); (9) Valley-American Hydrologic Unit 5519 (Lower American Hydrologic Sub-area 551921, Pleasant Grove Hydrologic Subarea 551922); (10) Colusa Basin Hydrologic Unit 5520 (Sycamore-Sutter Hydrologic Sub-area 552010, Sutter Bypass Hydrologic Sub-area 552030 and Butte Basin Hydrologic Sub-area 552040); (11) Butte Creek Hydrologic Unit 5521 (Upper Little Chico Hydrologic Sub-area 552130); and (12) Shasta Bally Hydrologic Unit 5524 (Platina Hydrologic Sub-area 552436, Spring Creek Hydrologic Sub-area 552440 and Kanaka Peak Hydrologic Sub-area 552462). **Figure 11** depicts the designated critical habitat for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon.



Figure 10. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Current and Historical Distribution



Figure 11. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Designated Critical Habitat

Reasons for Listing / Threats Assessment

Threats to Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon fall into three broad categories: (1) loss of historical spawning habitat; (2) degradation of remaining habitat; and (3) threats to the genetic integrity of the wild spawning populations from the FRFH spring-run Chinook salmon production program. The construction of dams in the Central Valley has eliminated virtually all historic spawning habitat of spring-run Chinook salmon in the basin. Native spring-run Chinook salmon have been extirpated from all tributaries in the San Joaquin River Basin, which represents a large portion of the historic range and abundance of the ESU. Naturally-spawning populations of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon currently are restricted to accessible reaches of the upper Sacramento River, Antelope Creek, Battle Creek, Beegum Creek, Big Chico Creek, Butte Creek, Clear Creek, Deer Creek, Feather River, Mill Creek, and Yuba River (CDFG 1998). These populations are relatively small. The Feather River population depends on FRFH production, and is likely hybridized with fall-run Chinook salmon. Little is known about the status of the spring-run Chinook salmon population in the lower Yuba River, although the relatively recent installation of a VAKI Riverwatcher system at Daguerre Point Dam is beginning to provide more accurate estimates of population size. The upper

Sacramento River may support a small spring-run Chinook salmon population, but population status is poorly documented, and the degree of hybridization with fall-run Chinook salmon is unknown.

The construction of Shasta and Keswick dams on the Sacramento River and Oroville Dam on the Feather River and subsequent blocking of upstream migration has eliminated the spatial separation between spawning fall-run and spring-run Chinook salmon. Reportedly, spring-run Chinook salmon migrated to the upper Feather River and its tributaries from mid-March through the end of July (CDFG 1998). Fall-run Chinook salmon reportedly migrated later and spawned in lower reaches of the Feather River than spring-run Chinook salmon (Yoshiyama *et al.* 2001). The same pattern likely also existed on the Sacramento River. Restricted access to historic spawning grounds currently causes spring-run Chinook salmon to spawn in the same lowland reaches that fall-run Chinook salmon use as spawning habitat. The overlap in spawning site locations, combined with an overlap in spawning timing (Moyle 2002) with temporally adjacent runs, may be responsible for inbreeding between spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon in the lower Feather River (Hedgecock *et al.* 2001) and in the Sacramento River below Keswick Dam.

In the upper Sacramento River, Feather River, and lower Yuba River, spring-run Chinook salmon spawning may occur a few weeks earlier than fall-run spawning, but currently there is no clear distinction between the two because of the disruption of spatial segregation by Shasta and Keswick dams on the Sacramento River, Oroville Dam on the Feather River, and Englebright Dam on the Yuba River. Thus, spawning of spring-run Chinook salmon occurs during the same months as fall-run. This presents difficulties from a management perspective in determining the proportional contribution of total spawning escapement by the spring- and fall-runs. Because of unnaturally high densities of spawning, particularly in the in the Low Flow Channel of the Feather River, spawning habitat is likely a limiting factor. Intuitively, it could be inferred that the slightly earlier spawning Chinook salmon displaying spring-run behavior would have better access to the limited spawning habitat, although early spawning likely leads to a higher rate of redd superimposition. Redd superimposition occurs when spawning Chinook salmon dig redds on top of existing redds dug by other Chinook salmon. The rate of superimposition is a function of spawning densities and typically occurs in systems where spawning habitat is limited (Fukushima *et al.* 1998). Redd superimposition may disproportionately affect early spawners and, therefore, potentially affect Chinook salmon exhibiting spring-run life history characteristics.

In general, spring-run Chinook salmon habitat has been degraded through elevated water temperatures, agricultural and municipal diversions and returns, restricted flows, entrainment of migrating juveniles into unscreened or poorly screened diversions, predation by non-native species and the poor quality and quantity of remaining habitat. Habitat problems remain one of the most important sources of ongoing risk to the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon (NMFS 1998). Like most spring-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon require cool freshwater while they mature over the summer. In the Central Valley, summer water temperatures are reportedly suitable for Chinook salmon only above 150 to 500-m elevations, and most such habitat is now upstream of impassable dams (NMFS 2005). Current spawning is restricted to the mainstem and a few river tributaries in the Sacramento River, where the habitat is severely degraded (NMFS 1998).

General degradation of rearing and migrating habitat includes elevated water temperatures, agricultural and municipal diversions and returns, restricted and regulated flows, entrainment of migrating fish into unscreened or poorly screened diversions, predation by nonnative species, and the poor quality and quantity of remaining habitat

(NMFS 1998). Hydropower dams and water diversions in some years have greatly reduced or eliminated in-stream flows during spring-run migration periods (NMFS 1998b).

In addition, hatchery programs in the Central Valley may pose threats to spring-run Chinook salmon stock genetic integrity (NMFS 1998). Most of the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon production is of hatchery origin, and naturally-spawning populations may be interbreeding with both fall/late fall- and spring-run Chinook salmon hatchery fish. This problem has been exacerbated by the increasing production of spring-run Chinook salmon from the Feather River and Butte Creek hatcheries, especially in light of reports suggesting a high degree of mixing between spring- and fall/late fall-run broodstock in the hatcheries. In the 1940s, trapping of adult Chinook salmon that originated from areas above Keswick and Shasta dams may have resulted in stock mixing, and further mixing with fall-run Chinook salmon apparently occurred with fish transferred to the CNFH. Deer Creek, one of the locations generally believed most likely to retain essentially native spring-run Chinook salmon, was a target of adult outplants from the 1940s trapping operation, but the success of those transplants is uncertain (NMFS 2005).

Hatchery strays are considered to be an increasing problem due to the management practice of releasing a larger proportion of fish off station (NMFS 1998). Since 1967, artificial production has focused on the program at the FRFH. The FRFH spring-run Chinook salmon program releases its production far downstream of the hatchery, causing high rates of straying (CDFG 2001a). Cramer (1996) reported that half of the hatchery-reared spring-run Chinook salmon returning to the Feather River did not return to the hatchery, but spawned naturally in the river. Given the large number of juveniles released off station, the potential contribution of straying adults to rivers throughout the Central Valley is considerable (NMFS 2005). The termination of CWT marking programs for hatchery-derived spring-run fish and the absence of spring-run carcass surveys for most river systems prevented the accurate estimation of the contribution of naturally-spawning hatchery strays (NMFS 2005). Cramer (1996) reported that up to 20 percent of the Feather River spring-run Chinook salmon are recovered in the American River sport fishery. Furthermore, the use of a fixed date to distinguish returning spring- and fall-run fish at the FRFH may have resulted in considerable hybridization between the two runs (Campbell and Moyle 1990 *in* NMFS 2005).

Additionally, hatchery production of spring-run Chinook salmon may threaten the genetic integrity of naturally-spawning populations. Cramer and Demko (Cramer and Demko 1997) reported that half of the hatchery reared spring-run Chinook salmon returning to the Feather River did not return to the hatchery, but spawned naturally in the river. Hatchery straying is considered to be an increasing problem due to current practices of offsite releases. The FRFH spring-run Chinook salmon program currently releases its production in San Pablo Bay, causing high straying rates (CDFG and NMFS 2001). Given the large numbers of juveniles released offsite, the potential for straying to rivers throughout the Central Valley is high.

A detailed threats assessment was conducted for the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and followed the same general procedure previously described for winter-run Chinook salmon. The threats/stressors affecting each spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group and population are described in Appendix A.

The completed stressor matrix sorted by normalized weight is a prioritized list of the life stage-specific stressors affecting the ESU. For spring-run Chinook salmon, threats were prioritized within each diversity group, as well as within each population. Specific information explaining the individual steps taken to generate these prioritized lists is provided in Appendix A.

Some major stressors to the entire Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU include passage impediments/barriers, ocean harvest, warm water temperatures for holding and rearing, limited quantity and quality of rearing habitat, predation, and entrainment. The complete prioritized list of life stage-specific stressors to this ESU is presented in Appendix A.

Some of the most important specific stressors to each diversity groups within the ESU are described below.

Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group

- Agricultural diversion dams and/or weirs on Deer, Mill, Antelope, and Butte creeks impeding or blocking access to upstream spawning habitat;
- Warm water temperatures in Deer, Mill, Antelope, Butte, and Big Chico creeks during the adult immigration and holding life stage;
- Englebright Dam blocking access to habitat historically used by Yuba River spring-run Chinook salmon;
- Oroville Dam blocking access to habitat historically used by Feather River spring-run Chinook salmon;
- Entrainment in Antelope Creek resulting from terminal diversions and loss of channel connectivity;
- Loss of rearing habitat in the lower and middle sections of the Sacramento River and in the Delta;
- Ocean harvest on all populations; and
- Predation on juveniles from all populations rearing and migrating through the Sacramento River and Delta.

Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group

- Keswick and Shasta dams blocking access to habitat historically used by spring-run Chinook salmon in the upper Sacramento River watershed;
- Passage impediments on the North and South Forks of Battle Creek;
- Loss of rearing habitat in the Sacramento River and Delta;
- Ocean harvest on all populations; and
- Predation on juveniles from all populations rearing and migrating through the Sacramento River and Delta.

Northwestern California Diversity Group

- Warm water temperatures in all three watersheds during the adult immigration and holding life stage;
- Limited spawning habitat availability in all three watersheds;
- Loss of rearing habitat in the lower and middle sections of the Sacramento River and in the Delta;
- Whiskeytown Dam blocking access to habitat potentially historically used by Clear River spring-run Chinook salmon;
- Ocean harvest on all populations; and
- Predation on juveniles from all populations rearing and migrating through the Sacramento River and Delta.

Conservation Measures

During 2004 through 2006, progress was made in addressing some of the limiting factors and threats to this ESU, largely through ESA Section 7 consultations and other ESA-related conservation efforts in the Central Valley. The CVP Section 7 consultation with Reclamation has likely

contributed to habitat improvements benefiting the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, such as flow and temperature improvements.

In addition, CALFED and CVPIA actions in the Sacramento River tributaries have focused on riparian and shaded riverine aquatic habitat restoration, improved access to available upstream habitat, improved instream flows, and reduced loss of juveniles at diversions, particularly for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead. For a description of CALFED, CVPIA and other actions, refer to the previous discussion of Conservation Measures for winter-run Chinook salmon.

The Delta Pumping Plant Fish Protection Agreement was intended to mitigate for SWP and pumping plant impacts through screening of unscreened water diversions, enhanced law enforcement efforts to reduce illegal fish harvest, installation of seasonal barriers to guide fish away from undesirable spawning habitat or migration corridors, salmon habitat restoration, and removal of four dams to improve fish passage on Butte Creek for Chinook and steelhead. Approximately one-third of the approved funding for salmon projects specifically targeted spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the upper Sacramento River tributaries.

Harvest protective measures benefiting spring-run Chinook salmon include seasonal constraints on sport and commercial fisheries south of Point Arena. In addition, the State has listed spring-run Chinook under the CESA, and has thus established specific in-river fishing regulations and no-retention prohibitions designed to protect this ESU (e.g., fishing method restrictions, gear restrictions, bait limitations, seasonal closures, and zero bag limits), particularly in primary tributaries such as Deer, Big Chico, Mill, and Butte creeks, which support spring-run Chinook salmon. The CDFG has implemented enhanced enforcement efforts in spring-run tributaries and adult holding areas, which have significantly reduced illegal harvest.

Biological Constraints and Needs

The Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is currently faced with three primary limiting factors and threats: (1) loss of most historic spawning habitat; (2) degradation of the remaining habitat; and (3) genetic threats from the FRFH spring-run Chinook salmon program. Spring-run Chinook require cool freshwater in summer, most of which is upstream of impassable dams. The ESU is currently limited to independent populations in Mill, Deer, and Butte creeks, persistent and presumably dependent populations in the Feather and Yuba rivers and in Big Chico, Antelope, and Battle creeks, and a few ephemeral or dependent populations in the Northwestern California region (e.g., Beegum, Clear, and Thomes creeks). This ESU continues to be threatened by habitat loss, degradation and modification, small hydropower dams and water diversions that reduce or eliminate instream flows during migration, unscreened or inadequately screened water diversions, excessively high water temperatures, and predation by non-native species.

The potential effects of long-term climate change also may adversely affect spring-run Chinook salmon and their recovery. These effects are summarized above for winter-run Chinook salmon, and more thoroughly discussed in Appendix A.

STEELHEAD

Brief Overview/Status of the Species

NMFS proposed to list the Central Valley steelhead (*Oncorhychus mykiss*) as endangered on August 9, 1996. NMFS (61 FR 41541 (August 1996)) concluded that the Central Valley steelhead ESU was in danger of extinction because of habitat degradation and destruction, blockage of freshwater habitats, water allocation problems, the pervasive opportunity for genetic introgression resulting from widespread production of hatchery

steelhead and the potential ecological interaction between introduced stocks and native stocks. Moreover, NMFS (71 FR 834 (January 5, 2006)) proposed to list steelhead as endangered because steelhead had been extirpated from most of their historical range.

On March 19, 1998, NMFS listed the Central Valley steelhead as a threatened species (63 FR 13347 (March 19, 1998)). NMFS (63 FR 13347 (March 19, 1998)) concluded that the risks to Central Valley steelhead had diminished since the completion of the 1996 status review based on a review of existing and recently implemented State conservation efforts and Federal management programs (e.g., CVPIA AFRP, CALFED) that address key factors for the decline of this species. In addition, NMFS (63 FR 13347 (March 19, 1998)) asserted that additional actions benefiting Central Valley steelhead included efforts to enhance fisheries monitoring and conservation actions to address artificial propagation.

On September 8, 2000, pursuant to a July 10, 2000, rule issued by NMFS under Section 4(d) of the ESA (16 USC § 1533(d)), the take restrictions that apply statutorily to endangered species began to apply to Central Valley steelhead (65 FR 42421 (July 10, 2000)). On January 5, 2006, NMFS reaffirmed the threatened status of the Central Valley Steelhead DPS (71 FR 834 (January 5, 2006)). NMFS (1998) based its conclusion on conservation and protective efforts that, *"mitigate the immediacy of extinction risk facing the Central Valley steelhead DPS."* **Figure 12** depicts the Central Valley steelhead DPS.

As previously discussed for the Chinook salmon ESUs, the Recovery Priority Number for a species is based on the criteria in the Recovery Priority Guidelines (NMFS 1990, 55 FR 24296) and indicates the priority of the species for recovery plan development and implementation. The Recovery Priority Number for the Central Valley steelhead ESU is 7. The Recovery Priority Number for the Central Valley steelhead DPS was derived from a moderate magnitude of threat, because more than 95 percent of historic spawning habitat is inaccessible (due to impassable dams) and because Central Valley steelhead require cooler water at higher elevations (again, found largely above impassable dams). The recovery potential was determined to be low to moderate due to a lack of suitable habitat (requiring cold water and high elevation) below impassable barriers, inadequate status and trends data to assess DPS viability, and the widespread stocking of hatchery fish (which could negatively impact wild steelhead populations). Conflict was determined to exist because of anticipated future development and habitat degradation issues, as well as increasing demands for Central Valley water supplies.

Species Description and Taxonomy

Steelhead and rainbow trout are the same species. In general, steelhead refers to the anadromous form of the species. Normally, adult steelhead reach a larger size than resident rainbow trout. Sacramento River Basin steelhead immigrants range in size from 12 to 18 inches (30.5 to 45.7 cm) FL for adults returning after 1 year in the ocean, to 18 to 23 inches (45.7 to 58.4 cm) FL for adults returning after 2 years in the ocean (S.P. Cramer & Associates 1995).



Figure 12. Central Valley Steelhead Distinct Population Segment[1] (Formerly Evolutionarily Significant Unit)

Steelhead can be identified by the numerous black spots on the caudal fin, adipose fin, dorsal fin and back (Moyle 2002). When in freshwater, steelhead often display the pinkish to red lateral band and cheeks typical of resident rainbow trout. The back is normally an iridescent blue to brown, the sides and belly are silver, white or yellowish (Moyle 2002). The resident forms are usually darker than the sea-run. Juvenile coloration is similar to adults except that juveniles often have 8 to 13 widely spaced parr marks centered on the lateral line, 5 to 10 dark marks on the back between the head and dorsal fin, white to orange tips on the dorsal and anal fins, and few, if any, dark spots on the tail (Moyle 2002).

Life History

Steelhead may exhibit anadromy or freshwater residency. Resident forms are usually referred to as ''rainbow'' or ''redband'' trout, while anadromous life forms are termed ''steelhead.'' Steelhead typically migrate to marine waters after spending two years in fresh water. They reside in marine waters for typically two or three years prior to returning to their natal stream to spawn as four- or five-year-olds. Unlike Pacific salmon, steelhead are capable of spawning more than once before they die. However, it is rare for steelhead to spawn more than twice before dying, and most that do so are females (Moyle 2002).

Currently, Central Valley steelhead are considered "ocean-maturing" (also known as winter) steelhead, although summer steelhead may have been present prior to construction of large dams (Moyle 2002). Ocean maturing steelhead enter fresh water with well-developed gonads and spawn shortly after river entry. Central Valley steelhead enter fresh water from August through April. They hold until flows are high enough in tributaries to enter for spawning (Moyle 2002). Steelhead adults typically spawn from December through April, with peaks from January though March in small streams and tributaries where cool, well oxygenated water is available year-round (Hallock *et al.* 1961; McEwan 2001). Depending on water temperature, steelhead eggs may incubate in redds for 1.5 to 4 months before hatching as alevins. Following yolk sac absorption, alevins emerge from the gravel as young juveniles or fry and begin actively feeding (Moyle 2002).

In the Sacramento River, juvenile steelhead generally migrate to the ocean in spring and early summer at 1 to 3 years of age and 10 to 25 cm FL, with peak migration through the Delta in March and April (Reynolds *et al.* 1993). Hallock *et al.* (1961) found that juvenile steelhead in the Sacramento River Basin migrate downstream during most months of the year, but the peak emigration period occurred in the spring, with a much smaller peak in the fall.

Steelhead may remain in the ocean from one to four years, growing rapidly as they feed in the highly productive currents along the continental shelf (Barnhart 1986). Oceanic and climate conditions such as sea surface temperatures, air temperatures, strength of upwelling, El Niño events, salinity, ocean currents, wind speed, and primary and secondary productivity affect all facets of the physical, biological and chemical processes in the marine environment. Some of the conditions associated with El Niño events include warmer water temperatures, weak upwelling, low primary productivity (which leads to decreased zooplankton biomass), decreased southward transport of subarctic water, and increased sea levels (Pearcy 1997). For juvenile steelhead, warmer water and weakened upwellings are possibly the most important of the ocean conditions associated with El Niño. Because of the weakened upwelling during an El Niño year, juvenile California steelhead would need to more actively migrate offshore through possibly stressful warm waters with numerous inshore predators. Strong upwelling is probably beneficial because of the greater transport of smolts offshore, beyond major concentrations of inshore predators (Pearcy 1997). **Table 4** depicts the temporal occurrence of steelhead life stages in the Sacramento River.

Table 4. The Temporal Occurrence of Adult and Juvenile Sacramento River Steelhead in the Sacramento River

Location	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Adult												
Sacramento River[1,3]												
Sacramento River at Red Bluff[2,3]												
Mill, Deer Creeks[4]												
Sacramento River at Fremont Weir[6]												
Sacramento River at Fremont Weir[6]												
San Joaquin River[7]												
Juvenile												
Sacramento River[1,2]												
Sacramento River at Knights Landing[2,8]												
Sacramento River at KL[9]												
Chipps Island (Wild)[10]												
Mossdale[8]												
Woodbridge Dam[11]												
Stanislaus River at Caswell[12]												
Sacramento River at Hood[13]												

Sources: [1]Hallock et al. 1961; [2]McEwan 2001; [3]USFWS unpublished data; [4]CDFG 1995; [5](Hallock et al. 1957); [6]Bailey 1954; [7]CDFG Steelhead Report Card Data; [8]CDFG unpublished data; [9]Snider and Titus 2000; [10]Nobriga and Cadrett 2003; [11]Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc., 2002; [12]S.P. Cramer and Associates, Inc. 2000 and 2001; [13]Schaffter 1980

Relative Abundance: = High = Medium = Low

Abundance Trends and Distribution

Prior to dam construction, water development and watershed perturbations, Central Valley steelhead were distributed throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers (Busby *et al.* 1996; NMFS 1996b). Steelhead were found from the upper Sacramento and Pit rivers (now inaccessible due to Shasta and Keswick dams) south to the Kings and possibly the Kern River systems, and in both east- and west-side Sacramento River tributaries (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1996). Lindley *et al.* (Lindley *et al.* 2006) estimated that historically there were at least 81 independent Central Valley steelhead populations distributed primarily throughout the eastern tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. Presently, impassable dams block access to 80 percent of historically available habitat, and block access to all historical spawning habitat for about 38 percent of historical populations (Lindley *et al.* 2006). Existing wild steelhead stocks in the Central Valley are mostly confined to the upper Sacramento River and its tributaries, including Antelope, Deer, and Mill creeks and the Yuba River. Populations may exist in Big Chico and Butte creeks, and a few wild steelhead are produced in the American and Feather rivers (McEwan 2001).

Historic Central Valley steelhead run sizes are difficult to estimate because of the lack of data, but may have approached one to two million adults annually (McEwan 2001). By the early 1960s the steelhead run size had declined to about 40,000 (CDFG 1996). Over the last 30 years the steelhead populations in the upper Sacramento River have declined substantially. In 1996, NMFS estimated the Central Valley total run size based on dam counts, hatchery returns, and past spawning surveys was probably less than 10,000 fish. Both natural and hatchery runs have declined since the 1960s. Counts at RBDD averaged 1,400 fish from 1991 to 1996, compared to counts in excess of 10,000 fish in the late 1960s (CDFG 1996). Run size estimates for the hatchery-produced American River stock averaged less than 1,000 fish, compared to 12,000 to 19,000 in the early 1970s (McEwan 2001).

In analyzing flow-habitat relationships for anadromous salmonids in the upper Sacramento River upstream of the Battle Creek confluence and downstream of Keswick Dam, USFWS (2003) reported that very few steelhead redds had been observed in CDFG aerial redd surveys, and of those redds observed, it was not possible to differentiate between steelhead and resident rainbow trout. Recent population estimates suggest two thirds (approximately 2,000 adults) of wild Central Valley steelhead spawn upstream of the RBDD and the majority of these spawners probably return to Battle Creek due to the presence of the CNFH. Specific information regarding steelhead spawning within the mainstem Sacramento River is limited due to lack of monitoring (NMFS 2004). Currently, the number of steelhead spawning in the Sacramento River is unknown because redds cannot be distinguished from a large resident rainbow trout population that has developed as a result of managing the upper Sacramento River for coldwater species.

Naturally spawning populations of steelhead also occur in the Feather, Yuba, American, and Mokelumne rivers, but these populations have had substantial hatchery influence and their ancestry is not clear (Busby *et al.* 1996). Steelhead runs in the Feather and American rivers are sustained largely by the FRFH and Nimbus Hatchery (CDFG 1996). The current and historical distribution of Central Valley steelhead is presented in **Figure 13**.

Habitat Characteristics/Ecosystem

A description of freshwater habitat requirements for steelhead is presented in the following sections. Habitat requirements are organized by the species life stage.



Figure 13. Current and Historical Distribution of Central Valley Steelhead

Adult Immigration and Holding

Adult steelhead immigration into Central Valley streams typically begins in August and continues into March (McEwan 2001; NMFS 2004). Steelhead immigration generally peaks during January and February (Moyle 2002). Optimal immigration and holding temperatures have been reported to range from 46°F to 52°F (CDFG 1991b).

Central Valley steelhead are known to use the Sacramento River as a migratory corridor to spawning areas in upstream tributaries. Historically, steelhead likely did not utilize the mainstem Sacramento River downstream from the Shasta Dam site except as a migratory corridor to and from headwater streams. The number of steelhead that spawn in the Sacramento River is unknown, but it is probably low (DWR 2003). Likewise, the Feather River below the current site of Oroville Dam was likely used only as a migratory corridor to upstream reaches.

Adult Spawning

Central Valley steelhead spawn downstream of dams on every major tributary within the Sacramento and San Joaquin River systems. The female steelhead selects a site with good intergravel flow, digs a redd with her tail, usually in the coarse gravel of the tail of a pool or in a riffle, and deposits eggs while an attendant male fertilizes them. Water velocities over redds are typically 20 to 155 cm/sec, and depths are 10 to 150 cm (Moyle 2002). The preferred water temperature range for steelhead spawning is reported to be 30°F to 52°F (CDFG 2000).

Embryo Incubation

Following deposition of fertilized eggs in the redd, they are covered with loose gravel. Central Valley steelhead eggs can reportedly survive at water temperature ranges of 35.6°F to 59°F (Myrick and Cech 2001). However, steelhead eggs reportedly have the highest survival rates at water temperature ranges of 44.6°F to 50.0°F (Myrick and Cech 2001). The eggs hatch in three to four weeks at 50°F to 59°F, and fry emerge from the gravel four to six weeks later (Shapovalov and Taft 1954).

Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration

Regardless of life history strategy, for the first year or two of life rainbow trout and steelhead are found in cool, clear, fast-flowing permanent streams and rivers where riffles predominate over pools, there is ample cover from riparian vegetation or undercut banks, and invertebrate life is diverse and abundant (Moyle 2002). The smallest fish are most often found in riffles, intermediate size fish in runs, and larger fish in pools. Steelhead can be found where daytime water temperatures range from nearly 32°F to 81°F in the summer, although mortality may result at extremely low (i.e., <39°F) or extremely high (i.e., > ~73°F) water temperatures if the fish have not been gradually acclimated (Moyle 2002). Juvenile steelhead in northern California rivers reportedly exhibited increased physiological stress, increased agonistic activity, and a decrease in forage activity after ambient stream temperatures exceeded 71.6°F (Nielsen et al. 1994).

When water temperatures become stressful in streams, juvenile steelhead are faced with the increased energetic costs of living at high water temperatures. Hence, juvenile steelhead will move into fast flowing riffles to feed because of the increased abundance of food, even though there are costs associated with maintaining position in fast water. At higher water temperatures, steelhead are more vulnerable to stress which can be fatal (Moyle 2002). Predators also have a strong effect on microhabitats selected by steelhead. Small steelhead select places to live based largely on proximity to cover in order to hide from predators.

Optimal water temperatures for growth of steelhead have been reported to be 59°F to 64.4°F (Moyle 2002). Many factors affect choice of water temperatures by steelhead, including the availability of food. As steelhead grow, they establish individual feeding territories. Some

juvenile steelhead utilize tidal marsh areas, non-tidal freshwater marshes, and other shallow water areas in the Delta as rearing areas for short periods prior to their final emigration to the ocean.

Critical Habitat

Critical habitat for listed salmonids is comprised of physical and biological features essential to the conservation of the species including: space for the individual and population growth and for normal behavior; cover; sites for breeding, reproduction and rearing of offspring; and habitats protected from disturbance or are representative of the historical geographical and ecological distribution of the species. The primary constituent elements considered essential for the conservation of listed Central Valley salmonids are: (1) freshwater spawning sites; (2) freshwater rearing sites; (3) freshwater migration corridors; (4) estuarine areas; (5) nearshore marine areas; and (6) offshore marine areas.

NMFS proposed critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead on February 5, 1999 (FR Vol. 64, No. 24 (Friday, February 5, 1999)), in compliance with Section 4(a)(3)(A) of the ESA, which requires that, to the maximum extent prudent and determinable, NMFS designates critical habitat concurrently with a determination that a species is endangered or threatened (NMFS 1999). On February 16, 2000 (FR Vol. 65, No. 32 (Wednesday, February 16, 2000)), NMFS published a final rule designating critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead. Critical habitat was designated to include all river reaches accessible to listed steelhead in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and their tributaries in California. Also included were river reaches and estuarine areas of the Delta, all waters from Chipps Island westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strait, all waters of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge, and all waters of San Francisco Bay (north of the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge) from San Pablo Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge.

In response to litigation brought by the National Association of Homebuilders (NAHB) on the grounds that the agency did not adequately consider economic impacts of the critical habitat designations (NAHB v. Evans, 2002 WL 1205743 No. 00–CV–2799 (D.D.C.)), NMFS sought judicial approval of a consent decree withdrawing critical habitat designations for 19 Pacific salmon and *O. mykiss* ESUs. The District Court in Washington DC approved the consent decree and vacated the critical habitat designations by Court order on April 30, 2002 (NAHB v. Evans, 2002 WL 1205743 (D.D.C. 2002)).

NMFS proposed new critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead on December 10, 2004 (FR Vol. 69, No. 237 (Friday, December 10, 2004)) and published a final rule designating critical habitat for this species on September 2, 2005. Critical habitat for the Central Valley steelhead includes the: (1) Tehama Hydrologic Unit 5504; (2) Whitmore Hydrologic Unit 5507; (3) Redding Hydrologic Unit 5508; (4) Eastern Tehama Hydrologic Unit 5509; (5) Sacramento Delta Hydrologic Unit 5510; (6) Valley-Putah-Cache Hydrologic Unit 5511; (7) American River Hydrologic Unit 5514; (8) Marysville Hydrologic Unit 5515; (9) Yuba River Hydrologic Unit 5517; (10) Valley American Hydrologic Unit 5519; (11) Colusa Basin Hydrologic Unit 5520; (12) Butte Creek Hydrologic Unit 5521; (13) Ball Mountain Hydrologic Unit 5523; (14) Shasta Bally Hydrologic Unit 5524; (15) North Valley Floor Hydrologic Unit 5531; (16) Upper Calaveras Hydrologic Unit 5533; (17) Stanislaus River Hydrologic Unit 5534; (18) San Joaquin Valley Floor Hydrologic Unit 5535; (19) Delta-Mendota Canal Hydrologic Unit 5541; (20) North Diablo Range Hydrologic Unit 5543; and (21) San Joaquin Delta Hydrologic Unit 5544 (FR Vol 70, No. 170 (Friday, September 2, 2005)). **Figure 14** depicts the designated critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead.



Figure 14. Central Valley Steelhead Designated Critical Habitat

Reasons for Listing / Threats Assessment

For the Chinook salmon ESUs, only a few extant populations are now at low or moderate risk of extinction, and the extensive extirpation of historical populations has placed these ESUs in jeopardy of extinction. The proximate problem afflicting these ESUs and the Central Valley steelhead DPS is that their historical spawning and rearing areas are largely inaccessible. For Central Valley steelhead, there are insufficient data to assess the risk of any but a few populations and, therefore, the Central Valley TRT could not assess the viability of this DPS using the quantitative approach. However, qualitative information does suggest that the Central Valley steelhead DPS is at a moderate or high risk of extinction. Most of the historical habitat once available to steelhead is largely inaccessible, and the anadromous forms of *O. mykiss* are becoming less abundant or rare in areas where they were probably once abundant.

Threats to Central Valley steelhead are similar to those for Chinook salmon and fall into three broad categories: loss of historical spawning habitat; degradation of remaining habitat; and threats to the genetic integrity of the wild spawning populations from hatchery steelhead production programs in the Central Valley.

Historically, steelhead occurred naturally throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins; however, stocks have been extirpated from large areas in both basins. The California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead (1988) reported a reduction in Central Valley steelhead habitat from 6,000 miles historically to 300 miles at present. Reynolds *et al.* (1993) reported that 95 percent of salmonid habitat in California's Central Valley has been lost, largely due to mining and water development activities. They also noted that declines in Central Valley steelhead stocks are *"due mostly to water development, inadequate instream flows, rapid flow fluctuations, high summer water temperatures in streams immediately below reservoirs, diversion dams which block access, and entrainment of juveniles into unscreened or poorly screened diversions."* Other problems related to land use practices (agriculture and forestry) and urbanization also have certainly contributed to stock declines.

The major threat to genetic integrity for Central Valley steelhead comes from past and present hatchery practices. Sufficient overlap of spawning hatchery and natural fish within this ESU probably exists for some genetic introgression to occur. Also, a substantial problem with straying of hatchery fish exists within this ESU (Hallock 1989). Currently, four hatcheries in the Central Valley produce steelhead to supplement the Central Valley wild steelhead population. The hatcheries and their current production targets are listed in **Table 5**. Habitat fragmentation and population declines resulting in small, isolated populations also pose genetic risk from inbreeding, loss of rare alleles, and genetic drift.

Potential adverse effects to wild steelhead populations associated with hatchery production are similar to those described above for winter-run Chinook salmon. However, recent research has indicated that approximately 63 to 92 percent of steelhead smolt production is of hatchery origin (NMFS 2003), which is a higher percentage than winter-run Chinook salmon estimates. More importantly, these data suggest that the relative proportion of wild to hatchery smolt production is decreasing (NMFS 2003).

Table 5. Hatcheries Producing Steelhead in the Central Valley

Hatchery	Production Target
Coleman National Fish Hatchery	500,000
Feather River Fish Hatchery	500,000
Nimbus Hatchery	430,000
Mokelumne Fish Hatchery	100,000

There is still significant local genetic structure to Central Valley steelhead populations, although fish from the San Joaquin and Sacramento basins cannot be distinguished genetically. Hatchery effects appear to be localized – for example, Feather River and the FRFH steelhead are closely related, as are American River and Nimbus Hatchery fish (DWR 2002). Leary *et al.* (1995) report that hatchery straying has increased gene flow among steelhead populations in the Central Valley, and that a smaller amount of genetic divergence is observed among Central Valley populations compared to wild British Columbia populations largely uninfluenced by hatcheries. Currently, natural annual production of steelhead smolts in the Central Valley is estimated at 181,000 and hatchery production is 1,340,000, for a ratio of 0.148 (Good *et al.* 2005).

A significant transfer of genetic material has occurred among hatcheries within the Central Valley, as well as some transfer from systems outside the Central Valley. For example, eyed eggs from the Nimbus Hatchery were transferred to the FRFH several time in the late 1960s and early 1970s (DWR 2002). Additionally, an Eel River strain of steelhead was used as the founding broodstock for the Nimbus Hatchery (DWR 2002). There have also been transfers of steelhead from the FRFH to the Mokelumne Hatchery. In the late 1970s, a strain of steelhead was brought in from Washington State for the FRFH (DWR 2002).

In 1998, NMFS continued to identify long-term declines in abundance, small population sizes in the Sacramento River, and the high risk of interbreeding between hatchery and naturally spawned steelhead as major concerns for Central Valley steelhead. The significant loss of historic habitat, degradation of remaining habitat from water diversions, reduction in water quality and other factors, harvest impacts, and the lack of monitoring data on abundance also were identified as other important risk factors for this ESU. Nevertheless, NMFS concluded that the risks to Central Valley steelhead had diminished based on a review of existing and recently implemented State conservation efforts and Federal management programs that address key factors for the decline of this species. NMFS stated that Central Valley steelhead were benefiting from two major conservation initiatives, being simultaneously implemented: (1) the CVPIA, which was passed by Congress in 1992; and (2) the CALFED Program, a joint State/Federal effort implemented in 1995.

In 2005 and 2006, NMFS affirmed that risk factors for Central Valley steelhead include extirpation from most of the historical range, a monotonic decline in the single available time series of abundance, declining proportion of wild fish in spawning runs, substantial opportunity for deleterious interactions with hatchery fish (including out-of-basin-origin stocks), various habitat problems, and lack of ongoing population assessments. In addition, harvest impacts have been identified. According to CDFG creel census surveys, the majority (93 percent) of steelhead catches occur on the American and Feather rivers, sites of steelhead hatcheries (CDFG 2001d). Creel census surveys conducted during 2000 indicated that 1,800 steelhead were retained, and 14,300 were caught and released. The total number of steelhead contacted might be a significant fraction of basin-wide escapement, so even low catch-and-release mortality may pose a problem for wild populations. Additionally, NMFS (2005) asserted that steelhead fisheries on some tributaries and the mainstem Sacramento River may affect some steelhead juveniles.

A detailed threats assessment was conducted for the Central Valley steelhead DPS. The threats/stressors affecting each steelhead diversity group and population are described in Appendix A.

Some major stressors to the entire Central Valley steelhead DPS include passage impediments and barriers, warm water temperatures for rearing, hatchery effects, limited quantity and quality of rearing habitat, predation, and entrainment. The

complete prioritized list of life stage-specific stressors to the DPS is presented in Appendix A.

Many of the most important stressors specific to the steelhead diversity groups correspond to the diversity group-specific stressors described for the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU on page 43. The only diversity group (i.e., area) unique to the steelhead DPS, relative to the diversity groups in the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is the southern Sierra Nevada diversity group. Some of the most important stressors to steelhead in the southern Sierra Nevada diversity group include:

- Friant Dam blocking access to habitat historically used by San Joaquin River steelhead;
- Passage impediments on Calaveras River including Bellota Weir and flash board dams;
- Limited habitat availability in each watershed and in the mainstem San Joaquin River for spawning and juvenile rearing;
- La Grange and Don Pedro dams blocking access to habitat historically used by Tuolumne River steelhead;
- Goodwin and New Melones dams blocking access to habitat historically used by Stanislaus River steelhead;
- McSwain and Crocker Huffman dams blocking access to habitat historically used by Merced River steelhead;
- Camanche and Pardee dams blocking access to habitat historically used by Mokelumne River steelhead; and
- Entrainment at the Jones and Banks Pumping Plants and associated losses from predation

Conservation Measures

During 2004–2006, progress was made toward addressing some of the limiting factors and threats to this DPS, largely through ESA Section 7 consultations and other ESA-related conservation efforts in the Central Valley. The CVP Section 7 consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation likely contributed to habitat improvements benefiting the Central Valley steelhead DPS, such as flow and temperature improvements.

In addition, two large, comprehensive conservation programs in the Central Valley provide a wide range of ecosystem and species-specific protective efforts that potentially benefit steelhead–the CALFED Program and the CVPIA. For a description of CALFED, CVPIA, and other actions, refer to the previous discussion of Conservation Measures for Winter-run and Spring-run Chinook Salmon.

Other ongoing measures to protect steelhead in the State of California include 100 percent marking of all hatchery steelhead, although they are not coded-wire tagged and, therefore, determination of hatchery of origin, as well as straying rates, remain problematic for stock identification. Zero bag limits for unmarked steelhead, gear restrictions, closures, and size limits designed to protect smolts are additional inland harvest measures designed to protect steelhead. The State also works closely with NMFS to review and improve inland fishing regulations.

Biological Constraints and Needs

The primary limiting factor to the Central Valley steelhead DPS is the inaccessibility of more than 95 percent of its historic spawning and rearing habitat due to impassable dams. Where steelhead are still extant, natural populations are subject to habitat degradation and various impacts from water development activities and land use activities. This DPS requires cool water found at higher elevations, now largely above impassable dams. The lack of adequate status and trend monitoring and research limits our understanding

of the viability of this DPS and our ability to determine how steelhead populations may have interacted before the dams were built. The geographically wide stocking of hatchery fish may have deleterious effects on native wild trout populations, but this cannot be assessed. It is likely many of the threats affecting Chinook salmon are also negatively impacting steelhead, such as inadequately screened water diversions, excessively high water temperatures, and predation by non-native species.

The potential effects of long-term climate change also may adversely affect steelhead and their recovery. These effects are summarized above for winter-run Chinook salmon, and are more thoroughly discussed in Appendix A.

Recovery Strategy

"The wide-ranging migration patterns and unique life histories of anadromous salmonids take them across ecosystem and management boundaries in an increasingly fragmented world, which creates the need for analyses and strategies at similarly large scales."

- Good *et al.* 2007. Recovery Planning for Endangered Species Act-listed Pacific Salmon: Using Science to Inform Goals and Strategies

STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

A broad strategic framework is necessary to serve as a strategic planning guide to integrate the actions contributing to the overarching goal of recovery of the two Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS, which contain a mixture of hatchery and wild fish, and resident and anadromous fish. Because of the complexity associated with the multi-faceted considerations for these recovery efforts within the Central Valley Domain, this strategic planning framework incorporates the concepts of viability at both the population and ESU levels, and the identification of recovery units and management units.

Population Viability

Recovery planning seeks to ensure the viability of protected species. Viability of populations (and ESUs) depends on the demographic properties of the population or ESU, such as population size, growth rate, the variation in growth rate, and carrying capacity (e.g., Tuljapurkar and Orzack 1980). In the short term, the demographic properties of a population depend largely on the quality and quantity of habitat. In the longer term, genetic diversity, and the diversity of habitats that support genetic diversity, become increasingly important (McElhany *et al.* 2000; Kendall and Fox 2002; Williams and Reeves 2003).

NMFS has developed guidelines to use in applying the four VSP parameters of abundance, productivity, spatial structure and diversity to salmonid populations for determining whether a population is viable (McElhany *et al*. 2000). These four parameters and their associated attributes are presented in **Figure 15**.

As presented in Good *et al.* (2005), criteria for VSP are based upon measures of population characteristics that reasonably predict extinction risk and reflect processes important to populations (McElhany *et al.* 2000). Abundance is critical, because small populations are generally at greater risk of extinction than large populations. Stage-specific or lifetime productivity (i.e., population growth rate) provides information on important demographic processes. Abundance and productivity data are used to asses the status of populations of threatened and endangered ESUs (Good *et al.* 2005). Genotypic and phenotypic diversity are important in that they allow species to use a wide array of environments, respond to short-term changes in the environment, and survive long-term environmental change. Spatial structure reflects how abundance is distributed among available or potentially available habitats and how



Figure 15. Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) Parameters and Their Attributes

it can affect overall extinction risk and evolutionary processes that may alter a population's ability to respond to environmental change.

ESU Viability

Good *et al.* (2007) report that viability criteria for Pacific salmon ESUs rely on determining how many and which populations need to be at a particular status for the ESU as a whole to have an acceptably low extinction risk. In general, an assessment of an ESU as being viable will be more likely if it contains multiple populations (metapopulations), some of which meet viability criteria. Viability of the ESU is also more likely if: (1) populations are geographically widespread but some are close enough together to facilitate connectivity; (2) populations do not all share common catastrophic risks; and (3) populations display diverse life-histories and phenotypes (McElhany *et al*. 2000).

Considerations regarding the viability of an ESU are discussed in ISAB (2005), and are generally adopted herein for application to the two Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS in the Central Valley Domain. To be viable, an ESU needs more than simple persistence over time; it needs to be in an ecologically and evolutionarily functional state. Evaluation of ESU viability should not only depend upon the numbers of component populations or on the abundance and productivity of those individual populations, but also should be based on the integration of population dynamics within the ecosystem as a whole. This concept of ESU viability does not accommodate the loss of populations or the anadromous or resident life history form from any given ESU, because that loss would represent a loss in diversity for the ESU that would put its long-term viability at risk. An ESU needs to contain viable populations inhabiting a variety of different habitats, interconnected as a metapopulation, if that ESU is to fulfill the entire complement of ecological and evolutionary interactions and functions (ISAB 2005).

A viable ESU consists of a group of populations existing together as a metapopulation that as an entity is self-sustaining for the foreseeable future. Populations within a viable ESU need to exhibit the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial distribution of natural spawners sufficient to accomplish the following: avoid the loss of genetic and/or life history diversity during short-term losses in abundance that are expected parts of environmental cycles; fulfill key ecological functions that are attributable to the species, such as nutrient cycling and food web roles; and provide for long-term evolutionary adaptability to changing environmental conditions. However, given the high uncertainty in prediction of future environmental conditions, as well as the uncertainty in interpretation of how genetic or other diversity metrics will be expressed in future environments, this Recovery Plan endeavors to avoid loss of currently small, peripheral, or in any way seemingly less valuable populations.

In addition to the considerations alliterated by ISAB (2005), the Central Valley TRT further addressed ESU viability for the Central Valley Domain using two different approaches. The goal of both approaches is to spread risk and maximize future potential for adaptation.

In the first approach, the Central Valley TRT assessed ESU viability by examining the number and distribution of viable populations across the landscape, and their proximity to sources of catastrophic disturbance. Risk-spreading is assessed by examining how viable populations are spread among geographically-defined regions within the ESU. As stated in Lindley *et al.* (2007), the Puget Sound, Williamette/Lower Columbia and Interior Columbia TRTs have used variations of the idea of dividing ESUs into subunits (Myers *et al.* 2003; Ruckelshaus *et al.* 2002; Interior Columbia Basin Technical Recovery Team 2003), and requiring representation of all subunits and redundancy within the subunits (which the Central Valley TRT referred to as the "representation and redundancy" rule). The ESU subunits are intended to capture important

components of habitat, life history or genetic diversity that contribute to the viability of salmonid ESUs (Hilborn *et al.* 2003; Bottom *et al.* 2005). If extinction risks are not strongly correlated between populations, two populations, each with low risk of extinction, would be extremely unlikely to go extinct simultaneously (McElhany *et al.* 2003). Should one go extinct, the other could serve as a source of colonists to reestablish the extirpated population. In the second approach, the TRT attempted to account explicitly for the spatial structure of the ESU and the spatial structure of various catastrophic risks, including volcanoes, wildfires, and droughts.

Diversity Groups

As discussed in Lindley *et al.* (2004), drainages in the Central Valley Basin are characterized by a wide variety of climatological, hydrological, and geological conditions. The Central Valley TRT used the Jepson floristic ecoregions defined by Hickman (1993) as a starting point for salmon ecoregions, but modified them to account for the effect of springs, which are influential on salmonids, but less influential to upland plants. These salmonid ecoregions are referred to herein as "Diversity Groups". The Central Valley TRT defined a "basalt and porous lava" Diversity Group that comprises the streams that historically supported winter-run Chinook salmon. All of these streams receive large inflows of cold water from springs through the summer, upon which winter-run Chinook salmon depended. This region excludes streams south of Battle Creek, but would include the part of the Upper Sacramento drainage used by winter-run, and part of the Modoc Plateau region. The southern part of the Cascades region (i.e., the drainages of Mill, Deer, and Butte creeks) is added to the Sierra Nevada region, but the Sierra Nevada region is divided into northern and southern parts (split somewhat arbitrarily south of the Mokelumne River). This split reflects the greater importance of snowmelt runoff in the southern part, and distinguishes tributaries to the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. The Central Valley steelhead DPS has two additional salmonid ecoregions: the Suisun Bay region which consists of tributaries to or near Suisun Bay, where summer temperatures are moderated by the marine influence of nearby San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean; and the Central Western California ecoregion, which contains west-side San Joaquin Valley tributaries. A more detailed discussion of diversity group establishment and differentiation is presented in Lindley *et al.* (2004, 2007). The historic diversity group structure is presented in **Figure 16** for the Chinook salmon ESUs, and in **Figure 17** for the steelhead DPS in the Central Valley Domain.

Recovery and Management Units

In accordance with the foregoing considerations of population viability, ESU viability and Diversity Groups, the recovery strategy identifies and employs recovery units and management units. Within the context of the Central Valley Domain, the Diversity Groups represent recovery units, and individual populations represent management units.

As stated in NMFS (2006), a recovery unit is a special unit of the listed entity that is geographically or otherwise identifiable and is essential to the recovery of the entire listed entity (i.e., recovery units are individually necessary to conserve genetic robustness, demographic robustness, important life history stages, and other features necessary for long-term sustainability of the entire listed entity (i.e., the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and the Central Valley steelhead DPS).

As such, the Diversity Groups contain multiple population sources in a dynamic ecosystem subject to unpredictable stochastic events, such as pyroclastic events or wild fires.



Figure 16. Diversity Groups for the Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon ESUs in the Central Valley Domain. The Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon ESU Historically Occurred in the Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group, while Spring-run Chinook Salmon Occurred in all of the Diversity Groups Shown.



Figure 17. Historic Diversity Group Structure for the Central Valley Steelhead DPS in the Central Valley Domain. The Numbers Identifying Steelhead Populations Correspond to Table 1 in Lindley *et al.* (2006)

Every recovery unit is necessary for the long-term health and stability of the overall listed entities and every recovery unit must be recovered before the species can be delisted.

The Diversity Groups, delineated as recovery units, collectively cover the entire range of the species in the Central Valley Domain. The rationale for delineating Diversity Groups as recovery units includes the following:

- Re-establishing historical or maintaining current genetic flow
- Encompassing current and historical population and habitat distributions
- Ensuring conservation of the breadth of a species' genetic variability
- Facilitating meta-population dynamics

For this Recovery Plan, individual populations are delineated as management units. As such, these management units require different management (perhaps because of different threats in different geographic areas) that might be managed by different entities. However, each management unit is not necessarily essential to the conservation of the species, as is the case for each recovery unit.

Within the Central Valley Domain, therefore, a single recovery unit encompasses multiple management units. Each recovery unit (i.e., Diversity Group) must be conserved to ensure the long-term viability of the species. Each of the recovery units consists of several populations (excluding winter-run Chinook salmon). To achieve recovery within each recovery unit, only a subset of the populations might have to reach certain abundance estimates and threats-based criteria to be considered for de-listing.

Strategy for Success

Although providing a tremendous challenge, the complex and inter-related biologic, economic, social, and technological issues must be addressed in order to recover winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain. Recovery will be expensive and time-consuming, and will require changes in the management and monitoring of aquatic resources and habitats. Because of these challenges, the Recovery Plan requires an achievable strategy to select and implement recovery actions.

This Recovery Plan establishes a "directional" strategic approach to recovery. Because recovery of the two Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS will require implementation over an extended period of time, this Recovery Plan adopts a stepwise strategy which first addresses more urgent near-term needs, upon which to build toward full recovery. As this Recovery Plan is implemented over time, additional information will become available to help determine whether the threats have been abated, to further develop understanding of the linkages between threats and Chinook salmon and steelhead population responses, and to evaluate the viability of Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain. There will be a thorough review of the recovery actions implemented, and population and habitat condition responses, at the 5- and 10-year status reviews of the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS.

The Central Valley Domain recovery strategy is based on two major components: *foundational principles* and an *implementation approach*. Foundational principles are the tenets guiding selection and prioritization of actions. The implementation approach describes key aspects of the manner in which restoration actions will be implemented.

Foundational Principles

Foundational principles, as used in this Recovery Plan, are generally analogous to conceptual models or conceptual foundations reported elsewhere (e.g., ISG 2000; CALFED 1999), and are fundamental to the guidance of recovery actions for anadromous salmonids in the Central Valley Domain. The following foundational principles

are those presented in Williams (2006) as modified critical elements of the conceptual foundation described for the Columbia River Basin (ISG 2000):

- Restoration of Central Valley anadromous salmonids must address the entire natural and cultural ecosystem, which encompasses the continuum of freshwater, estuarine, and ocean habitats where salmonid fishes complete their life histories. This consideration includes human developments, as well as natural habitats.

- Sustained salmonid productivity requires a network of complex and interconnected habitats, which are created, altered, and maintained by natural physical processes in freshwater, the estuary, and the ocean. These diverse and high-quality habitats, which have been extensively degraded by human activities, are crucial for salmonid spawning, rearing, migration, maintenance of food webs, and predator avoidance. Ocean conditions, which are variable, are important in determining the overall patterns of productivity of salmon populations.

- Life history diversity, genetic diversity, and metapopulation organization are ways that salmonids adapt to their complex and connected habitats. These factors are the basis of salmonid productivity and contribute to the ability of salmonids to cope with environmental variation that is typical of freshwater and marine environments.

Implementation Approach

The approach of this Recovery Plan for winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain includes stakeholder cooperation, local initiatives, public support, and adaptive management and monitoring components.

Stakeholder Cooperation

Individual entities alone cannot achieve recovery of winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain. Partnerships and collaborations to achieve mutual goals and objectives will accelerate accomplishments, increase available resources, reduce duplication of efforts, encourage innovative solutions, improve communication, and increase public involvement and support through shared authority and ownership of habitat restoration actions (USFWS 2001). Both the Department of the Interior AFRP and the CALFED ERP plans contain processes for the building of partnerships to pursue restoration actions. Both the AFRP and the ERP continue to build partnerships and provide funds to local agencies and watershed groups, as well as other Federal and State agencies, to implement specific restoration actions throughout the Central Valley Domain. NMFS is actively engaged in both of these efforts, as well as with local agency and stakeholder efforts, and recognizes and encourages the need for the furtherance of partnerships to achieve the goals of the Recovery Plan. Achievement of these goals requires partnerships and depends upon the cooperation of all stakeholders and regulatory entities.

Local Initiatives

NMFS encourages local agencies and stakeholder groups to share or take the lead in implementing recovery and habitat restoration actions. Influences on individual fish populations are related to specific watersheds and locally controlled water management and land use. Local development and implementation of recovery actions is essential to the success of the Recovery Plan. NMFS supports, and therefore will participate in, locally-led collaborative efforts to develop and implement recovery actions within the Central Valley Domain.

Public Support

In addition to local, State and other Federal agencies, public support is necessary for the acceptance and successful implementation of the Recovery Plan for the Central Valley Domain. As stated by USFWS (2001), public sentiment is an indicator of perceived economic and social effects of restoration actions, and public support for an action will facilitate implementation and attract partners for future actions. NMFS will continue to provide and seek additional opportunities for the public to assist in identifying, planning and implementing recovery and habitat restoration actions.

Adaptive Management and Monitoring

NMFS' implementation of the Recovery Plan includes an adaptive management and monitoring component to increase the effectiveness of, and to address the scientific uncertainty associated with, specific restoration actions. The adaptive management component allows NMFS, as well as local water agencies and irrigation districts, municipal and county governmental agencies, watershed groups, and State and other Federal agencies, to learn from past experiences through experimentation or by altering actions based on their measured effectiveness. There will be a thorough review of the recovery actions implemented and their effectiveness reflected by population and habitat condition responses at the 5- and 10-year status reviews of the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS.

Within the framework of the Recovery Plan, NMFS has the flexibility to work with partners to develop and implement recovery actions to address specific problems as they arise, intensify, or as additional information becomes available regarding threats abatement, the linkages between threats and population responses, and the viability of Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain. This flexibility will facilitate the coordination of recovery action implementation to achieve maximal benefits to population viability and habitat restoration. The adaptive management and monitoring component of this Recovery Plan is necessary to provide this flexibility, and to provide a framework to obtain the appropriate types and amounts of data to evaluate the effectiveness of recovery actions and the progress toward recovery. Therefore, the adaptive management and monitoring program needs to address system-wide, watershed, population and action-specific scales.

System-wide, Watershed and Population Monitoring

Several monitoring programs and studies have been developed and implemented on the system-wide, watershed and population scales by a variety of agencies and organizations. CDFG has conducted numerous monitoring programs and activities dating back to the 1940s and 1950s. These programs and activities have included spawning stock escapement (from carcass counts), creel census and inland harvest surveys, ocean harvest records, juvenile emigration (RST) surveys, snorkel surveys and redd counts, among others. The Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) continues to conduct long-term and real time monitoring programs, coordinates monitoring and manages data with particular emphasis on the Bay/Delta system. Pursuant to the CVPIA, the Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program (CAMP) was prepared using a watershed-specific approach to evaluate long-term trends in anadromous fish. The AFRP has funded and implemented several watershed-specific and population-specific monitoring programs, including spawning stock escapement programs (e.g., VAKI Riverwatcher infrared and photo documentation monitoring) and instream flow evaluations, as well as site-specific habitat restoration actions. CALFED developed the Comprehensive Monitoring Assessment and Research Program (CMARP) to describe general monitoring, assessment and research needs for all of the CALFED programs.

Although each of these programs and monitoring activities provide important information to the overall status of the specific resources and their habitats of the Bay/Delta and its watersheds, they

can be generally characterized as being implemented on a project-by-project basis, and the need persists for more coordinated and comprehensive system-wide watershed and population monitoring. Moreover, several streams and associated populations within the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS within the Central Valley Domain have no existing monitoring surveys or programs.

Existing adult Chinook salmon escapement monitoring programs in the Central Valley are currently inadequate to estimate population status and evaluate population trends in a statistically valid manner for the following management purposes: (1) providing a sound basis for assessing recovery of listed stocks; (2) monitoring the success of restoration programs; (3) evaluating the contribution of hatchery fish to Central Valley populations; and (4) managing sustainable ocean and inland harvest (Allen 2005).

The need is even greater for the development and implementation of a comprehensive monitoring plan for steelhead populations throughout the Central Valley Domain. The Central Valley Domain TRT was unable to assess the status of the Central Valley steelhead DPS because nearly all of its approximately 80 populations are classified as data deficient, with a few exceptions that are closely associated with a hatchery (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

Until recently, hatchery marking programs for Central Valley anadromous salmonids have been inadequate to evaluate hatchery contributions to Central Valley populations. CDFG has initiated efforts to implement a constant fractional marking and tagging program for hatchery-produced anadromous salmonids within the Central Valley. The efficacy of this program depends, in part, on the tag recovery rates in the adult escapement surveys in order to determine hatchery contribution or straying rates among populations.

In addition to population status and trend evaluation, accurate estimation of adult Chinook salmon and steelhead spawner escapement is a necessary component of harvest management. Age and run-specific escapement data in the Central Valley are necessary to utilize more accurate models associated with ocean harvest management.

CALFED recently funded, as an ERP directed action, the development of a comprehensive Central Valley adult Chinook salmon escapement monitoring plan. The objective of this plan is to develop a long-term monitoring program to estimate the population status and trends in abundance of Central Valley Chinook salmon at the watershed level, in a statistically valid manner. The plan will include statistical review of current monitoring methods, recommendations for the improvement of existing programs, and will develop comprehensive databases linking escapement, hatchery production, and coded-wire tag data. The framework for the plan was developed by the Interagency Ecological Program's Central Valley Salmonid Escapement Project Work Team (CVSEPWT). Agencies involved in the development of the framework for the plan include CDFG, DWR, NMFS, USFWS, Reclamation, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, Yuba County Water Agency, and East Bay Municipal Utility District. Implementation of this monitoring plan is essential to provide the data necessary to evaluate system-wide, watershed, and population viability of Chinook salmon in the Central Valley Domain. Although providing essential contributions to meeting the needs of this Recovery Plan, the CVSEPWT monitoring plan most likely will need to be expanded or augmented in order to address the broad expanse of populations, watersheds and Diversity Groups associated with the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS throughout the Central Valley Domain. Moreover, a similar plan needs to be developed to provide the data necessary to evaluate threats abatement, the linkages between threats and population responses, and the viability of steelhead populations in the Central Valley Domain.

Watershed-level monitoring is necessary to evaluate the overall effects of multiple restoration actions within a single watershed. Monitoring at the watershed level should address population and/or lifestage-specific attributes of target populations and of selected habitat variables. Watershed-specific monitoring evaluations will contribute to the assessment of threats abatement and population responses.

In addition to monitoring necessary to evaluate population status, trends and progress toward recovery, the long-term effects of habitat restoration actions need to be assessed throughout the Central Valley Domain. Components that require monitoring include long-term changes in the characteristics of aquatic habitat, riverine channel configuration, riparian vegetation, floodplain structure and function, and other targeted recovery/restoration components (see Background and Appendix A).

Action-Specific Monitoring

Monitoring at each of the previously mentioned scales serves as the basis for evaluation of restoration action success, and progress toward recovery. Although inherently germane to monitoring at all scales, the following discussion (from SWRI 2000) is most explicitly applicable to specific recovery/habitat restoration actions.

A properly designed restoration monitoring program should: (1) indicate whether restoration actions were designed and implemented properly; (2) determine whether restoration objectives for each action were met; (3) identify target species' response to the actions (i.e., habitat changes); and (4) provide insight into ecosystem structure and function (Kershner 1997). The latter two points are especially important because this knowledge will be used to direct future actions and update this Recovery Plan through the use of adaptive management.

Three types of monitoring for restoration projects have been recommended (Kershner 1997): (1) *implementation monitoring*; (2) *effectiveness monitoring*; and (3) *validation monitoring*. *Implementation monitoring* is used to continuously evaluate the project design in the field to determine its appropriateness for achieving the desired result, and is a necessary component of most restoration projects. *Effectiveness monitoring* is used to determine how well the project achieved its desired results, and whether the restoration objectives were met. *Validation monitoring* is primarily focused on research and is used to verify the basic assumptions supporting effectiveness monitoring. Effectiveness monitoring and validation monitoring are necessary components of an adaptive management process.

The success of any restoration monitoring program is dependent on clear definition of its goals and objectives. An effective restoration goal should: (1) be achievable; (2) establish the purpose of the restoration action; and (3) indicate a desired future condition. The project objectives are specific, measurable, and quantifiable steps that are to be taken to accomplish the project goal(s). Each objective should establish the spatial and temporal scale in which relevant data will be collected, and should be developed in such a manner as to provide an indication of site-specific change from some baseline or reference condition. Because the monitoring program's sampling design, parameters of interest, and data analyses are dictated by its goals and objectives, the importance of clearly articulated restoration goals and objectives cannot be overstated.

By definition, habitat restoration projects include alteration, modification, or enhancement of some physical ecosystem component. Often, the parameters most directly influenced by these actions are physical in nature. Physical parameters affected by restoration actions may include hydraulic parameters (e.g., water depth and velocity), geomorphic (e.g., substrate), riparian (e.g., streamside vegetation), and chemical (e.g., water quality) attributes of the system. The scope of factors affected by restoration actions may encompass only instream parameters, only riparian parameters, or both. The physical

parameters selected also may include changes exhibited in habitat conditions or ecological processes/functions (e.g., sediment transport).

A restoration-monitoring program should identify the physical parameters that are expected to exhibit an observable and quantifiable response to the implemented action, and the expected direction and/or magnitude of anticipated change. A causal relationship should be established between the restoration action implemented and the physical parameters being monitored.

While some restoration actions are designed to induce a direct biological response, changes in biological parameters are often measured as secondary responses resulting from improved habitat conditions created by physical modifications or enhancements. Biological responses may be manifested by changes at one (or more) of several trophic levels, including:

- Individual (e.g., behavioral responses of a particular life stage)
- Ecological niche
- Population (e.g., size trends)
- Community (e.g., changes in dominant species populations)

In addition to physical parameters, a restoration-monitoring program should identify the biological parameters that are expected to exhibit an observable and quantifiable response to an action and the expected direction and/or magnitude of change. A causal relationship should be established between the restoration action implemented and the biological parameters being monitored.

The primary purpose of a habitat restoration monitoring program is to detect some level of change resulting from the restoration action. This point must be clearly articulated in the stated goals and objectives and accomplished through the: (1) experimental approach to monitoring; (2) specific data to be collected; and (3) data analyses to be performed. The research question(s) should be stated, and hypotheses should be presented to allow statistical verification of answers. Ten essential principles for conducting environmental field studies (Green 1979) include:

- State concisely to someone else the research question(s). Your results will be as coherent and as comprehensible as your initial conception of the problem
- Take replicate (multiple) samples within each combination of time, location, and any other controlled variable. Differences "among" can only be demonstrated by comparison to differences "within"
- Take an equal number of randomly allocated replicate samples for each combination of controlled variables (putting samples in "representative" or "typical" places is not random sampling)
- To test whether a condition has an effect, collect samples both where the condition is present and where the condition is absent, but all else is the same. An effect can only be demonstrated by comparison with a control or "reference site"
- Conduct preliminary sampling to provide a basis for evaluation of sampling design and statistical analysis options. Those who skip this step because they do not have enough time usually end up losing time
- Verify that the sampling device or method is sampling the population it is supposed to be sampling, and with equal and adequate efficiency over the entire range of sampling conditions to be encountered. Variation in efficiency of sampling from area to area biases among-area comparisons
- If the area to be sampled has large-scale environmental diversity, break the area into relatively homogenous sub-areas and allocate samples to each in proportion to

the size of the sub-area (e.g., employ stratified random sampling designs). If estimating abundance over the entire area, make the area allocation proportional to the number of organisms in the sub-area. If it is an estimate of total abundance over the entire area that is desired, make the allocation proportional to the number of organisms in the subarea

- Verify that the sample unit size is appropriate to the size, density, and spatial distribution of each organism being sampled. Then, estimate how many replicate samples are required to obtain the desired precision

- Test the data to determine whether the error variation is homogenous, normally distributed, and independent of the mean. If it is not, as will be the case for most field data, then (a) appropriately transform the data, (b) use a distribution-free (non-parametric) procedure, (c) use an appropriate sequential sampling design, or (d) test against simulated H_o data

- Having chosen the best statistical method to test the hypothesis, stick with the result. An unexpected or undesired result is not a valid reason for rejecting an appropriate analytical method and hunting for a "better" one

A well-documented, highly specific field protocol is important to ensure consistent data collection among technicians, seasons, years, etc. A standard operations procedure (SOP) should be developed to ensure that monitoring personnel are collecting data in a consisted manner from year-to-year and among personnel. To maximize consistency, monitoring personnel should have a good working knowledge of the project's goals and objectives and undergo sufficient training in the data collection procedures prior to conducting monitoring. In addition to learning the data collection protocols, field technicians should undergo safety training, especially when the project requires data collection in/near deep and/or fast-flowing river sections. Checklists and data sheets consistent with the SOP should be developed and standardized to help ensure that protocols are followed properly in the field. Quality control checks at regular intervals should be implemented throughout the data collection period.

In general, the type of data analyses utilized in restoration monitoring fall into one of two general categories: (1) qualitative; and (2) quantitative.

The type of analytical approach chosen may depend on such factors as the type of data collected and the target audience, and should be selected in consultation with a statistician. Qualitative approaches are relatively basic and typically involve visual assessments of data. Commonly used qualitative approaches include trend analyses of time-series photographs, and graphical (e.g., bar, pie, line) display of data. Qualitative analyses and reporting often are appropriate for a non-technical audience (e.g., public, policy/decision makers).

Quantitative assessments are more robust approaches to data analyses that provide a statistical interpretation of the results. Statistical interpretations depend largely on properly designed sampling plans. When properly implemented, statistical analyses may allow for an "absolute" measure of whether null hypotheses can be rejected. Because the range of available statistical applications is dependent on the type and amount of data collected, the statistical assumptions involved in the project, and the hypotheses being tested, the analytical approach should be developed in consultation with a statistician prior to data collection. In many cases, the success of a restoration action may be determined by the ability to reject, or fail to reject a null hypothesis; however, it is important to note that not all measures of restoration success can be determined using a statistical approach. In addition, it is important to understand and recognize the difference between "biological

significance" and "statistical significance" (Krebs 1989). Statistical significance, which determines whether a given result is attributable to chance, does not necessarily mean that the result is biologically/ecologically important or relevant. Conversely, a statistical approach may not always detect something that is biologically important.

Restoration success often depends on the analysis and reporting of results. This is especially true in the context of a large-scale, multi-dimensional approach, such as that intended by this Recovery Plan. Knowing whether the project was a failure, a success, or was marginally successful is key to a successful adaptive management approach. Lessons learned from failed restoration projects often provide information as useful as that gained from successful restoration projects. Information contained in the report should include documentation of approaches that worked as well as those that did not. To the extent possible, a restoration monitoring plan should be designed to collect information that will indicate the conditions under which it was most effective, as well as the conditions under which it was least effective. The monitoring findings can be, in turn, used in an adaptive management context to implement supplemental restoration actions, make recommendations regarding future monitoring, and/or guide the development of new projects.

Of primary interest to the post-implementation monitoring effort is addressing the hypotheses addressed by the action. For example, if the action reduces fall water temperatures in a reach of river, which is hypothesized to encourage earlier spawning in that particular reach, then subsequent to the appropriate data analyses, this hypothesis must be addressed. The data and their qualitative/quantitative analyses either fail to reject the null hypothesis (e.g., fail to show that the physical change in water temperature has any real effect on date of initial spawning) or support rejection of the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypotheses (e.g., that the reduction in fall water temperatures observed resulted in earlier initiation of spawning). After implementation of the action, post-action monitoring and data analyses need to fully address the original hypotheses associated with the restoration action.

Oftentimes, implementation of restoration actions and their post-implementation monitoring produce inconclusive results and, thus, associated hypotheses cannot be effectively addressed. Nevertheless, these initial efforts invariably fill previous data gaps and contribute to reducing uncertainties in key areas. It is important to document the filling of previous data gaps and reduction in uncertainties so that the design and scope of future restoration actions reflect this new knowledge.

This adaptive management and monitoring component of this Recovery Plan provides the flexibility to address specific problems as they arise, intensify, or as additional information becomes available regarding threats abatement, the linkages between threats and population responses, and the viability of Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley Domain. It also provides the framework to obtain the appropriate types and amounts of data to evaluate the effectiveness of recovery actions and the progress toward recovery. NMFS will continue to provide input and collaborate with the CVSEPWT to develop and implement the comprehensive Central Valley adult Chinook salmon escapement monitoring plan to provide the data necessary to evaluate system-wide, watershed, and population viability of Chinook salmon in the Central Valley Domain. Further, NMFS will provide input to this multi-agency effort regarding the need to expand or augment this program in order to address the broad expanse of populations, watersheds and Diversity Groups associated with the Chinook salmon ESUs, and to develop a plan to provide the data necessary to evaluate threats abatement, the linkages between threats and population responses, and the viability of steelhead populations in the Central Valley Domain.

In addition to the multi-agency led comprehensive escapement monitoring plans, NMFS will be actively engaged with local agencies and stakeholder groups in developing and implementing watershed-specific, population-specific, and habitat restoration action-specific monitoring plans. NMFS believes that it is critically important to participate in locally-led collaborative efforts of local communities, State and Federal entities, and other stakeholder groups in order to provide input to the development and implementation of monitoring plans to help ensure that they are conducted within the adaptive management and monitoring framework of this Recovery Plan.

APPLIED STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

For the Central Valley Domain, the TRT applied the strategic framework components of population and ESU viability to winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead. The following is taken directly from the TRT report (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon

All four historical populations of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon are "extinct" in their historical spawning range. The upper Sacramento, McCloud and Pit River populations had spawning and rearing habitat far upstream of impassable Keswick and Shasta dams, although these populations were apparently in poor condition even before the construction of Shasta dam in the 1940s (Moffett 1949). Winter-run Chinook salmon no longer inhabit Battle Creek as a self-sustaining population.

The population of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon that now spawns below Keswick Dam is at moderate extinction risk according to the Population Viability Analyses (PVA), and at low risk according to the other criteria. Since roughly the mid-1990s, this population has been growing. At present, the population easily satisfies the low-risk criteria for population size, population decline, and catastrophe, but hatchery influence is a concern.

The Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU does not currently satisfy the representation and redundancy rule because it has only one population, and that population spawns outside of the ecoregion where it evolved. For the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU to satisfy the representation and redundancy rule, at least two populations would need to be re-established in the basalt-and-porous-lava region.

Obviously, an ESU represented by a single population at moderate risk of extinction is at high risk of extinction over the long run. A single catastrophe could extirpate the entire Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, if its effects persisted for four or more years.

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon

Perhaps 15 of the 18 or 19 historical populations of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon are extinct, with their entire historical spawning habitats behind various impassable dams (Lindley *et al*. 2007). Butte Creek and Deer Creek spring-run Chinook salmon are at low risk of extinction, satisfying both the PVA and other viability criteria. Mill Creek is at moderate extinction risk according to the PVA, but appears to satisfy the other viability criteria for low-risk status. Lindley *et al.* (2004) were uncertain whether Mill and Deer creek populations were each independent, or two parts of a single larger population. If viewed as a single population, Mill and Deer Creek spring-run Chinook salmon are at low extinction risk. Early-returning Chinook salmon persist within the FRFH population and spawn in the Father River below Oroville Dam and the Yuba River below Englebright Dam. The current status of these fish is not assessable due to insufficient data.

With demonstrably viable populations in only one of at least three Diversity Groups that historically contained them, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon fail the representation and redundancy rule for ESU viability. Historically, the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU spanned four ecoregions: the region used by winter-run Chinook salmon plus the northern and southern Sierra Nevada and the northwestern California region. There are two or three viable populations in the northern Sierra Nevada (Mill, Deer and Butte creeks). A few ephemeral or dependent populations are found in the Northwestern California region (e.g., Beegum and perhaps Clear creeks). Spring-run Chinook salmon have been entirely extirpated from both the basalt and porous lava region and the southern Sierra Nevada region. The current distribution of viable populations makes the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU vulnerable to catastrophic disturbance. All three extant independent populations are in basins whose headwaters lie within the debris and pyroclastic flow radii of Mt. Lassen. The current ESU structure is vulnerable to drought and even wildfires, which pose a significant threat to the ESU in its current configuration.

Central Valley Steelhead

There are few data with which to assess the status of any of the 81 Central Valley steelhead populations described by Lindley *et al.* (2006). With few exceptions, therefore, Central Valley steelhead populations are classified as data deficient (Lindley *et al*. 2007). The exceptions are restricted to streams with long-running hatchery programs such as Battle Creek and the Feather, American and Mokelumne rivers. In all cases, hatchery-origin fish likely comprise the majority of the natural spawning run, placing the natural populations at high risk of extinction.

Data are lacking to suggest that the Central Valley steelhead DPS is at low risk of extinction, or that there are viable populations of steelhead anywhere in the DPS. Conversely, there is evidence to suggest that the Central Valley steelhead DPS is at moderate or high risk of extinction (McEwan 2001; Good *et al.* 2005). Clearly, most of the historical habitat once available to steelhead has been lost (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1996; McEwan 2001; Lindley *et al.* 2006). Furthermore, the observation that anadromous *O. mykiss* are becoming rare in areas where they were probably once abundant McEwan (2001) indicates that an important component of life history diversity is being suppressed or lost. It should be noted, however, that habitat fragmentation, degradation, and loss are likely having a strong negative impact on many resident as well as anadromous *O. mykiss* populations (Hopelain 2003).

RECOVERY PLAN STRATEGY

Specific identification of how many actions of what type and magnitude, applied to which management units (i.e., populations) within the various Diversity Groups necessary to achieve recovery is ongoing, and will be updated at the 5 and 10-year status reviews for the two Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS within the Central Valley Domain. Therefore, this Plan establishes a "directional" strategic approach to recovery. This directional approach is similar to, and incorporates components of the strategic approaches adopted by NMFS for the three ESUs of salmon and steelhead within the Washington Lower Columbia Management Unit (NMFS 2005a), and for six ESUs of salmon and steelhead in the Willamette and Lower Columbia river basins (NMFS 2005b). This approach identifies actions that addresses threats, and establishes an adaptive management framework to adjust actions and goals as understanding of the efficacy of certain actions and ESU (and DPS) status improves over time.

Recovery of the two Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS within the Central Valley Domain will require implementation of the plan over an extended period of time. Recovery of individual Diversity Groups, on even individual

populations is likely to be a challenging and slow process (Lindley *et al.* 2007). Therefore, in order to achieve the overarching goal of recovery within the Central Valley Domain, this Recovery Plan adopts a stepwise strategy which first addresses more urgent near-term needs, upon which to build toward full recovery.

Near-term Strategic Approach

- *Secure all extant populations*. Both ESUs and the DPS are far short of being viable, and extant populations, even if not presently viable, may be needed for recovery. The Central Valley TRT recommends that every extant population be viewed as necessary for the recovery of the ESU and DPS. Wherever possible, the status of extant populations should be improved.

- *Begin collecting distribution and abundance data for O. mykiss in habitats accessible to anadromous fish*. This is fundamental to designing effective recovery actions and eventual delisting. Of equal importance is assessing the relationship of resident and anadromous forms of *O. mykiss*, including the role the resident fish play in population maintenance and persistence.

- *Minimize straying from hatcheries to natural spawning areas*. Even low levels of straying from hatchery populations to wild ones works against the goal of maximizing diversity within ESUs and populations. Current mark and recovery regimes do not generally allow reliable estimation of contributions of hatchery fish to natural spawning, so the Central Valley TRT recommends that all hatchery fish be marked in some way. A number of actions could reduce straying from hatcheries to natural areas, including replacing off-site releases with volitional releases from the hatchery, allowing all fish that attempt to return to the hatchery to do so, and reducing the amount of fish released (see CDFG and NMFS (2001), for a review of hatchery issues).

- *Conduct critical research on fish passage, reintroductions, and climate change*. To recover Central Valley salmon and ESUs and the steelhead DPS, some populations will need to be established in areas now blocked by dams or insufficient flows. Assuming that most of these dams will remain in place for the foreseeable future, it will be necessary to move fish around the dams.

- *Listed salmonid ESUs are likely to be conservation-reliant* (Scott *et al*. 2005). It seems highly unlikely that enough habitat can be restored in the foreseeable future such that Central Valley salmonid ESUs (and DPS) could be expected to persist without continued conservation management. Rather, it may be possible to restore enough habitat such that ESUs (and DPS) can persist with appropriate management, which should focus on maintaining ecological processes at the landscape level.

Long-term Strategic, Directional Approach

Strategies for Achieving Recovery at the ESU/DPS Level

- Every Diversity Group that historically existed should have a high probability of persistence.

- As a strategy for achieving recovery, until all ESU viability criteria have been achieved, no population should be allowed to deteriorate in its probability of persistence.

- ❑ As a strategy for achieving recovery, high levels of recovery should be attempted in more populations than identified in the Diversity Group viability criteria because not all attempts will be successful.

Strategies for Achieving Recovery at the Diversity Group Level

- ❑ Individual populations within a Diversity Group should have persistence probabilities consistent with a high probability of Diversity Group persistence.

- ❑ Within a Diversity Group, the populations restored/maintained at viable status or above should be selected to:

  - Allow for normative meta-population processes, including the viability of "core" populations, which are defined as the most productive populations.

  - Allow for normative evolutionary processes, including the retention of the genetic diversity represented in relatively unmodified historic gene pools.

  - Minimize susceptibility to catastrophic events.

Recovery Goals, Objectives and Criteria

"Merely increasing a species' numbers, range and abundance does not ensure its long-term health and sustainability; only by alleviating threats can lasting recovery be achieved."

- Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance (NMFS 2006)

RECOVERY GOALS

The overarching goal of this Recovery Plan is the removal of the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and Central Valley steelhead DPS in the Central Valley Domain from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (50 C.F.R. 17.11). The objectives and criteria to accomplish this goal builds upon the technical input and guidance provided by the Central Valley TRT, and much of the following discussion is taken directly from information developed by the TRT (Lindley *et al.* 2004; 2006; 2007).

Threatened and endangered species recovery plan guidance (NMFS 2006) describes the recovery planning goal as recovery and long-term sustainability of an endangered or threatened species and, therefore, delisting of the species. Further, NMFS (2006) states that goals usually can be subdivided into discrete component objectives which, collectively, describe the conditions (criteria) necessary for achieving the goal. Simply stated, recovery objectives are the parameters of the goal, and criteria are the values for those parameters. The objectives and related criteria, representing the components of the recovery goal, identify mechanisms for pursuing the goal (including necessary recovery actions) and allows confirmation when the goal has been reached.

According to NMFS (2006), recovery and long-term sustainability of an endangered or threatened species require:

- Adequate reproduction for replacement of losses due to natural mortality factors (including disease and stochastic events)
- Sufficient genetic robustness to avoid inbreeding depression and allow adaptation
- Sufficient habitat (type, amount, and quality) for long-term population maintenance
- Elimination or control of threats (this may also include having adequate regulatory mechanisms in place)

ESU (AND DPS) DIVERSITY GROUP AND POPULATION OBJECTIVES

Implementation of the Recovery Plan is designed to ultimately achieve objectives for the ESUs (and DPS) at the Diversity Group level, and at the population level for the four VSP criteria of abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure. Objectives addressing these requirements include demographic parameters, reduction or elimination of threats to the species (the listing factors), and any other particular vulnerability or biological needs inherent to the species. The Central Valley TRT described these objectives in a general sense, and NMFS expects that more detailed objectives and accompanying criteria will be developed over the next several years as part of recovery plan implementation.

ESU/DPS and Diversity Group Objectives

ESU/DPS viability depends on the number of populations within the ESU/DPS, their individual status, their spatial arrangement with respect to each other and sources of catastrophic disturbance, and diversity of the populations and their habitats. In the most general terms, ESU/DPS viability increases with the number of populations, the viability of these populations, the diversity of the populations, and the diversity of habitats that they occupy. Each of the Diversity Groups must achieve recovery in order for the ESUs and DPS to be considered to achieve recovery. Thus, an overall objective is to achieve recovery in each of the Diversity Groups.

In order for the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS to achieve recovery, each Diversity Group must be represented, and population redundancy within the groups must be met to achieve Diversity Group recovery, therefore, Diversity Group objectives include: (1) a minimum of two viable populations of winter-run Chinook salmon within the winter-run Chinook salmon Diversity Group; (2) a minimum of two viable populations of spring-run Chinook salmon within each of the four spring-run Chinook salmon Diversity Groups, with the exception of the Northwestern California Diversity Group which historically did not contain independent spring-run Chinook salmon populations. For the Northwestern California Diversity Group, observed occupancy will suffice rather than viability, as defined; and (3) a minimum of two viable steelhead populations within each of six the steelhead Diversity Groups.

In addition to population considerations, in order for the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS to achieve recovery each Diversity Group must meet habitat objectives:

- The spatial distribution and productive capacity of freshwater, estuarine, and marine habitats should be sufficient to maintain viable populations identified for recovery

- The diversity of habitats for recovered populations should resemble historic conditions given expected natural disturbance regimes (wildfire, flood, volcanic eruptions, etc.). Historic conditions represent a reasonable template for a viable population; the closer the habitat resembles the historic diversity, the greater the confidence in its ability to support viable populations

- At a large scale, habitats should be protected and restored, with a trend toward an appropriate range of attributes for salmonid viability. Freshwater, estuarine, and marine habitat attributes should be maintained in a non-deteriorating state

Population Objectives

Consistent with the directional strategic approach to achieve recovery, this Recovery Plan establishes objectives for the viability of individual populations, similar to NMFS (2005b) as follows.

Productivity and Abundance

- In general, viable populations should demonstrate a combination of population growth rate, productivity, and abundance that produces an acceptable probability of population persistence. Various approaches for evaluating population productivity and abundance combinations may be acceptable, but must meet reasonable standards of statistical rigor

- A population with non-negative growth rate and an average abundance approximately equivalent to estimated historic average abundance should be considered to be in the highest persistence category. The estimate of historic abundance should be credible, the estimate of current abundance should be averaged over several generations, and the growth rate should be estimated with adequate statistical confidence

Within-Population Spatial Structure

The spatial structure of a population must support the population at the desired productivity, abundance, and diversity levels through short-term environmental perturbations, longer-term environmental oscillations, and natural patterns of disturbance regimes. The metrics and benchmarks for evaluating the adequacy of a population's spatial structure specifically address:

- Quantity: Spatial structure should be large enough to support growth and abundance, and diversity criteria

- Quality: Underlying habitat spatial structure should be within specified habitat quality limits for life-history activities such as spawning, rearing, migration, or a combination, taking place within the patches

- Connectivity: Spatial structure should have permanent or appropriate seasonal connectivity to allow adequate migration between spawning, rearing, and migration patches

- Dynamics: The spatial structure should not deteriorate in its ability to support the population. The processes creating spatial structure are dynamic, so structure will be created and destroyed, but the rate of flux should not exceed the rate of creation over time

- Catastrophic Risk: the spatial structure should be geographically distributed in such a way as to minimize the probability of a significant portion of the structure being lost because of a single catastrophic event, either anthropogenic or natural

Within-Population Diversity

Sufficient life-history diversity must exist to sustain a population through short-term environmental perturbations and to provide for long-term evolutionary processes. The metrics and benchmarks for evaluating the diversity of a population should be evaluated over multiple generations and include:

- Substantial proportion of the diversity of a life-history trait(s) that existed historically

- Gene flow and genetic diversity should be similar to historic (natural) levels and origins

- Successful utilization of habitats throughout the habitat
- Resilience and adaptation to environmental fluctuations

RECOVERY CRITERIA

The ESA requires that recovery plans, to the maximum extent practicable, incorporate objective, measurable criteria which, when met, would result in a determination in accordance with the provisions of the ESA that the species be removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants (50 CFR 17.11 and 17.12). The recovery criteria constitute the standards upon which the decision to reclassify or delist a species will be based.

While this plan establishes some objective, measurable criteria specific to both population demographics and threat abatement, it is not practicable to provide measurable criteria for all demographic and threat-based factors at this time. Therefore, qualitative delisting criteria are provided in such instances.

Evaluating a species for potential delisting requires an explicit analysis of population or demographic parameters (the biological recovery criteria) and also of threats under the five ESA listing factors in ESA section 4(a)(1) (threats criteria). Together, these make up the "objective, measurable criteria" required under section 4(f)(1)(B).

These criteria represent the best scientific analysis incorporating the most current understanding of the ESU and DPS and their populations. As this Recovery Plan is implemented, additional information will become available that can increase certainty about whether the threats have been abated, whether improvements in populations and ESU and DPS status have occurred, and whether linkages between threats and changes in Chinook salmon and steelhead status are understood. These recovery criteria will be assessed through the adaptive management program for this Recovery Plan, and there will be a thorough review of the criteria at the 5 and 10-year status reviews of the Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS. NMFS will apply the Recovery Plan's criteria when it makes a decision whether to delist the ESUs and DPS.

Biological Recovery Criteria

The delisting criteria presented below include components that address population viability and trends, as well as components addressing threats to the species, including those identified under the factor analyses conducted when the species were listed under the ESA. It is possible to determine if one has met these criteria or not by examining the population trends, the success of threat abatement and/or the extent of implementation of mitigation measures. When the demographic recovery criteria (e.g. total population size, population structure and geographic distribution) are modified at the 5 and 10-year status review of the two Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS, they will reflect the population demographics and the control of threats (as indicated below), before delisting and removing the protections of the ESA.

In order to delist the winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon ESUs and the steelhead DPS, the demographics must be consistent with viable wild populations within their respective Diversity Groups.

- Diversity Group population demographics, including but not limited to total population size, population structure, and geographic distribution, as informed by modeling results, indicating that the ESU or DPS is viable
- Two or more populations within each of the Diversity Groups, as described above, for each ESU and DPS are stable or increasing

In addition to consideration of the conceptual framework provided by McElhany *et al.* (2000), the Central Valley TRT further assessed population viability with quantitative extinction models (PVA) or criteria relating to population size, population growth rate, the occurrence of catastrophic declines, and the degree of hatchery influence. Then, populations were classified into one of six categories, including "extinct", "extinct in the wild", "high", "moderate", and "low" extinction risk, or "data deficient" following the general approach of the IUCN (1994) as modified for Pacific salmonids by Allendorf *et al.* (1997).

The goal of recovery activities should be to achieve at least a low risk of extinction for focal populations. The Central Valley TRT assumed that a 5 percent risk of extinction in 100 years is an acceptably low extinction risk for populations. The following population viability criteria discussion is taken directly from the Central Valley TRT report (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

The Central Valley TRT incorporated the four VSP parameters into assessments of population viability, and two sets of population viability criteria were developed, expressed in terms of extinction risk. The first set of criteria deal with direct estimates of extinction risk from population viability models. If data are available and such analyses exist and are deemed reasonable for individual populations, such assessments may be efficient for assessing extinction risk. The Central Valley TRT used a population viability assessment based on the random-walk-with-drift model extended to account for observation error (Lindley *et al.* 2007). In addition, the Central Valley TRT also provided simpler criteria, both of which are presented in **Table 6**.

The simpler criteria include population size (and effective population size), population decline, catastrophic rate and effect, and hatchery influence. The effective population size criteria in the second row of Table 6 relate to loss of genetic diversity. Very small populations, for example with *Ne* < 50, suffer severe inbreeding depression (Franklin 1980; Soulé 1980 *in* Lindley *et al.* 2007), and normally outbred populations with such low *Ne* have a high risk of extinction from this inbreeding. Somewhat larger, but still small, populations can be expected to lose variation in quantitative traits through genetic drift faster than it can be replaced by mutation. With future research, it may be possible to define population size targets that conserve genetic variation and

Table 6. Criteria for assessing the Level of Risk of Extinction for Populations of Pacific Salmonids, Applied to the Chinook Salmon ESUs and the Steelhead DPS in the Central Valley Domain (from Lindley *et al.* 2007)

	Risk of Extinction		
Criterion	High	Moderate	Low
Extinction risk from PVA	> 20% within 20 years	> 5% within 100 years	< 5% within 100 years
	– or any ONE of –	– or any ONE of –	– or ALL of –
Population size[a]	$N_e \leq 50$	$50 < N_e \leq 500$	$N_e > 500$
	–or–	–or–	–or–
	$N \leq 250$	$250 < N \leq 2500$	$N > 2500$
Population decline	Precipitous decline[b]	Chronic decline or depression[c]	No decline apparent or probable
Catastrophe, rate and effect[d]	Order of magnitude decline within one generation	Smaller but significant decline[e]	not apparent
Hatchery influence[f]	High	Moderate	Low

[a] Census size N can be used if direct estimates of effective size N_e are not available, assuming $N_e/N = 0.2$.
[b] Decline within last two generations to annual run size ≤ 500 spawners, or run size > 500 but declining at ≥ 10% per year. Historically small but stable population not included.
[c] Run size has declined to ≤ 500, but now stable.
[d] Catastrophes occuring within the last 10 years.
[e] Decline < 90% but biologically significant.
[f] See Figure 1 for assessing hatchery impacts.

account for migration and genetic structuring within ESUs.

The population decline criteria are intended to capture demographic risks. The rationale behind the population decline criteria are fairly straightforward–severe and prolonged declines to small run sizes are strong evidence that a population is at risk of extinction.

The overall goal of the catastrophe criteria is to capture a sudden shift from a low risk state to a higher risk state. Catastrophes are defined as instantaneous declines in population size due to events that occur randomly in time, by contrast to regular environmental variation. A high risk catastrophic event is created by a 90 percent decline in population size over one generation. A moderate risk catastrophic event is one that is smaller but biologically significant, such as a year-class failure.

The spawning of hatchery fish in the wild is a potentially serious threat to the viability of natural populations. Population genetics theory predicts that fish hatcheries can negatively impact wild populations when hatchery fish spawn in the wild. In assessing the genetic impact of immigration on a population, considerations include the source of the immigrants, duration of the impact, the number of immigrants relative to the size of the recipient population, and how divergent the immigrants are from the recipient population. Definitions of the manner in which different scenarios relate to extinction risk for natural populations are summarized in **Figure 18.** Application of these definitions can result in a low-risk classification even with moderate amounts of straying from best-practices hatcheries, as long as other risk measures are acceptable (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

Estimators for the various viability criteria are presented in **Table 7** (from Lindley *et al.* 2007). The average run size is computed as the mean of up to the three most recent generations, if that much data are available. Mean population size is estimated as the product of the mean run size and the average generation time. Population growth (or decline) rate is estimated from the slope of the natural logarithm of spawners versus time for the most recent 10 years of spawner count data. The fraction of naturally-spawning fish of hatchery origin is the mean fraction over one to four generations.



Figure 18. Extinction Risk Levels Corresponding to Different Amount, Duration and Source of Hatchery Strays.

Green bars indicate the range of low risk, yellow bars moderate risk, and red areas indicate high risk. Which chart to use depends on the relationship between the source and recipient populations. (A) hatchery strays are from a different ESU than the wild population. (B) Hatchery strays are from the same ESU but from a different diversity group within the ESU. (C) Hatchery strays are from the same ESU and diversity group, but the hatchery does not employ "best management practices." (D) Hatchery strays are from the same ESU and diversity group, and the hatchery employs "best management practices." (from Lindley *et al.* 2007)

Table 7. Estimation Methods and Data Requirements for Population Metrics

S_t denotes the number of spawners in year t; g is mean generation time, assumed as three years for California salmon (from Lindley *et al.* 2007)

Metric	Estimator	Data	Criterion
$\hat{S}_t$	$\sum_{i=t-g+1}^{t} S_i/g$	$\geq$ 3 years spawning run estimates	Population decline
N_e	$N \times 0.2$ or other	varies	Population size
N	$\hat{S}_t \times g$	$\geq$ 3 years spawning run estimates	Population size
Population growth rate (% per year)	slope of $\log(S_t)$ v. time $\times 100$	10 years S_t	Population decline
c	$100 \times (1 - \min(N_{t+g}/N_t))$	time series of N	Catastrophe
h	average fraction of natural spawners of hatchery origin	mean of 1-4 generations	Hatchery influence

Threat Abatement Criteria

It is imperative that threats to the species be controlled prior to delisting. This includes all threats identified at the time of listing, as well as any new factors identified since listing. Since listing, numerous additional threats have been identified and prioritized for each of the Diversity Groups and individual populations of the winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon ESUs, and the steelhead DPS within the Central Valley Domain (Introduction, Appendix A).

NMFS proposes that, to determine that the affected ESU is recovered to the point that it no longer requires the protections of the ESA, the listing factors should be addressed according to specific criteria identified for each of them so that delisting is not likely to result in re-emergence of the threat. It is possible that current perceived threats will become insignificant in the future because of changes in the natural environment, changes in the way threats affect the entire life cycle of salmon, or the success of actions intended to ameliorate the threat. Consequently, NMFS expects that the significance of threats will change over time. It is also possible that new threats may be identified. During the status reviews, NMFS will evaluate and review the listing factor criteria under conditions at that time.

NMFS is providing the specific criteria listed below for each of the relevant listing/delisting factors to help to ensure that underlying causes of decline have been addressed and mitigated prior to considering a species for delisting. The explicit listing factor (threats) criteria described below correspond to the listing factors identified for winter- and spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in this Recovery Plan, and to the stressors described in Appendix A. For example, this Recovery Plan describes the impacts on salmon that have resulted from habitat destruction by dam construction, hydropower operation and harvest management. Accordingly, NMFS expects that if this Recovery Plan's proposed actions to address the threats and limiting factors are implemented, they will make substantial progress toward meeting the listing factor (threats) criteria specified herein.

Listing Factors and Threats

Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon

Several factors have contributed to the decline of winter-run Chinook salmon through degradation of spawning, rearing, and migration habitats. The primary factors included in the listing of winter-run Chinook salmon were blockage of historical habitat by Shasta and Keswick dams, warm water releases from Shasta Dam, juvenile and adult passage constraints at RBDD, water exports in the southern Delta, heavy metal contamination from Iron Mountain Mine, high ocean harvest rates and entrainment in a large number of unscreened or poorly screened water diversions (NMFS 1997). Other factors include smaller water manipulation facilities and dams, loss of rearing habitat in the

lower Sacramento River and Delta from levee construction, marshland reclamation, interaction with and predation by introduced species, adverse flow conditions, high summer water temperatures and vulnerability to drought (NMFS 1997). Since listing, some of these threats have been addressed, although numerous additional threats have been identified and prioritized (Appendix A). Each of the threats criteria described below is related to one or more of the major factors limiting recovery described and listed in the NMFS 2006 Report to Congress on the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF).

Below each specific threat abatement criterion, actions and/or general goals related to eliminating or minimizing the threat are described.

Factor WR-1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range

Dams in the Central Valley have: (1) blocked access to the entire historical spawning grounds; (2) modified natural flow regimes and altered water temperatures; and (3) reduced habitat quality and complexity.

To determine that the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, threats to habitat and the risks posed to the abundance, productivity, and especially to the spatial structure and diversity of the ESU should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion WR-1.1: Address Threats to Spawning Grounds

- ❑ As appropriate or necessary to support region-wide recovery goals, passage obstructions (e.g. dams) should be removed or modified to restore fish access or improve passage to historically accessible habitat
- ❑ Instream flow conditions and programs that support salmon rearing, spawning and migration needs and meet the winter-run Chinook salmon population targets are achieved

Criterion WR-1.2: Address Threats to Water Quality

- ❑ Deleterious effects of stormwater runoff are eliminated or controlled so as not to impair water quality and quantity in salmonid streams or the riparian habitats supporting them
- ❑ Agricultural practices are implemented and programs are in place to protect and restore riparian areas, floodplains and stream channels, and to protect water quality from sediment, pesticide, herbicide and fertilizer runoff
- ❑ Urban and rural development, including land use conversion from agriculture and forest land to developed areas, does not impair water quality or result in dysfunctional stream conditions
- ❑ The effects of toxic contaminants on salmonid fitness and survival in the Delta, lower mainstem rivers, and nearshore ocean are sufficiently limited and programs are in place to ensure continued limiting so as not to affect recovery
- ❑ Programs are in place to ensure continued protection and restoration of water quality

Criterion WR-1.3: Address Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

- ❑ Instream flow conditions and programs that support salmon rearing, spawning and migration needs and meet the winter-run Chinook salmon population targets are achieved
- ❑ Channel function, including vegetated riparian areas, instream wood, streambank stability, off-channel and side-channel habitats, natural substrate and sediment processes, and channel complexity is restored to provide rearing, migration, and spawning habitat to meet the Recovery Plan's recovery goals

- Floodplain function and the availability of floodplain habitats for salmon is restored to a degree sufficient to support a viable ESU, including tidal swamp and marsh habitat in estuaries and the tidal freshwater portion of the lower rivers. This restoration should include connectivity between river and floodplain, and the restoration of impaired sediment delivery processes and conditions affecting both estuaries and lower mainstem rivers

- Nearshore processes are protected and restored so that ecological inputs (of sediment, insects, leaves and wood) to drift cells and mudflats function properly to support winter-run Chinook salmon and the species they prey upon

- Activities that dredge or fill in nearshore and river beds or harden streambanks are sufficiently mitigated

- Forest management practices that protect and restore watershed and stream functions are implemented on Federal, State, Tribal, and private lands and programs are in place to ensure continued mitigation

- Technical tools accurately assess the impacts of habitat management actions

Factor WR-2: Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes

Although overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific or educational purposes no longer appears to have a significant impact on winter-run Chinook salmon populations, continued assessment is warranted.

To determine that the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, any utilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion WR-2.1: Address Threats to Overutilization

- Fishery management plans for salmon ESUs are in place that (a) accurately account for total fishery mortality (i.e., both landed catch and non-landed mortalities) and constrain mortality rates for individual populations to levels that are consistent with achieving ESU viability (i.e., provide for adequate spawning escapement given intrinsic productivity for populations representative of the life history and major regional divisions in the ESU); and (b) are implemented so that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the ESU

- Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of fishery management actions

- Rules and regulations for fishery management actions are effectively enforced

Factor WR-3: Disease or Predation

Both naturally spawned and artificially propagated winter-run Chinook salmon are susceptible to threats from: (1) disease outbreaks caused by naturally occurring pathogens; and (2) predation.

To determine that the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, any disease or predation that threatens its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion WR-3.1: Address Threats from Disease Outbreaks

- Hatchery operations apply measures that reduce the risk that natural winter-run Chinook salmon populations are adversely affected by fish diseases and parasites

Criterion WR-3.2: Address Threats from Predation

- ❑ Suitable methods and levels of marine mammal control are identified and implemented to mitigate negative interactions with salmon where predation poses significant risks to recovery
- ❑ Populations of introduced game fish are managed such that competition with or predation on winter-run Chinook salmon does not impede salmon population recovery

Factor WR-4: Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

Despite Federal and non-Federal efforts and partnerships that have been implemented to help increase the abundance and productivity of winter-run Chinook salmon over the past 10 to 15 years, the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU remains at risk of extinction because the existing regulatory mechanisms do not provide sufficient certainty that efforts to reduce threats to the ESU will be fully funded or implemented.

To determine that the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, any inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms that threatens its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion WR-4.1. Address Threats Resulting from Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

- ❑ Regulatory mechanisms are in place to ensure that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the ESU
- ❑ Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of regulatory actions
- ❑ Rules and regulations for habitat protection and restoration are effectively enforced
- ❑ Fishery Management Plans are effectively enforced
- ❑ Habitat conditions, watershed functions and nearshore processes are protected and restored through land-use planning that guides human population growth and development
- ❑ Habitat conditions and watershed function are protected and restored through regulations that govern resource extraction such as timber harvest and gravel mining
- ❑ Habitat conditions, watershed functions and nearshore processes are protected and restored through land protection agreements as appropriate, where existing policy or regulations do not provide adequate protection
- ❑ Adequate resources, priorities, regulatory frameworks, and coordination mechanisms are established and/or maintained for effective enforcement of land and water use regulations that protect and restore habitats and marine and freshwater water bodies and for the effective management of fisheries
- ❑ Regulatory, control, and education measures to prevent additional exotic species invasions are in place

Factor WR-5: Other Natural and Manmade Factors Affecting its Continued Existence

Winter-run Chinook salmon are susceptible to natural and man-made threats caused by the effects of: (1) artificial propagation on the productivity and spatial structure of the ESU (i.e., fitness and productivity); (2) climate changes on El Niño ocean conditions and prolonged drought conditions; and (3) entrainment at unscreened water diversions.

To determine that the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, other natural and man-made threats to its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion WR-5.1. Address Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation

- ❑ Hatchery management plans are in place to ensure that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the ESU
- ❑ Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of hatchery management actions
- ❑ Rules and regulations for hatchery management and protection are effectively enforced
- ❑ Hatchery programs are operated in a manner that is consistent with individual watershed and region-wide recovery approaches; appropriate criteria are used for the integration of hatchery Chinook salmon populations and extant natural populations inhabiting watersheds where the hatchery fish return
- ❑ Hatcheries operate using appropriate ecological, genetic, and demographic risk containment measures for: (1) hatchery-origin adults returning to natural spawning areas; (2) release of hatchery juveniles; (3) handling of natural-origin adults at hatchery facilities; (4) withdrawal of water for hatchery use; (5) discharge of hatchery effluent; and (6) maintenance of fish health during their propagation in the hatchery
- ❑ Hatcheries mark or tag Chinook salmon so that they can be differentiated from natural Chinook salmon in fisheries, migratory areas, and as adults returning to hatcheries and natural spawning areas

Criterion WR-5.2. Address Threats Resulting from Climate Change

- ❑ Mechanisms are in place to reduce the incidence of, and impacts from, introduced, invasive, or exotic species
- ❑ Nutrient enrichment programs must be evaluated to determine where additional nutrient inputs can provide significant benefits
- ❑ Ecological functions of salmon, including their benefits in cycling ocean-derived nutrients into freshwater areas, are considered in fishery, hatchery, and habitat management
- ❑ Funded, active research that aids in predicting the effects of climate change on salmon recovery is in place and there are Federal and State commitments to respond to findings from the research

Criterion WR-5.3. Address Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

- ❑ Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility.
- ❑ Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.

Criterion WR – 5.4. Address Threats Resulting from Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Species

- ❑ Implement the management actions for addressing aquatic invasive species described in the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan.

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon

Listing factors and threats to Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon fall into three broad categories: loss of historical spawning habitat; degradation of remaining habitat; and threats to the genetic integrity of the wild spawning populations from the FRFH spring-run Chinook salmon production program and from spawning with naturally- and hatchery produced fall-run Chinook salmon. Since listing, a comprehensive list of additional threats has been developed.

Some major stressors to the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU include passage impediments/barriers, warm water temperatures for holding and rearing, limited quantity and quality of rearing habitat, predation, and entrainment. The complete prioritized list of life stage-specific stressors to this ESU is presented in Appendix A. Each of the threats criteria described below is related to one or more of the major factors limiting recovery described and listed in the NMFS 2006 Report to Congress on the PCSRF.

Factor SR-1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range

Dams in the Central Valley have: (1) blocked access to the entire historical spawning grounds; (2) modified natural flow regimes and altered water temperatures; and (3) reduced habitat quality and complexity.

To determine that the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, threats to habitat and the risks posed to the abundance, productivity, and especially to the spatial structure and diversity of the ESU should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion SR-1.1: Address Threats to Spawning Grounds

- ❑ As appropriate or necessary to support region-wide recovery goals, passage obstructions (e.g. dams) are removed or modified to restore fish access or improve passage to historically accessible habitat
- ❑ Instream flow conditions and programs that support salmon rearing, spawning and migration needs and meet the spring-run Chinook salmon population targets are achieved

Criterion SR-1.2: Address Threats to Water Quality

- ❑ Deleterious effects of stormwater runoff are eliminated or controlled so as not to impair water quality and quantity in salmonid streams or the riparian habitats supporting them
- ❑ Agricultural practices are implemented and programs are in place to protect and restore riparian areas, floodplains and stream channels, and to protect water quality from sediment, pesticide, herbicide and fertilizer runoff
- ❑ Urban and rural development, including land use conversion from agriculture and forest land to developed areas, does not impair water quality or result in dysfunctional stream conditions
- ❑ The effects of toxic contaminants on salmonid fitness and survival in the Delta, lower mainstem rivers, and nearshore ocean are sufficiently limited and programs are in place to ensure continued limiting so as not to affect recovery
- ❑ Programs are in place to ensure continued protection and restoration of water quality

Criterion SR-1.3: Address Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

- ❑ Channel function, including vegetated riparian areas, instream wood, streambank stability, off-channel and side-channel habitats, natural substrate and sediment processes, and channel complexity is restored to provide rearing, migration, and spawning habitat to meet the Recovery Plan's recovery goals

- Floodplain function and the availability of floodplain habitats for salmon is restored to a degree sufficient to support a viable ESU, including tidal swamp and marsh habitat in estuaries and the tidal freshwater portion of the lower rivers. This restoration should include connectivity between river and floodplain, and the restoration of impaired sediment delivery processes and conditions affecting both estuaries and lower mainstem rivers

- Nearshore processes are protected and restored so that ecological inputs (of sediment, insects, leaves and wood) to drift cells and mudflats function properly to support Chinook salmon and the species they prey upon

- Activities that dredge or fill in nearshore and river beds or harden streambanks are sufficiently mitigated

- Forest management practices that protect and restore watershed and stream functions are implemented on Federal, State, Tribal, and private lands and programs are in place to ensure continued mitigation

- Technical tools accurately assess the impacts of habitat management actions

Factor SR-2: Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes

Although overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific or educational purposes no longer appears to have a significant impact on spring-run Chinook salmon populations, continued assessment is warranted.

To determine that the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, any utilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion SR-2.1: Address Threats to Overutilization

- Fishery management plans for salmon ESUs are in place that (a) accurately account for total fishery mortality (i.e., both landed catch and non-landed mortalities) and constrain mortality rates for individual populations to levels that are consistent with achieving ESU viability (i.e., provide for adequate spawning escapement given intrinsic productivity for populations representative of the life history and major regional divisions in the ESU); and (b) are implemented so that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the ESU

- Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of fishery management actions

- Rules and regulations for fishery management actions are effectively enforced

Factor SR-3: Disease or Predation

Both naturally spawned and hatchery-reared spring-run Chinook salmon are susceptible to threats from: (1) disease outbreaks caused by naturally occurring pathogens; and (2) predation.

To determine that the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, any disease or predation that threatens its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion SR-3.1: Address Threats from Disease Outbreaks

- Hatchery operations apply measures that reduce the risk that natural spring-run Chinook salmon populations are adversely affected by fish diseases and parasites

Criterion SR-3.2: Address Threats from Predation

- ❑ Suitable methods and levels of marine mammal control are identified and implemented to mitigate negative interactions with salmon where predation poses significant risks to recovery
- ❑ Populations of introduced game fish are managed such that competition with or predation on spring-run Chinook salmon does not impede salmon population recovery

Factor SR-4: Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanism

Despite Federal and non-Federal efforts that have been implemented to help increase the abundance of spring-run Chinook salmon over the past few years, the existing protective efforts are inadequate to ensure the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is no longer at risk of becoming endangered. The existing regulatory mechanisms do not provide sufficient certainty that efforts to reduce threats will be fully funded or implemented, nor do these actions currently occur at a scale that is adequate to protect and conserve the entire ESU.

To determine that the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, any inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms that threatens its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion SR-4.1. Address Threats Resulting from Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

- ❑ Regulatory mechanisms are in place to ensure that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the ESU
- ❑ Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of regulatory actions
- ❑ Rules and regulations for habitat protection and restoration are effectively enforced
- ❑ Fishery Management Plans are effectively enforced
- ❑ Habitat conditions, watershed functions and nearshore processes are protected and restored through land-use planning that guides human population growth and development
- ❑ Habitat conditions and watershed function are protected and restored through regulations that govern resource extraction such as timber harvest and gravel mining
- ❑ Habitat conditions, watershed functions and nearshore processes are protected and restored through land protection agreements as appropriate, where existing policy or regulations do not provide adequate protection
- ❑ Adequate resources, priorities, regulatory frameworks, and coordination mechanisms are established and/or maintained for effective enforcement of land and water use regulations that protect and restore habitats and marine and freshwater water bodies and for the effective management of fisheries
- ❑ Regulatory, control, and education measures to prevent additional exotic species invasions are in place

Factor SR-5: Other Natural and Manmade Factors Affecting its Continued Existence

Spring-run Chinook salmon are susceptible to natural and man-made threats caused by the effects of: (1) artificial propagation on the genetic integrity of the ESU; (2) climate changes on El Niño ocean conditions and prolonged drought

conditions; and (3) entrainment at unscreened water diversions.

To determine that the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is recovered, other natural and man-made threats to its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion SR-5.1. Address Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation

- ❑ Hatchery management plans are in place to ensure that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the ESU
- ❑ Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of hatchery management actions
- ❑ Rules and regulations for hatchery management and protection are effectively enforced
- ❑ Hatchery programs are operated in a manner that is consistent with individual watershed and region-wide recovery approaches; appropriate criteria are used for the integration of hatchery Chinook salmon populations and extant natural populations inhabiting watersheds where the hatchery fish return
- ❑ Hatcheries operate using appropriate ecological, genetic, and demographic risk containment measures for: (1) hatchery-origin adults returning to natural spawning areas; (2) release of hatchery juveniles; (3) handling of natural-origin adults at hatchery facilities; (4) withdrawal of water for hatchery use; (5) discharge of hatchery effluent; and (6) maintenance of fish health during their propagation in the hatchery
- ❑ Hatcheries mark or tag Chinook salmon so that they can be differentiated from natural Chinook salmon in fisheries, migratory areas, and as adults returning to hatcheries and natural spawning areas

Criterion SR-5.2. Address Threats Resulting from Climate Change

- ❑ Mechanisms are in place to reduce the incidence of, and impacts from, introduced, invasive, or exotic species
- ❑ Nutrient enrichment programs must be evaluated to determine where additional nutrient inputs can provide significant benefits
- ❑ Ecological functions of salmon, including their benefits in cycling ocean-derived nutrients into freshwater areas, are considered in fishery, hatchery, and habitat management
- ❑ Funded, active research that aids in predicting the effects of climate change on salmon recovery is in place and there are Federal and State commitments to respond to findings from the research

Criterion SR-5.3. Address Threats Resulting from Unscreened Water Diversions

- ❑ Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility.
- ❑ Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.

Criterion SR – 5.4. Address Threats Resulting from Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Species

- ❑ Implement the management actions for addressing aquatic invasive species described in the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan.

Central Valley Steelhead

Threats to Central Valley steelhead are similar to those for Central Valley Spring-run Chinook salmon and fall into three broad categories: loss of historical spawning habitat, degradation of remaining habitat, and threats to the genetic integrity of the wild spawning populations from hatchery steelhead production programs in the Central Valley. Some major stressors to the Central Valley steelhead DPS include passage impediments/barriers, warm water temperatures for rearing, hatchery effects, limited quantity and quality of rearing habitat, predation, and entrainment. The complete prioritized list of life stage-specific stressors to the DPS is presented in Appendix A. Each of the threats criteria described below is related to one or more of the major factors limiting recovery described and listed in the NMFS 2006 Report to Congress on the PCSRF.

Factor ST-1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range

Dams in the Central Valley have: (1) blocked access to the vast majority of historical spawning grounds; (2) modified natural flow regimes and altered water temperatures; and (3) reduced habitat quality and complexity.

To determine that the steelhead DPS is recovered, threats to habitat and the risks posed to the abundance, productivity, and especially to the spatial structure and diversity of the DPS should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion ST-1.1: Address Threats to Spawning Grounds

- ❑ As appropriate or necessary to support region-wide recovery goals, passage obstructions (e.g. dams) are removed or modified to restore fish access or improve passage to historically accessible habitat
- ❑ Instream flow conditions and programs that support salmon rearing, spawning and migration needs and meet the steelhead population targets are achieved

Criterion ST-1.2: Address Threats to Water Quality

- ❑ Deleterious effects of stormwater runoff are eliminated or controlled so as not to impair water quality and quantity in salmonid streams or the riparian habitats supporting them
- ❑ Agricultural practices are implemented and programs are in place to protect and restore riparian areas, floodplains and stream channels, and to protect water quality from sediment, pesticide, herbicide and fertilizer runoff
- ❑ Urban and rural development, including land use conversion from agriculture and forest land to developed areas, does not impair water quality or result in dysfunctional stream conditions
- ❑ The effects of toxic contaminants on salmonid fitness and survival in the Delta, lower mainstem rivers, and nearshore ocean are sufficiently limited and programs are in place to ensure continued limiting so as not to affect recovery
- ❑ Programs are in place to ensure continued protection and restoration of water quality

Criterion ST-1.3: Address Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

- ❑ Channel function, including vegetated riparian areas, instream wood, streambank stability, off-channel and side-channel habitats, natural substrate and sediment processes, and channel

complexity is restored to provide rearing, migration, and spawning habitat to meet the Recovery Plan's recovery goals

- ❑ Floodplain function and the availability of floodplain habitats for salmon is restored to a degree sufficient to support a viable DPS, including tidal swamp and marsh habitat in estuaries and the tidal freshwater portion of the lower rivers. This restoration should include connectivity between river and floodplain, and the restoration of impaired sediment delivery processes and conditions affecting both estuaries and lower mainstem rivers

- ❑ Nearshore processes are protected and restored so that ecological inputs (of sediment, insects, leaves and wood) to drift cells and mudflats function properly to support steelhead and the species they prey upon

- ❑ Activities that dredge or fill in nearshore and river beds or harden streambanks are sufficiently mitigated

- ❑ Forest management practices that protect and restore watershed and stream functions are implemented on Federal, State, Tribal, and private lands and programs are in place to ensure continued mitigation

- ❑ Technical tools accurately assess the impacts of habitat management actions

Factor ST-2: Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes

Although there are no commercial fisheries for steelhead in the ocean, inland steelhead fisheries continue to be important tribal and recreational fisheries and, thus, continue to warrant assessment.

To determine that the steelhead DPS is recovered, any utilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion ST-2.1: Address Threats to Overutilization

- ❑ Fishery management plans that address the steelhead DPS are in place that (a) accurately account for total fishery mortality (i.e., both landed catch and non-landed mortalities) and constrain mortality rates for individual populations to levels that are consistent with achieving DPS viability (i.e., provide for adequate spawning escapement given intrinsic productivity for populations representative of the life history and major regional divisions in the DPS); and (b) are implemented so that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the DPS

- ❑ Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of fishery management actions

- ❑ Rules and regulations for fishery management actions are effectively enforced

Factor ST-3: Disease or Predation

Both naturally spawned and hatchery-reared steelhead are susceptible to threats from: (1) disease outbreaks caused by naturally occurring pathogens; and (2) predation.

To determine that the steelhead DPS is recovered, any disease or predation that threatens its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion ST-3.1: Address Threats from Disease Outbreaks

- ❑ Hatchery operations apply measures that reduce the risk that natural steelhead populations are adversely affected by fish diseases and parasites

Criterion ST-3.2: Address Threats from Predation

- ❑ Suitable methods and levels of marine mammal control are identified and implemented to mitigate negative interactions with steelhead where predation poses significant risks to recovery
- ❑ Populations of introduced game fish are managed such that competition with or predation on steelhead does not impede population recovery

Factor ST-4: Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

Despite Federal and non-Federal efforts that have been implemented to protect steelhead, the steelhead ESU remains at risk of extinction because the existing regulatory mechanisms do not provide sufficient certainty that efforts to reduce threats to the DPS will be fully funded or implemented. Existing conservation efforts, research and monitoring activities also do not occur at a scale that is adequate to protect the entire DPS.

To determine that the steelhead DPS is recovered, any inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms that threatens its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion ST-4.1. Address Threats Resulting from Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

- ❑ Regulatory mechanisms are in place to ensure that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the DPS
- ❑ Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of regulatory actions
- ❑ Rules and regulations for habitat protection and restoration are effectively enforced
- ❑ Fishery Management Plans are effectively enforced
- ❑ Habitat conditions, watershed functions and nearshore processes are protected and restored through land-use planning that guides human population growth and development
- ❑ Habitat conditions and watershed function are protected and restored through regulations that govern resource extraction such as timber harvest and gravel mining
- ❑ Habitat conditions, watershed functions and nearshore processes are protected and restored through land protection agreements as appropriate, where existing policy or regulations do not provide adequate protection
- ❑ Adequate resources, priorities, regulatory frameworks, and coordination mechanisms are established and/or maintained for effective enforcement of land and water use regulations that protect and restore habitats and marine and freshwater water bodies and for the effective management of fisheries
- ❑ Regulatory, control, and education measures to prevent additional exotic species invasions are in place

Factor ST-5: Other Natural and Manmade Factors Affecting its Continued Existence

Steelhead are susceptible to natural and man-made threats caused by the effects of: (1) artificial propagation on the productivity, spatial structure and diversity of the DPS; (2) climate changes on El

Niño ocean conditions and prolonged drought conditions; and (3) entrainment at unscreened water diversions.

To determine that the steelhead DPS is recovered, other natural and man-made threats to its continued existence should be addressed as outlined below:

Criterion ST-5.1. Address Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation

- ❑ Hatchery management plans are in place to ensure that any effects on the abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure of populations are consistent with the recovery of the DPS
- ❑ Technical tools accurately assess the potential impacts of hatchery management actions
- ❑ Rules and regulations for hatchery management and protection are effectively enforced
- ❑ Hatchery programs are operated in a manner that is consistent with individual watershed and region-wide recovery approaches; appropriate criteria are used for the integration of hatchery steelhead populations and extant natural populations inhabiting watersheds where the hatchery fish return
- ❑ Hatcheries operate using appropriate ecological, genetic, and demographic risk containment measures for: (1) hatchery-origin adults returning to natural spawning areas; (2) release of hatchery juveniles; (3) handling of natural-origin adults at hatchery facilities; (4) withdrawal of water for hatchery use; (5) discharge of hatchery effluent; and (6) maintenance of fish health during their propagation in the hatchery
- ❑ Hatcheries mark or tag steelhead so that they can be differentiated from natural steelhead in fisheries, migratory areas, and as adults returning to hatcheries and natural spawning areas

Criterion ST-5.2. Address Threats Resulting from Climate Change

- ❑ Mechanisms are in place to reduce the incidence of, and impacts from, introduced, invasive, or exotic species
- ❑ Nutrient enrichment programs must be evaluated to determine where additional nutrient inputs can provide significant benefits
- ❑ Ecological functions of steelhead, including their benefits in cycling ocean-derived nutrients into freshwater areas, are considered in fishery, hatchery, and habitat management
- ❑ Funded, active research that aids in predicting the effects of climate change on steelhead recovery is in place and there are Federal and State commitments to respond to findings from the research

Criterion ST-5.3. Address Threats Resulting from Unscreened Water Diversions

- ❑ Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility.
- ❑ Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.

Criterion ST – 5.4. Address Threats Resulting from Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Species

- ❑ Implement the management actions for addressing aquatic invasive species described in the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan.

Recovery Actions

"Once there is a firm commitment and a strategy alternative has been decided upon, the third and final pillar of an effective salmon recovery effort is that a number of specific actions will be required to achieve effective implementation."

- Jeffrey J. Dose. Commitment, Strategy, Action: The Three Pillars of Wild Salmon Recovery *in* Salmon 2100: the future of wild Pacific salmon

This Recovery Plan establishes a "directional" strategic approach to recovery, which identifies general recovery actions for the Central Valley, as well as watershed- and site-specific recovery actions. Watershed-specific recovery actions address threats occurring in each of the rivers or creeks that currently support spawning populations included in the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, or the Central Valley steelhead DPS. Site-specific recovery actions address threats to these species occurring within a migratory corridor (e.g., San Francisco Bay or the Delta).

This Recovery Plan maintains a consistent strategic framework for the establishment of recovery goals and criteria, the identification and prioritization of threats, and the identification of recovery actions. As described in the Recovery Strategy chapter, the framework for ESU or DPS recovery includes goals and criteria directed at the diversity group (recovery units) and population (management units) levels. Similarly, the threats assessment framework for each ESU or DPS also was organized by diversity groups and populations. For winter-run Chinook salmon, threats were prioritized within the Sacramento River population, whereas for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead, threats were prioritized within each diversity group as well as within each population.

Results from the threats assessment and prioritization process (described in Appendix A) were used to guide the identification of watershed- and site-specific recovery actions for each diversity group and population. In that process, threat/stressor matrices were used to structure diversity group, population, life stage, and stressor information into hierarchically-related tiers so that stressors to each ESU or DPS could be prioritized. Prioritizing stressors was accomplished by weighting each tier beneath the diversity group tier, calculating a composite and normalized weight for each specific stressor, and then sorting the normalized weights[3]. A completed stressor matrix sorted by normalized weight resulted in a prioritized list of the life stage-specific stressors affecting each ESU or DPS throughout its life cycle[4].

[3] The stressor weighting and prioritization process is fully described in Appendix A.

[4] Threats to the species that were included in the matrices were limited to those which could potentially be minimized or eliminated with some directed action. For example, although ocean conditions, such as upwelling, are believed to be a major factor affecting the growth and survival of Chinook salmon, this factor was not included in the stressor matrices, because there is no way to control the frequency and magnitude of upwelling events. Conversely, ocean harvest and poaching is a managed threat included in the stressor matrices.

Although the matrix provides a semi-quantitative means of comparatively ranking individual stressors within a diversity group or population, it is important to avoid attributing unwarranted specificity to the prioritized stressor list. As such, the prioritized stressor list was distributed into four separate quartiles which represent four tiers of stressor importance. The stressors in the quartile with the highest normalized weights were identified as having "Very High" importance. The stressors in the other three quartiles were identified as having either a "High", "Medium", or "Low" importance depending on the magnitude and distribution of the normalized weights. For example, a population with 100 individual stressors with distinct (i.e., unequal) normalized weights would have 25 stressors that were considered of "Very High" importance, 25 with "High" importance, 25 with "Medium" importance, and 25 with "Low" importance. However, if the normalized weights of some of the stressors were equal, then the distribution could be altered such that not all tiers received the same number of stressors. For example, if the 25th and 26th ranked stressors in the sorted list of 100 stressors were equal, then the "Very High" importance stressor category would contain 26 stressors. The "High" and "Medium" importance categories would contain 25 or more stressors depending on whether the normalized weights for the stressors at the quartile cutoffs were equal or not. The "Low" importance category would contain the remaining lowest weighted stressors.

Watershed- or site-specific recovery actions have been identified for each specific threat that was considered to be of "Very High" or "High" importance within a particular diversity group (spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead) or population (winter-run Chinook salmon) (**Appendix B**). Specific stressors that are common to multiple populations were listed only once in each species- and diversity group-specific table. For example, within the Northern Sierra Nevada spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group, although loss of floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento River ranked as a stressor of "Very High" importance affecting juvenile Chinook salmon produced in each population, this particular stressor (and associated recovery actions) was only listed once. Similarly, within a diversity group, specific stressors that are common to multiple life stages within a population were only listed once in each table.

By linking specific recovery actions to the highest ranked threats, those recovery actions also become prioritized in importance to the diversity group or population. These recovery actions represent the first step at eliminating or alleviating the factors believed to be most detrimental to the viability of a particular diversity group or population.

In an effort to focus and direct energy at the most significant threats (i.e., threats in the "Very High" or "High" category) to the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and the Central Valley steelhead DPS, watershed- or site-specific recovery actions for the threats ranked in the "Medium" or "Low" quartiles have not been described in this recovery plan. Although such actions would certainly contribute to ESU or DPS recovery, considering the number of specific threats that ranked in the "Very High" or "High" quartiles for each diversity group[5], we believe an efficient recovery strategy should address the most important threats first. This strategy would also likely alleviate some stressors in the "Medium" or "Low" quartiles as stressors in migratory and rearing habitats utilized by multiple populations rank in the top 50 percent of stressors for some populations and in the bottom 50 percent for others.

The status of the recovery actions identified corresponding to the threats of "Very High" or "High" importance will be assessed through the adaptive management program of the recovery plan at the 5- and 10-year status reviews of the

[5] Nearly 250 specific threats were identified in the "Very High" quartile for the Northern Sierra Nevada steelhead diversity group alone.

ESU and DPS. During these status reviews, the threats identification and prioritization process could be re-initiated to account for threats that have been alleviated and for changes in environmental and biotic conditions, which may have altered the distribution of stressors in terms of importance. Such alterations would result in a re-prioritization of recovery actions.

A number of ecosystem and/or anadromous fish enhancement plans for the Central Valley, as well as input received from two recovery planning public workshops, held May 22nd and 24th, 2007 in Sacramento and Redding, respectively, have been used to identify recovery actions. These documents include:

- Final Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (USFWS 2001)
- Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (USFWS 1997)
- AFRP Planning Documents (AFRP Website 2005; AFRP Website 2006a; AFRP Website 2006b)
- Ecosystem Restoration Plan Planning Documents (CALFED 2006; CALFED 2007)
- Summary of Threats and Recovery Actions for Spring-run Chinook salmon and Winter-run Chinook Salmon Recovery Actions. Sacramento Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Workshop (NMFS 2007c)
- Summary of Threats and Recovery Actions for Steelhead. Sacramento Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Workshop (NMFS 2007a)
- Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California (CDFG 1996)
- Lower Yuba River Revised Implementation Plan and Appendices (CALFED and YCWA 2005)
- Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP) (CALFED 1999a)
- Restoring Central Valley Streams: A Plan for Action (CDFG 1993)
- Lower Yuba River Fisheries Management Plan (CDFG 1991a)
- Initial Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat Management and Restoration Plan for the Lower American River (Water Forum 2001)
- CALFED Bay/Delta Program Multi-Species Conservation Strategy. Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix (CALFED 2000a)
- Potential for Re-establishing a Spring-Run Chinook Salmon Population in the Lower Feather River (MWD 2005)
- Central Valley Salmon – A perspective on Chinook and Steelhead in the Central Valley of California (Williams 2006)

GENERAL RECOVERY ACTIONS FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY

The recovery actions presented below are general to the Central Valley Domain and are listed in no particular order.

- Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals and implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish, including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass).

- ❑ Promote State and local initiatives and programs to improve water conservation
- ❑ Decrease ocean harvest of winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon
- ❑ Conduct Central Valley-wide assessment of keystone dams and passage opportunities and implement programs to restore access to properly functioning habitat that was historically available
- ❑ Increase integration of the State and Federal water projects through shared storage and conveyance agreements
- ❑ Replenish spawning gravel and restore riparian habitat below Shasta Dam
- ❑ Assist the State in efforts to avoid losses of juvenile anadromous fish resulting from unscreened or inadequately screened diversions
- ❑ Use pulse flows to increase migratory fish survival
- ❑ Eliminate fish losses due to flow fluctuations of the CVP
- ❑ Maintain suitable water temperatures for anadromous fish survival by controlling or relocating the discharge of irrigation return flows and sewage effluent, and by restoring riparian forests
- ❑ Evaluate passage at small dams or other man-made obstructions and implement fish passage per NMFS criteria
- ❑ Support programs to provide educational outreach and local involvement in restoration, including programs like Salmonids in the Classroom, Aquatic Wild, and Adopt a Watershed and school district environmental camps
- ❑ Develop programs to educate the public about anadromous fish issues, such as the effects of poaching and environmental contaminants, especially contaminants in urban runoff
- ❑ Reduce toxic chemical and trace element contamination
- ❑ Provide additional funding for increased law enforcement to reduce illegal take of anadromous fish, stream alteration, and water pollution and to ensure adequate protection for juvenile fish at pumps and diversions
    - Evaluate the need to revise harvest regulations to increase spawning escapement of naturally produced Chinook salmon
    - Evaluate the potential to modify hatchery procedures to benefit native stocks of salmonids
- ❑ Evaluate and avoid potential competitive displacement of naturally produced juvenile salmonids with hatchery-produced juveniles by implementing release strategies for hatchery-produced fish designed to minimize detrimental interactions
- ❑ Evaluate and implement specific hatchery spawning protocols and genetic evaluation programs to maintain genetic diversity in hatchery and natural stocks
- ❑ Evaluate a program to tag and fin-clip all or a significant portion of hatchery-produced fish as a means of collecting better information regarding harvest rates on hatchery and naturally produced fish and effects of hatchery-produced fish on naturally produced fish

- ❑ Evaluate the direct and indirect effects of contaminants on production of anadromous fish

- ❑ Evaluate the effects of exotic species on production of anadromous fish

- ❑ Encourage the restoration of small tributaries by evaluating the feasibility of screening or relocating diversions, switching to alternative sources of water for upstream diversions, restoring and maintaining a protected riparian strip, limit excessive erosion, enforcing dumping ordinances, removing toxic materials or controlling their source, replacing bridge and ford combinations with bridges or larger culverts and installing siphons to prevent truncation of small streams at irrigation canals

- ❑ Identify and evaluate different procedures of physically separating spawning fall-run and spring-run Chinook salmon to minimize introgression

- ❑ Implement conjunctive use program where appropriate

- ❑ Modify/improve existing gravel supply and condition

- ❑ Conduct Central Valley-wide assessment of dams and passage opportunities

- ❑ Regulate point source discharges

- ❑ Transfer fish to new "opened" habitat, where it is unlikely that fish would spontaneously recolonize it

- ❑ Reduce the E/I water quality control standard in the Delta from 65 percent to 35 percent in January in order to promote higher survival during juvenile salmonid outmigration (per CVPIA Delta Action 8 salmon survival studies)

- ❑ Establish a new flow standard at Vernalis using all San Joaquin tributaries to meet the standard to protect Central Valley steelhead and a future spring-run Chinook salmon population(s)

- ❑ Establish a new flow standard at Rio Vista to improve or maintain upstream and downstream migration conditions

- ❑ Implement the Vernalis Adaptive Management Program beyond the 2011 sunset date to improve juvenile outmigration for steelhead and future spring-run Chinook salmon

- ❑ Reclaim/restore floodplain habitat throughout the Delta

- ❑ Take climate change into account when prioritizing restoration actions

    - Prefer restoration activities that will benefit multiple species or ecosystems over those that are specific to salmonid, especially along streams where water temperatures are less likely to remain tolerable for salmon.

    - Take into consideration change in the amount and distribution of precipitation when designing restoration projects to match historical hydrology

    - Resist temptation to allow uncertainty regarding precisely how climate will change to be used to justify not taking future climate change into account in restoration planning.

Implementation and Cost Estimates

"Although recovery actions can, and should, start immediately upon listing a species as endangered or threatened under the ESA, prompt development and implementation of a recovery plan will ensure that recovery efforts target limited resources effectively and efficiently into the future."

NMFS 2006. Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Guidance

INTEGRATING RECOVERY INTO NMFS ACTIONS

It is a challenging undertaking to facilitate a change in practice and policy that reverses the path towards extinction of a species to one of recovery. This change can only be accomplished with effective outreach and education, strong partnerships, focused recovery strategies and solution-oriented thinking that can shift agency and societal attitudes, practices and understanding.

Implementation of the recovery plan by NMFS will take many forms and is generally and specifically described in the NMFS Protected Resources Division Strategic Plan 2006. The Recovery Planning Guidance (NMFS 2006) 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" (NMFS 2006). 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:

5. Formalizing recovery planning goals on a program-wide basis to prioritize work load allocation and decision-making (to include developing the mechanisms to make implementation (*e.g.*, restoration) possible).
6. Conduct an aggressive outreach and education program.
7. Facilitate a consistent framework for research, monitoring, and adaptive management that can directly inform recovery objectives and goals.
8. Establish an implementation tracking system that is adaptive and pertinent to support the annual reporting for the Government Performance and Results Act, Bi-Annual Recovery Reports to Congress and the 5-Year Review.

NMFS' efforts must be as far-reaching (beyond those under the direct regulatory jurisdiction of NMFS) as the issues adversely affecting the species. Thus, to achieve recovery, NMFS will need to promote the recovery plan and provide needed technical information and assistance to other entities that implement actions that may impact the species' recovery. For example, NMFS will work with key partners on high

priorities such as facilitating passage assessment and working with Counties to ensure protective measures consistent with recovery objectives are included in their General Plans.

While recovery plans are guidance documents not regulatory documents, the intent is that they are used to prioritize and target necessary actions for the survival and recovery of the species. The Recovery Planning Guidance (NMFS 2006) specifically outlines NMFS' obligations:

> "...the ESA clearly envisions recovery plans as the central organizing tool for guiding each species' recovery process. They should also guide Federal agencies in fulfilling their obligations under section 7(a)(1) of the ESA… and provide context and a framework for implementing other provisions of the ESA such as section 7(a)(2), development of Habitat Conservation Plans or Safe Harbor agreements under section 10, special rules for threatened species under section 4(d)".

Furthermore, recovery plans should guide enhancement provisions of sections 4 and 5, take prohibitions through sections 4(d) and 9, cooperation with state(s) under section 6, needed research under section 10, fishery management actions taken and Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) consultations conducted under the provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA).

The approaches NMFS intends to use when implementing various sections of the ESA and MSFCMA are discussed in detail and are summarized in **Table 8**. These approaches are intended to formalize 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. The discussion below outlines the specific action recommendations found the highest priorities in the recovery planning process for the Domain.

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 develop recovery plans. Critical habitat designations may be revised as needed to reflect recovery strategies.

Tailored 4(d) rules to address high priority or low priority activities have been developed for the Central Valley salmonid species listed as threatened in the Domain; however, because 4(d) applies only to threatened species, this mechanism is not available for Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon due to their listing status as endangered. To authorize take of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, section 7(a)(2) or 10 (a)(1)(B) processes are the legal mechanism available under the ESA.

Section 5

Section 5 is a program that applies to land acquisition with respect to the National Forest System. Multiple National Forests lands are present within the Central Valley domain.

Section 6

Section 6 describes protocols for consultation and agreements between NMFS and the states for the purpose of conserving threatened or endangered species.

Congress established the Pacific Coast SalmonRecovery Fund (PCSRF) to contribute to the restoration and conservation of Pacific salmon and steelhead populations and their habitats. The states of Washington, Oregon,

Table 8. Summary of approaches NMFS intends to use when implementing various sections of the ESA and MSFCMA.

Authority	Description	Implementation Actions
ESA Section 7	Section 7(a)(1) Interagency Cooperation (Use of authorities)	Use threats assessments and recovery actions to guide Federal partners to further the conservation of listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead.
ESA Section 7	Section 7(a)(2) Interagency Cooperation (Consultation)	Use recovery criteria and objectives as a reference point to determine effects of proposed actions on the likelihood of species' recovery.
	Note: Permits issued under section 10(a)(1) of the ESA also undergo section 7 consultation prior to issuance.	Use threats assessments and recovery strategy as a guide to prioritizing consultations when making workload decisions.
		Place high priority on consultations for actions that implement recovery strategy or specific actions.
		Streamline consultations for those actions with little or no effect on recovery areas or priorities.
ESA Section 9	Section 9 Enforcement	Prioritize those actions and areas deemed of greatest threat or importance for focused efforts to halt illegal take of listed species.
ESA Section 10	Section 10(a)(1)(B) Incidental Take Permits	Prioritize permit applications that address identified research and monitoring needs in the recovery plan.
		Prioritize cooperation and assistance to landowners proposing activities or programs designed to achieve recovery objectives.
		Standardize monitoring methods in HCPs to the TRT research needs and the recovery plan template.
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management	Fishery Management	Implement fishery regulations to maintain salmon harvest levels at or below those necessary to allow for the recovery of listed salmon and steelhead.
		Implement fishery regulations to reduce bycatch of salmon in federally-managed fisheries.

California, Idaho, and Alaska, and the Pacific Coastal and Columbia River tribes receive Congressional 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. NOAA Fisheries Service 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. This existing MOU disqualifies California for an additional section 6 agreement for salmonids. It is important to note that the Central Valley is excluded from receiving PCSRF funds because of funding allocations available through the California Bay-Delta Authority (CALFED). The State would qualify if a new agreement focused on other NOAA species that do not receive PCSRF or other federal funds (e.g. green sturgeon or abalone).

Section 7

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) allows a Federal agency the discretion to give the conservation of endangered species priority over its more central and traditional missions. "Conservation" is defined in the ESA as those measures necessary delist a species. In other words, the theme is *recovery*. To date, other Federal agencies have not complied with the section 7(a)(1) requirement to develop conservation programs for listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead. To prompt Federal agencies to develop conservation programs, NMFS shall:

- Encourage development of a SWR Sacramento Office or Regional Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) similar to a 1994 MOU [Daily Env't Rep. (BNA) No. 188, at E-1] between Agencies (which expired in 1999), establishing a framework for cooperation and participation to further the purposes of the ESA that specifically outlines a process for coordinating and implementing appropriate recovery actions identified in recovery plans.

- 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 salmonid conservation and recovery priorities.

- Encourage development of Conservation Bank Agreements for creating an array of individual conservation bank sites that will provide credits as compensation for actions that may affect anadromous salmonids within the Central Valley recovery domain. Focus conservation bank sites in key listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead watersheds.

- Encourage meaningful and focused mitigation, in alignment with recovery goals for restoration and threat abatement, for all actions that incidentally take listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead or affect their habitat.

- Encourage Federal partners to include recovery actions in project proposals.

- Conduct outreach to Federal partners, and provide an outline of 7(a)(1) obligations.

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]." This provision bars only those agency actions that would take the species' overall health below its status quo. The theme is not one of recovery but of "no jeopardy" or "adverse modification." Federal agencies request interagency consultation with NMFS (and/or FWS) 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. As a result, the majority of these actions have done a good job at preventing and minimizing direct take but have done little to contribute to recovery of listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead.

To improve the section 7(a)(2) consultation process, NMFS will utilize it authorities to:

- Use recovery criteria and objectives as a reference point to determine effects of proposed actions on the likelihood of species' recovery.
- Place high priority on consultations for actions that implement recovery strategy or specific actions.
- Develop and maintain databases to track the amount of incidental take authorized and effectiveness of conservation and mitigation measures.
- Provide recommended actions in recovery plan as section 7(a)(1) conservation recommendations.
- Prioritize staff time to address and minimize short- and long-term effects of all actions occurring in listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead habitats.
- Adopt an emergency no-incidental take policy for Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon for all projects not associated with recovery.
- Focus staff priorities away from section 7 compliance in watersheds not designated as a priority for recovery and direct efforts to recovery implementation.
- Streamline consultations for those actions with little or no effect on recovery areas or priorities.
- Prioritize staff efforts to carefully and consistently consider short-term and long-term impacts to watershed processes when conducting jeopardy analysis for Federal actions in key listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead watersheds.
- Apply the VSP framework and recovery priorities to evaluate population and area importance in jeopardy and adverse modification analysis.
- Develop a mitigation policy and include concepts of mitigation banking in areas identified as essential for recovery for all section 7s

Within this framework NMFS will utilize its authorities to encourage:

- Amendments to the Corps section 404 Clean Water Act exemptions for farming, logging, and ranching activities. Terminating section 404(f) exemptions for discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States associated with certain normal agricultural activities (defined as logging, ranching, and farming) will allow interagency consultations in key Dependent and Independent watersheds and provide incidental take coverage for individuals/corporations/agencies engaged in those activities.

- The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to fund upgrades for flood-damaged facilities to meet the requirements of the ESA and facilitate recovery.
- The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to prioritize action 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.
- The FHWA and Caltrans develop pile driving guidelines, approved by NMFS, for all bridge construction projects in Key Dependent, Independent, and other watersheds with extant listed Central Valley salmon and/or steelhead populations.
- 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 who designate a non-Federal representative to conduct informal consultation or prepare a biological assessment ensure the associated documentation comports to 50 CFR 402.14(c) prior to initiating consultations with NMFS.
- All consulting agencies to provide biological assessments that comport to 50 CFR 402.14(c) for all projects in all watersheds where listed Central Valley salmon and/or steelhead are present and/or with designated critical habitat.
- 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.
- Encourage Federal agencies to coordinate and develop programmatic incidental take authorization for activities that contribute to the recovery of listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead, to streamline their permitting processes.
- Encourage all consulting agencies to provide biological assessments that comport to 50 CFR 402.14(c) for all projects in all watersheds where listed Central Valley salmon and/or steelhead are present and/or with designated critical habitat.

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 individual rear or spawn. The recovery plan will assist NMFS' Enforcement personnel by targeting key watersheds essential for species recovery. Core recovery areas identified in this plan should be considered the highest priority areas. NMFS PRD staff will work closely with NMFS Enforcement regarding the identification of threats and other activities believed to place coho salmon at high risk of take and/or extirpation. Actions will include the following:

- NMFS will conduct outreach and provide enforcement a summary of the recovery priorities and threats.
- NMFS will prioritize those actions and areas deemed of greatest threat or importance for focused efforts to halt illegal take of listed species.
- NMFS will develop a plan to outline responsibilities and priorities between PRD and enforcement to ensure activities by NMFS staff, when supporting enforcement, are focused on the highest recovery priorities.
- When a take threat has occurred in a high priority area, NMFS PRD will work with NMFS enforcement, to the extent feasible, with the development of a take statement.

- NMFS enforcement will work with the California Department of Fish and Game, in conjunction with the Joint Enforcement Agreement to increase patrols and landowner outreach in critical watersheds, particularly during droughts, when listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead salmon are potentially at greater threat of unauthorized taking.
- Regular meetings between recovery staff and Enforcement will occur. NMFS Enforcement will place a high priority on identification and curtailment of threats in key populations identified for recovery.

Section 10

Section 10 provides permits for the authorization of take for scientific research, or to enhance the propagation or survival of listed species. Typically NMFS has authorized conservation hatcheries, research activities, and habitat conservation plans for non-federal activities under section 10. To improve the section 10 authorization process, NMFS will utilize it authorities to:

Section 10(a)(1)(a) Research Permits

- Prioritize permit applications that address identified research and monitoring needs in the recovery plan.
- Evaluate all proposed activities against the identified threats, recovery strategy, and recovery actions identified in the plan.
- Develop and maintain databases to tracks the amount of incidental take authorized and the effectiveness of conservation and mitigation measures.

Section 10(a)(1)(B) Habitat Conservation Plans

We recommend all future HCPs, where listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead are covered species, adopt the viability and threats assessment guidelines described in this recovery plan. Adoption of these guidelines will facilitate standardization and could help in the tracking of recovery actions and threats abatement. Additionally, adoption of the assessment protocols should streamline jeopardy analysis and assist applicants in identification of limiting factors and strategically targeting beneficial and conservation and mitigation opportunities and locations. Finally, adoption of the assessment protocols will facilitate consistency in the development of standards to determine the appropriate levels of mitigation necessary to ensure the continued existence of listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead. The Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook stresses the need for consistency of mitigation measures for a species and for specific standards. Although, not a preferred option (according to the USFWS/NMFS HCP Handbook), if offsite mitigation is necessary this recovery plan can be used to target watersheds for recovery actions. In some circumstances off-site mitigation may provide greater opportunity for recovery than onsite mitigation (*i.e.*, if an HCP's covered activities occur in a non-focus watershed).

Within this framework NMFS will utilize its authorities to:

- Prioritize cooperation and assistance to landowners proposing activities or programs designed to achieve recovery objectives.
- Standardize monitoring methods in HCPs to the TRT research needs and the recovery plan template. Consistent data collection techniques and the ability to compare similar data sets over space and time will set the framework for the five year review and help track recovery progress.

Fisheries Management and EFH

Much of listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead habitat is located in areas identified as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for the Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan (FMP) under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation

and Management Act (MSFCMA). NMFS will implement fishery regulations to maintain salmon harvest levels at or below those necessary to allow for the recovery of listed salmon. NMFS anticipates the objective and recovery strategies will serve as a guide when providing conservation recommendations for actions that may adversely affect EFH. In addition, NMFS will work to implement fishery regulations to reduce bycatch of salmon in federally-managed fisheries.

Coordinate with other NMFS Divisions

Other divisions within NOAA can contribute significantly to recovery. NMFS PRD staff will coordinate closely with the SWFSC, Habitat Conservation Division, and NOAA Restoration Center to assist in the development, review and funding of restoration projects.

Technical Assistance

Beyond NMFS' statutory authorities and obligations we are engaged in a significant amount of outreach to various constituencies where we provide technical assistance regarding listed salmon, their habitat needs, and various life history requirements. Due to the large proportion of private lands and the limited contributions of section 7, developing partnerships through providing technical assistance will be critical for recovery. Through this role NMFS shall focus efforts in key areas critical for recovery through the following actions:

- Work with the individual counties throughout the Central Valley to recommend county planning and policies protective of listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead.
- Continue working with Natural Resource Conservation Service, Resource Conservation Districts, and Reclamation Districts, to encourage improved agricultural practices as well as land use practices of rural residential landowners.
- Encourage Smart Growth policies and provide outreach and education to urban planners and builders. Encourage planning that accounts for natural events such as droughts, storm, flooding and climate change.
- Encourage State wide policies for urban and rural roads.
- Prioritize cooperation and assistance to landowners proposing activities or programs designed to achieve recovery objectives.
- Establish policies and compliance that preserve and protect stream flows required by specific life stages of listed Central Valley salmon and steelhead.
- Assemble a NMFS Water Rights Team that focuses on restoring and maintaining natural streamflow regimes across the ESUs/DPS.
- Work to assure funding and staff for full enforcement of laws, codes, regulations and ordinances across the listed Central Valley salmon ESUs and steelhead DPS.

Cost Estimate

An implementation schedule describing time frames and costs associated with individual recovery actions is under development and will be included in the public draft recovery plan. Estimates of near-term (1-5 years) total costs associated with recovery will be available once the implementation schedule is complete. Total cost to recovery is much more challenging, if not impossible to estimate because the biological response of many of the recovery actions is uncertain, achieving recovery will be a long-term effort likely requiring at least a few decades, and new stressors may emerge over time.

Literature Cited

Allendorf, F. W., D. Bayles, D. L. Bottom, K. P. Currens, C. A. Frissell, D. G. Hankin, J. A. Lichatowich, W. Nehlsen, P. C. Trotter, and T. H. Williams. 1997. Prioritizing Pacific Salmon Stocks for Conservation. Conservation Biology Volume 11: 140-152.

Arkush, K. D., M. A. Banks, D. Hedgecock, P. D. Siri, and S. Hamelberg. 1997. Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program: Progress Report Through April 1996. Technical Report 49. Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary.

Bailey, E. D. 1954. Time Pattern of 1953-54 Migration of Salmon and Steelhead into the Upper Sacramento River. California Department of Fish and Game. Unpublished report.

Banks, M. A., V. K. Rashbrook, M. J. Calavetta, C. A. Dean, and D. Hedgecock. 2000. Analysis of Microsatellite DNA Resolves Genetic Structure and Diversity of Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in California's Central Valley. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 57: 915-927.

Barnhart, R. A. 1986. Species Profiles: Life Histories and Environmental Requirements of Coastal Fishes and Invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) - Steelhead. Biological Report 82 [11.60], TR EL-82-4.

Bell, M. C. 1986. Fisheries Handbook of Engineering Requirements and Biological Criteria. Sacramento, CA: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fish Passage Development and Evaluation Program.

Brandes, P. L. and J. S. McLain. 2001. Juvenile Chinook Salmon Abundance, Distribution, and Survival in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp **39**-136.

Brown, R. and F. Nichols. 2003. The 2003 CALFED Science Conference: A Summary of Key Points and Findings. Submitted to CALFED Science Program, Sam Luoma, Lead Scientist, May 2003.

Busby, P. J., T. C. Wainwright, G. J. Bryant, L. J. Lierheimer, R. S. Waples, F. W. Waknitz, and I. V. Lagomarsino. 1996. Status Review of West Coast Steelhead From Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. Report No. NMFS-NWFSC-27. NOAA Technical Memorandum. U.S. Department of Commerce.

CALFED. 1999a. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan, Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration.

CALFED. 1999b. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan, Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration, Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix.

CALFED. 2000a. CALFED Bay-Delta Program Multi-Species Conservation Strategy Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix. Available at http://calwater.ca.gov/ CALFEDDocuments/ Final_EIS_EIR.shtml.

CALFED. 2000b. Final Programmatic EIS/EIR for CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

CALFED. 2006. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Year 7, Year 6 Annotated Budget, and Milestones Update (State FYs 2006-07; Federal FYs 2007). Implementing Agencies: CDFG, USFWS, NMFS.

CALFED. 2007. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Year 8 and Year 8 Annotated Budget (State FYs 2007-08; Federal FY 2008).

CALFED and YCWA. 2005. Draft Implementation Plan for Lower Yuba River Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration. Prepared on Behalf of the Lower Yuba River Fisheries Technical Working Group by SWRI.

California Energy Commission. 2003. Climate Change and California Staff Report. Prepared in Support of the 2003 Integrated Energy Policy Report Proceeding (Docket # 02-IEO-01).

CDFG. 1991a. Lower Yuba River Fisheries Management Plan.

CDFG. 1991b. Steelhead Restoration Plan for the American River. Prepared by D. McEwan and J. Nelson.

CDFG. 1993. Restoring Central Valley Streams: A Plan for Action.

CDFG. 1996. Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California. Prepared by D. McEwan and T.A. Jackson. California Department of Fish and Game.

CDFG. 1998. Report to the Fish and Game Commission: Report to the Fish and Game Commission: A Status Review of the Spring-Run Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*) in the Sacramento River Drainage. Candidate Species Status Report 98-01. Sacramento, CA: Department of Fish and Game.

CDFG. 2000. Lower American River Pilot Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Habitat Improvement Project. Quarterly Status Report July 1999-March 2000. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

CDFG. 2004a. Sacramento River Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, Biennial Report 2002 - 2003. Prepared for the Fish and Game Commission.

CDFG. 2004b. Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Biennial Report (2002-2003). Prepared for the Fish and Game Commission.

CDFG. 2006 AFRP. Appendix B - FY 2006 AFRP Restoration and Research Gap Analysis. Available at www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/AFRP/documents/FY05_Gap_Analysis.pdf.

CDFG. 2007a. AFRP. Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Workplan for Fiscal Year 2007. Available at www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/AFRP/planningdocs.asp. Accessed on October 25, 2007.

CDFG. 2007b. AFRP. Appendix A - FY 2006 AFRP Program Status by Watershed. Available at http://www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/AFRP/documents/FY05_Program_Status_Accomp.pdf. Accessed on October 25, 2007.

CDFG. 2007c. California's Plants and Animals: Chinook Salmon - Winter-Run. Available at www.dfg.ca.gov. Accessed on April 27, 2007.

CDFG and NMFS. 2001. Joint Hatchery Review Committee Final Report on Anadromous Salmonid Fish Hatcheries in California.

Cramer, S. P. and D. B. Demko. 1997. The Status of Late-Fall and Spring Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River Basin Regarding the Endangered Species Act. Special Report submitted to National Marine Fisheries Service on behalf of Association of California Water Agencies and California Urban Water Agencies. Sacramento CA.

DWR. 2000. Biological Opinion on Operation of the Federal Central Valley Project and the California State Water Project From December 1, 1999 Through March 31, 2000.

DWR. 2002. Evaluation of the Feather River Hatchery Effects on Naturally Spawning Salmonids. SP-F9. Oroville Facilities Relicensing FERC Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2003. Evaluation of Project Effects on Natural Salmonid Populations. Interim Literature Review, SP-F9. Oroville Facilities Relicensing FERC Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2004. Evaluation of the Feather River Hatchery Effects on Naturally Spawning Salmonids.

DWR. 2006. Progress of Incorporating Climate Change into Management of California's Water Resources. Available at http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/climatechange.

DWR and Reclamation. 1999. Biological Assessment: Effects of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations From October 1998 Through March 2000 on Steelhead and Spring-Run Chinook Salmon.

Federal Register. 1989. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Critical Habitat; Winter-run Chinook Salmon. Vol 54:32085-32068. August 4, 1989.

Federal Register. 1990. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Final Rule. Vol 55:46515-46523. November 5, 1990.

Federal Register. 1992. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Endangered Status for Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Vol 57:27416-27423. June 19, 1992.

Federal Register. 1992. NMFS. Designated Critical Habitat; Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Proposed Rule. Vol 57:36626-36632. August 13, 1992.

Federal Register. 1993. NMFS. Designated Critical Habitat; Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Vol 58:33212-33219. June 16, 1993.

Federal Register. 1994. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Status of Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Final Rule. Vol 59:440-450. January 4, 1994.

Federal Register. 1996. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Proposed Endangered Status for Five ESUs of Steelhead and Proposed Threatened Status for Five ESUs of Steelhead in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California. Vol 61:41541-41561. August 1996.

Federal Register. 1998. NMFS. Final Rule: Notice of Determination. Endangered and Threatened Species: Threatened Status for Two ESUs of Steelhead in Washington, Oregon, and California. Vol 63:13347-13371. March 19, 1998.

Federal Register. 1999. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Threatened Status for Two Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) in California; Final Rule. Vol 64:50394-50415. September 16, 1999.

Federal Register. 2000. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Salmon and Steelhead; Final Rule. Vol 65:42421-42481. July 10, 2000.

Federal Register. 2002. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Final Rule Governing Take of Four Threatened Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) of West Coast Salmonids. Vol 67:1116-1133. January 9, 2002.

Federal Register. 2004. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Extension of Public Comment Period and Notice of Rescheduled Public Hearing on Proposed Listing Determinations for West Coast Salmonids. Vol 69:61348-61349. October 18, 2004.

Federal Register. 2004. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Proposed Listing Determinations for 27 ESUs of West Coast Salmonids. Vol 69:33102-33179. June 14, 2004.

Federal Register. 2005. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Listing Determinations for 16 ESUs of West Coast Salmon, and Final 4(d) Protective Regulations for Threatened Salmonid ESUs. Final Rule. Vol 70:37160. June 28, 2005.

Federal Register. 2006. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Listing Determinations for 10 Distinct Population Segments of West Coast Steelhead, Final Rule. Vol 71:834-862. January 5, 2006.

Fisher, F. W. 1994. Past and Present Status of Central Valley Chinook Salmon. Conservation Biology Volume 8: 870-873.

Fry, D. H. 1961. King Salmon Spawning Stocks of the California Central Valley, 1940-1959. Calif. Fish and Game Volume 47: 55-71.

Fukushima, M., T. P. Quinn, and W. W. Smoker. 1998. Estimation of Eggs Lost from Superimposed Pink Salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) Redds. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 55: 618-625.

Good, T. P., R. S. Waples, and P. Adams. 2005. Updated Status of Federally Listed ESUs of West Coast Salmon and Steelhead. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-66.

Hallock, R. J., D. H. Fry, Jr., and D. A. LaFaunce. 1957. The Use of Fyke Traps to Estimate the Runs of Adult Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento River. California Fish and Game Volume 43: 271-298.

Hallock, R. J., W. F. Van Woert, and L. Shapovalov. 1961. An Evaluation of Stocking Hatchery-Reared Steelhead Rainbow Trout (*Salmo Gairdnerii Gairdnerii*) in the Sacramento River System. Fish Bulletin No. 114. Sacramento, CA: Department of Fish and Game.

Healey, M. C. 1991. Life History of Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*) *in* Pacific Salmon Life Histories. Groot, C. and Margolis, L. (ed.), Vancouver B.C.: UBC Press, pp 311-393.

Healey, T. P. 1979. The Effect of High Temperature on the Survival of Sacramento River Chinook (King) Salmon, *Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*, Eggs and Fry. California Department of Fish and Game, Anadromous Fisheries Branch Administrative Report No. 79-10.

Hedgecock, D., M. A. Banks, V. K. Rashbrook, C. A. Dean, and S. M. Blankenship. 2001. Applications of Population Genetics to Conservation of Chinook Salmon Diversity in the Central Valley *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp 45-70.

Hilborn, R. 1992. Hatcheries and the Future of Salmon in the Northwest. Fisheries Volume 17: 5-8.

Hindar, K., N. Ryman, and F. Utter. 1991. Genetic Effects of Cultured Fish on Natural Populations. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 48: 945-957.

Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. 2002. Foundation Runs Report for Restoration Action Gaming Trials. Prepared for Friant Water Users Authority and Natural Resources Defense Council

Kastner, A. 2003. Feather River Hatchery- Draft Annual Report 2002-2003. Wildlife and Inland Fisheries Division Administrative Report. California Department of Fish and Game.

Kjelson, M. A., P. F. Raquel, and F. W. Fisher. 1981. The Life History of Juvenile Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary of California. Estuaries Volume 4: 285-.

Knowles, N., M. Dettinger, and D. Cayan. 2006. Trends in Snowfall Versus Rainfall in the Western United States. Journal of Climate Volume 19: 4545-4559.

Leary, R. F., F. W. Allendorf, and G. K. Sage. 1995. Hybridization and Introgression Between Introduced and Native Fish. American Fisheries Society Symposium Volume 15: 91-101.

Lindley, S., R. Schick, E. Mora, P. B. Adams, J. J. Anderson, S. Greene, C. Hanson, B. P. May, D. McEwan, R. B. MacFarlane, C. Swanson, and J. G. Williams. 2007. Framework for Assessing Viability of Threatened and Endangered Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. San Francisco Estuary & Watershed Science Volume 5, Issue 1. Article 4: California Bay-Delta Authority Science Program and the John Muir Institute of the Environment.

Lindley, S. T., R. Schick, B. P. May, C. Hanson, A. Low, D. McEwan, R. B. MacFarlane, C. Swanson, and J. G. Williams. 2004. Population Structure of Threatened and Endangered Chinook Salmon ESU's in California's Central Valley Basin. SWFSC-370.

Lindley, S. T., R. S. Schick, A. Agrawal, M. Goslin, T. E. Pearson, E. Mora, J. Anderson, B. May, S. Greene, C. Hanson, A. Low, D. McEwan, R. B. MacFarlane, C. Swanson, and J. G. Williams. 2006. Historical Population Structure of Central Valley Steelhead and its Alteration by Dams. San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science Volume 4, Issue 1. February 2006.

MacFarlane, R. B. and E. C. Norton. 2002. Physiological Ecology of Juvenile Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) at the Southern End of Their Distribution, the San Francisco Estuary and Gulf of the Farallones, California. Fisheries Bulletin Volume 100: 244-257.

Lufkin, A. (ed.). 1996. California's Salmon and Steelhead, The Struggle to Restore an Imperiled Resource. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Martin, C. D., P. D. Gaines, and R. R. Johnson. 2001. Estimating the Abundance of Sacramento River Juvenile Winter Chinook Salmon With Comparisons to Adult Escapement. Red Bluff Research Pumping Plant Report Series, Volume 5. Red Bluff, CA: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

McEwan, D. 2001. Central Valley Steelhead *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp 1-43.

Moyle, P. B. 2002. Inland Fishes of California. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press,

MWD. 2005. Potential for Re-Establishing a Spring-Run Chinook Salmon Population in the Lower Feather River. Prepared by Surface Water Resources, Inc. June 2005.

Myers, J. M., R. G. Kope, G. J. Bryant, D. Teel, L. J. Lierheimer, T. C. Wainwright, W. S. Grant, F. W. Waknitz, K. Neely, S. T. Lindley, and R. S. Waples. 1998. Status Review of Chinook Salmon From Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. Report No. NMFS-NWFSC-35. NOAA Tech. Memo. U.S. Department of Commerce.

Myrick, C. A. and J. J. Cech. 2001. Temperature Effects on Chinook Salmon and Steelhead: A Review Focusing on California's Central Valley Populations. Bay-Delta Modeling Forum Technical Publication 01-1.

Nielsen, J. L., T. E. Lisle, and V. Ozaki. 1994. Thermally Stratified Pools and Their Use by Steelhead in Northern California Streams. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society Volume 123: 613-626.

NMFS. 1993. Biological Opinion: Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon.

NMFS. 1996a. Recommendations for the Recovery of the Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Prepared by the Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Recovery Team under the direction of National Marine Fishery Service, Southwest Region.

NMFS. 1996b. Status Review of West Coast Steelhead From Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. Technical Memorandumn - NOAA Fisheries-NWFSC-27.

NMFS. 1997. Proposed Recovery Plan for the Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Long Beach, CA: National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region.

NMFS. 1998. Factors Contributing to the Decline of Chinook Salmon: An Addendum to the 1996 West Coast Steelhead Factors for Decline Report. Portland, Oregon: Protected Resources Division, National Marine Fisheries Service.

NMFS. 1999. Recovery Planning for West Coast Salmon.

NMFS. 2003. Preliminary Conclusions Regarding the Updated Status of Listed ESUs of West Coast Salmon and Steelhead. Draft Report February 2003. West Coast Salmon Biological Review Team. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service-Northwest Fisheries Science Center.

NMFS. 2004. Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan. Prepared by National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region.

NMFS. 2006. Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance.

NMFS. 2007a. Central Valley Steelhead Recovery Breakout Group Notes. Notes from Central Valley Steelhead Recovery Workshop, May 21, 2007.

NMFS. 2007b. Monitoring and Research Needed to Manage the Recovery of Threatened and Endangered Chinook and Steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. Prepared by J.G. Williams, J.J. Anderson, S. Greene, C. Hanson, S.T. Lindley, A. Low, B.P. May, D. McEwan, M.S. Mohr, R. B MacFarlane, C. Swanson. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-399.

NMFS. 2007c. Summary of Threats and Recovery Actions for Spring-Run and Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Notes from Sacramento Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Workshop, May 22, 2007.

Nobriga, M. P. 2001. differences Among Hatchery and Wild Steelhead: Evidence of Delta Fish Monitoring Programs. Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary Newsletter. 14:2:30:38.

Painter, R. E., L. H. Wixom, and S. N. Taylor. 1977. An Evaluation of Fish Populations and Fisheries in the Post-Oroville Project Feather River.

Pearcy, W. G. 1997. Salmon Production in Changing Ocean Regimes. In Pacific Salmon and Their Ecosystems, Status and Future Options Stouder, D. J., Bisson, P. A., and Nuiman, R. J. (ed.), Chapman and Hall, New York.,

Reclamation. 1992. Biological Assessment for USBR Long-Term Central Valley Project Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP).

Reiser, D. W., C. M. Huang, S. Beck, M. Gagner, and E. Jeanes. 2006. Defining Flow Windows for Upstream Passage of Adult Anadromous Salmonids at Cascades and Falls. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society Volume 135: 668-679.

Reynolds, F. L., T. Mills, R. Benthin, and A. Low. 1993. Central Valley Anadromous Fisheries and Associated Riparian and Wetlands Areas Protection and Restoration Action Plan Draft.

S.P. Cramer & Associates. 1995. The Status of Steelhead Populations in California in Regards to the Endangered Species Act. Report Submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service on Behalf of the Association of California Water Agencies. Gresham, OP: S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.

Schaffter, R. 1980. Fish Occurrence, Size, and Distribution in the Sacramento River Near Hood, California During 1973 and 1974. California Department of Fish and Game.

Seesholtz, A., B. Cavallo, J. Kindopp, R. Kurth, and M. Perrone. 2003. Lower Feather River Juvenile Communities: Distribution, Emigration Patterns, and Association With Environmental Variables. *In* Early Life History of Fishes in the San Francisco Estuary and Watershed: Symposium and Proceedings Volume American Fisheries Society, Larval Fish Conference, August 20-23, 2003, Santa Cruz, California.

Shapovalov, L. and A. C. Taft. 1954. The Life Histories of the Steelhead Rainbow Trout (*Salmo Gairdneri Gairdneri*) and Silver Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Kisutch*). Fish Bulletin No. 98. State of California Department of Fish and Game.

Snider, B., B. Reavis, and S. Hill. 2001. Upper Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Escapement Survey May-August 2000. Stream Evaluation Program Technical Report No. 01-1.

Snider, B. and R. Titus. 2000a. Timing, Composition, and Abundance of Juvenile Anadromous Salmonid Emigration in the Sacramento River Near Knights Landing October 1996 - September 1997.

Snider, B. and R. G. Titus. 2000b. Timing, Composition and Abundance of Juvenile Anadromous Salmonid Emigration in the Sacramento River Near Knights Landing October 1998 - September 1999.

Snider, B. and R. G. Titus. 2000c. Lower American River Emigration Survey October 1996 - September 1997. Stream Evaluation Program Technical Report No. 00-2. California Department of Fish and Game.

Sommer, T., B. Harrell, M. Nobiga, R. Brown, W. Kimmerer, and L. Schemel. 2001a. California's Yolo Bypass: Evidence That Flood Control Can Be Compatible With Fisheries, Wetlands, Wildlife, and Agriculture. Fisheries 26:(8) 6-16.

Sommer, T. R., M. L. Nobriga, W. C. Harrell, W. Batham, and W. J. Kimmerer. 2001b. Floodplain Rearing of Juvenile Chinook Salmon: Evidence of Enhanced Growth and Survival. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 58: 325-333.

Taylor, E. B. 1991. A Review of Local Adaptation in Salmonidae, with Particular Reference to Pacific and Atlantic Salmon. Aquaculture Volume 98: 185-207.

Thompson, K. 1972. Determining Stream Flows for Fish Life *in* Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission Instream Flow Requirement Workshop, March 15-16, 1972.

USFWS. 1995. Draft Anadromous Fish Restoration Plan, A Plan to Increase Natural Production of Anadromous Fish in the Central Valley of California. Prepared for the Secretary of the Interior by the USFWS with assistance from the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Core Group under authority of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

USFWS. 1997. Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, A Plan to Increase Natural Production of Anadromous Fish in the Central Valley of California. Prepared for the Secretary of the Interior by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with assistance from Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Core Group under authority of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

USFWS. 2001. Final Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program: A Plan to Increase Natural Production of Anadromous Fish in the Central Valley of California. Prepared for the Secretary of the Interior by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with assistance for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Core Group under authority of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

Vogel, D. A. and K. R. Marine. 1991. Guide to Upper Sacramento River Chinook Salmon Life History. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Central Valley Project. Redding, CA: CH2M Hill.

Waples, R. S. 1991. Genetic Interactions Between Hatchery and Wild Salmonids: Lessons from the Pacific Northwest. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 48: 124-133.

Ward, M. B. and W. M. Kier. 1999. Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Plan.

Ward, P., T. McReynolds, and C. Garman. 2003. Butte and Big Chico Creeks Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, *Oncoryhnchus Tshawytscha*, Life History Investigations 2001-2002. Prepared for CDFG.

Washington, P. M. and A. M. Koziol. 1993. Overview of the Interactions and Environmental Impacts of Hatchery Practices on Natural and Artificial Stocks of Salmonids. Fisheries Research Volume 18: 105-122.

Water Forum. 2001. Initial Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat Management and Restoration Plan for the Lower American River. A Product of the Lower American Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat (FISH) Working Group. Prepared by SWRI. Available at http://www.waterforum.org.

Williams, J. G. 2006. Central Valley Salmon: A Perspective on Chinook and Steelhead in the Central Valley of California. San Francisco Estuary & Watershed Science Volume 4, Issue 3, Article 2.

Yoshiyama, R. M., F. W. Fisher, and P. B. Moyle. 1998. Historical Abundance and Decline of Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley Region of California. North American Journal of Fisheries Management Volume 18: 487-521.

Yoshiyama, R. M., E. R. Gerstung, and F. W. Fisher. 2001. Historical and Present Distribution of Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley Drainage of California *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp 71-176.

Yoshiyama, R. M., E. R. Gerstung, F. W. Fisher, and P. B. Moyle. 1996. Historical and Present Distribution of Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley Drainage of California. Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project: Final Report to Congress, vol. III. Davis, CA: University of California, Centers for Water and Wildland Resources.

Appendix A

Threats Assessment for the Evolutionarily Significant Units of Winter-run Chinook Salmon *(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)* and Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon *(O. tshawytscha)*, and the Distinct Population Segment of Central Valley Steelhead *(O. mykiss)*

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1-1

2.0 SACRAMENTO RIVER WINTER-RUN CHINOOK SALMON 2-1

2.1 Background 2-1
2.1.1 Listing History 2-1
2.1.2 Critical Habitat 2-1
2.1.3 Unique Species Characteristics 2-2
2.1.3.1 Life History Strategy 2-2
2.1.3.2 Historic Spawning Habitat Utilization 2-4
2.1.4 Status of Winter-run Chinook Salmon 2-4
2.1.4.1 Historic Population Trends 2-4
2.1.4.2 Current Status 2-5
2.1.4.3 Extinction Risk Assessment 2-7

2.2 Life History and Biological Requirements 2-7
2.2.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 2-7
2.2.1.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 2-7
2.2.1.2 Biological Requirements 2-7
2.2.2 Adult Spawning 2-8
2.2.2.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 2-8
2.2.2.2 Biological Requirements 2-8
2.2.3 Embryo Incubation 2-9
2.2.3.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 2-9
2.2.3.2 Biological Requirements 2-9
2.2.4 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 2-9
2.2.4.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 2-9
2.2.4.2 Biological Requirements 2-10
2.2.5 Sub-adult and Adult Ocean Residence 2-10
2.2.5.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 2-10
2.2.5.2 Biological Requirements 2-10

2.3 Threats and Stressors 2-11
2.3.1 Summary of ESA Listing Factors 2-11
2.3.1.1 Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range 2-11
2.3.1.2 Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes 2-12
2.3.1.3 Disease or Predation 2-12
2.3.1.4 Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms 2-12
2.3.1.5 Other Natural and Manmade Factors Affecting the Species' Continued Existence 2-13
2.3.2 Non-Life Stage-Specific Threats and Stressors 2-14
2.3.2.1 Artificial Propagation Program 2-14
2.3.2.2 Small Population Size Composed of a Single Extant Population 2-16
2.3.2.3 Genetic Integrity 2-16
2.3.2.4 Long-term Climate Change 2-17

2.3.3 San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun Bays 2-18
2.3.3.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 2-18
2.3.3.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 2-21
2.3.4 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta 2-23
2.3.4.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 2-23
2.3.4.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 2-24
2.3.5 Lower Sacramento River (Princeton [RM 163] to the Delta) 2-29
2.3.5.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 2-29
2.3.5.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 2-31
2.3.6 Middle Sacramento River (Red Bluff Diversion Dam [RM 243] to Princeton [RM 163]) 2-33
2.3.6.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 2-33
2.3.6.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 2-34
2.3.7 Upper Sacramento River (Keswick Dam [~RM 302] to Red Bluff Diversion Dam) 2-36
2.3.7.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 2-36
2.3.7.2 Spawning 2-37
2.3.7.3 Embryo Incubation 2-40
2.3.7.4 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 2-41
2.3.8 Sub-adult and Adult Ocean Residence 2-44
2.3.8.1 Harvest 2-44
2.3.8.2 Ocean Conditions 2-45

2.4 Stressor Prioritization 2-46
2.4.1 Stressor Matrix Development 2-46
2.4.1.1 Stressor Matrix Overview 2-46
2.4.1.2 Population Identification and Ranking 2-46
2.4.1.3 Life Stage Identification and Ranking 2-47
2.4.1.4 Stressor Identification and Ranking 2-47
2.4.2 Stressor Matrix Results 2-50

3.0 CENTRAL VALLEY SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON 3-1

3.1 Background 3-1
3.1.1 Listing History 3-1
3.1.2 Critical Habitat Designation 3-2
3.1.3 Unique Species Characteristics 3-2
3.1.4 Status of Spring-run Chinook Salmon 3-4

3.2 Life History and Biological Requirements 3-6
3.2.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 3-6
3.2.1.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 3-6
3.2.1.2 Biological Requirements 3-6
3.2.2 Adult Spawning 3-6
3.2.2.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 3-6
3.2.2.2 Biological Requirements 3-6
3.2.3 Embryo Incubation 3-10
3.2.3.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 3-10
3.2.3.2 Biological Requirements 3-10
3.2.4 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-10
3.2.4.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 3-10
3.2.4.2 Biological Requirements 3-10

3.2.5 Smolt Outmigration 3-11
3.2.5.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 3-11
3.2.5.2 Biological Requirements 3-11
3.2.6 Sub-adult and Adult Ocean Residence 3-11
3.2.6.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 3-11
3.2.6.2 Biological Requirements 3-11

3.3 Threats and Stressors 3-11
3.3.1 Summary of ESA Listing Factors 3-11
3.3.1.1 Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range 3-13
3.3.1.2 Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes 3-13
3.3.1.3 Disease or Predation 3-14
3.3.1.4 Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms 3-14
3.3.1.5 Other Natural and Manmade Factors Affecting the Species' Continued Existence 3-15
3.3.2 Non-Life Stage-Specific Threats and Stressors for the ESU 3-15
3.3.2.1 Feather River Hatchery Artificial Propagation Program 3-15
3.3.2.2 Small Population Size Composed of Only Three Extant Natural Populations 3-16
3.3.2.3 Genetic Integrity 3-17
3.3.2.4 Long-term Climate Change 3-17
3.3.3 San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun Bays 3-17
3.3.3.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 3-17
3.3.3.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-17
3.3.4 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta 3-17
3.3.4.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 3-17
3.3.4.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-18
3.3.5 Lower Sacramento River (Princeton [RM 163] to the Delta) 3-18
3.3.5.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 3-18
3.3.5.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-19
3.3.6 Middle Sacramento River (Red Bluff Diversion Dam [RM 243] to Princeton [RM 163]) 3-21
3.3.6.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 3-21
3.3.6.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-22
3.3.7 Upper Sacramento River (Keswick Dam to Red Bluff Diversion Dam) 3-24
3.3.7.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 3-24
3.3.7.2 Spawning 3-25
3.3.7.3 Embryo Incubation 3-27
3.3.7.4 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-29
3.3.8 Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 3-30
3.3.8.1 Feather River 3-32
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-32
Spawning 3-33
Embryo Incubation 3-35
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-36
3.3.8.2 Yuba River 3-38
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-38
Spawning 3-39
Embryo Incubation 3-40
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-41

3.3.8.3 Butte Creek 3-43
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-43
Spawning 3-44
Embryo Incubation 3-46
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-47
3.3.8.4 Big Chico Creek 3-49
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-49
Spawning 3-50
Embryo Incubation 3-53
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-54
3.3.8.5 Deer Creek 3-55
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-56
Spawning 3-57
Embryo Incubation 3-58
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-59
3.3.8.6 Mill Creek 3-60
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-61
Spawning 3-61
Embryo Incubation 3-63
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-63
3.3.8.7 Antelope Creek 3-64
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-64
Spawning 3-65
Embryo Incubation 3-66
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-67
3.3.9 Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group 3-68
3.3.9.1 Battle Creek 3-69
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-70
Spawning 3-71
Embryo Incubation 3-74
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-74
3.3.9.2 Upper Sacramento River 3-75
3.3.10 Northwestern California Diversity Group 3-76
3.3.10.1 Thomes Creek 3-76
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-76
Spawning 3-78
Embryo Incubation 3-79
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-79
3.3.10.2 Cottonwood/Beegum Creek 3-80
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-81
Spawning 3-81
Embryo Incubation 3-82
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-83
3.3.10.3 Clear Creek 3-84
Adult Immigration and Holding 3-84
Spawning 3-85
Embryo Incubation 3-87
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 3-87
3.3.11 Sub-adult and Adult Ocean Residence 3-88
3.3.11.1 Harvest 3-88
3.3.11.2 Ocean Conditions 3-89

3.4 Stressor Prioritization 3-91
3.4.1 Stressor Matrix Development 3-91
3.4.1.1 Stressor Matrix Overview 3-91
3.4.1.2 Population Identification and Ranking 3-91
3.4.1.3 Life Stage Identification and Ranking 3-93
3.4.1.4 Stressor Identification and Ranking 3-94
3.4.2 Stressor Matrix Results 3-94
3.4.2.1 Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 3-94
3.4.2.2 Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group 3-95
3.4.2.3 Northwestern California Diversity Group 3-95

4.0 CENTRAL VALLEY STEELHEAD 4-1

4.1 Background 4-1
4.1.1 Listing History 4-1
4.1.2 Critical Habitat Designation 4-1
4.1.3 Unique Species Characteristics 4-2
4.1.3.1 Life History Strategy 4-2
4.1.3.2 Historic Spawning Habitat Utilization 4-4
4.1.4 Status of Central Valley Steelhead 4-4
4.1.4.1 Historic Population Trends 4-4
4.1.4.2 Current Status 4-4
4.1.4.3 Extinction Risk Assessment 4-5

4.2 Life History and Biological Requirements 4-6
4.2.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 4-6
4.2.1.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 4-6
4.2.1.2 Biological Requirements 4-6
4.2.2 Adult Spawning 4-6
4.2.2.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 4-6
4.2.2.2 Biological Requirements 4-6
4.2.3 Embryo Incubation 4-11
4.2.3.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 4-11
4.2.3.2 Biological Requirements 4-11
4.2.4 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-11
4.2.4.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 4-11
Biological Requirements 4-11
4.2.5 Smolt Outmigration 4-12
4.2.5.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 4-12
4.2.5.2 Biological Requirements 4-12
4.2.6 Sub-adult and Adult Ocean Residence 4-12
4.2.6.1 Geographic and Temporal Distribution 4-12
4.2.6.2 Biological Requirements 4-12

4.3 Threats and Stressors 4-12
4.3.1 Summary of ESA Listing Factors 4-12
4.3.1.1 Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range 4-14
4.3.1.2 Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Education Purposes 4-14
4.3.1.3 Disease or Predation 4-15

4.3.1.4 Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms 4-15
4.3.1.5 Other Natural and Manmade Factors Affecting its Continued Existence 4-16
4.3.2 Non-Life Stage-Specific Threats and Stressors for the ESU 4-16
4.3.2.1 Artificial Propagation Program 4-16
4.3.2.2 Small Population Size 4-17
4.3.2.3 Genetic Integrity 4-17
4.3.2.4 Long-term Climate Change 4-17
4.3.3 San Francisco, San Pablo and Suisun Bays 4-18
4.3.3.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 4-18
4.3.3.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-18
4.3.4 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta 4-18
4.3.4.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 4-18
4.3.4.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-18
4.3.5 Lower Sacramento River (Princeton [RM 163] to the Delta) 4-18
4.3.5.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 4-18
4.3.5.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-19
4.3.6 Middle Sacramento River (Red Bluff Diversion Dam [RM 243] to Princeton [RM 163]) 4-22
4.3.6.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 4-22
4.3.6.2 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-22
4.3.7 Upper Sacramento River (Keswick Dam to Red Bluff Diversion Dam) 4-24
4.3.7.1 Adult Immigration and Holding 4-24
4.3.7.2 Spawning 4-25
4.3.7.3 Embryo Incubation 4-26
4.3.7.4 Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-28
4.3.8 Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 4-29
4.3.8.1 American River 4-29
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-30
Spawning 4-31
Embryo Incubation 4-32
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-33
4.3.8.2 Auburn/Coon Creek 4-35
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-35
Spawning 4-36
Embryo Incubation 4-38
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-38
4.3.8.3 Dry Creek 4-40
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-40
Spawning 4-41
Embryo Incubation 4-42
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-42
4.3.8.4 Feather River 4-44
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-44
Spawning 4-45
Embryo Incubation 4-46
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-47

4.3.8.5 Bear River 4-48
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-49
Spawning 4-49
Embryo Incubation 4-50
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-51
4.3.8.6 Yuba River 4-52
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-52
Spawning 4-53
Embryo Incubation 4-54
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-55
4.3.8.7 Butte Creek 4-57
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-57
Spawning 4-57
Embryo Incubation 4-58
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-59
4.3.8.8 Big Chico Creek 4-60
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-60
Spawning 4-61
Embryo Incubation 4-62
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-63
4.3.8.9 Deer Creek 4-64
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-65
Spawning 4-65
Embryo Incubation 4-66
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-67
4.3.8.10 Mill Creek 4-68
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-68
Embryo Incubation 4-70
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-70
4.3.8.11 Antelope Creek 4-71
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-71
Spawning 4-72
Embryo Incubation 4-73
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-73
4.3.9 Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group 4-74
4.3.9.1 Battle Creek 4-74
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-74
Spawning 4-75
Embryo Incubation 4-77
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-77
4.3.9.2 Cow Creek 4-79
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-79
Spawning 4-79
Embryo Incubation 4-80
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-81
4.3.9.3 Upper Sacramento River Tributaries 4-82
4.3.10 Northwestern California Diversity Group 4-82
4.3.10.1 Stony Creek 4-82
4.3.10.2 Thomes Creek 4-86
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-86
Spawning 4-87

Embryo Incubation 4-88
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-88
4.3.10.3 Cottonwood/Beegum Creek 4-89
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-89
Spawning 4-89
Embryo Incubation 4-90
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-91
4.3.10.4 Clear Creek 4-92
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-92
Spawning 4-92
Embryo Incubation 4-93
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-94
4.3.10.5 Putah Creek 4-94
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-95
Spawning 4-96
Embryo Incubation 4-97
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-98
4.3.11 Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 4-98
4.3.11.1 Mokelumne River 4-99
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-99
Spawning 4-100
Embryo Incubation 4-102
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-102
4.3.11.2 Calaveras River 4-104
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-104
Spawning 4-105
Embryo Incubation 4-106
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-106
4.3.11.3 Stanislaus River 4-107
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-108
Spawning 4-108
Embryo Incubation 4-109
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-110
4.3.11.4 Tuolumne River 4-111
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-111
Spawning 4-112
Embryo Incubation 4-112
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-113
4.3.11.5 Merced River 4-114
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-114
Spawning 4-115
Embryo Incubation 4-116
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-116
4.3.11.6 Upper San Joaquin River 4-117
Adult Immigration and Holding 4-118
Spawning 4-118
Embryo Incubation 4-119
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration 4-120

4.4 Stressor Prioritization 4-121
4.4.1 Stressor Matrix Development 4-121
4.4.1.1 Stressor Matrix Overview 4-121
4.4.1.2 Population Identification and Ranking 4-121
4.4.1.3 Life Stage Identification and Ranking 4-124
4.4.1.4 Stressor Identification and Ranking 4-124
4.4.2 Stressor Matrix Results 4-124
4.4.2.1 Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 4-124
4.4.2.2 Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group 4-125
4.4.2.3 Northwestern California Diversity Group 4-125
4.4.2.4 Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 4-126

5.0 LITERATURE CITED 5-1

List of Attachments

Attachment A Stressor Matrix for Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit

Attachment B Stressor Matrices for Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit

Attachment C Stressor Matrices for Central Valley Steelhead Distinct Population Segment

List of Figures

Figure 1-1. San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta 1-2

Figure 1-2. Mainstem Sacramento River and Tributaries 1-3

Figure 1-3. San Joaquin River and Tributaries 1-5

Figure 2-1. Annual Estimate of Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Spawning Escapement from 1967-2006 2-5

Figure 2-2. Five-year Moving Average of the Winter-run Chinook Salmon Cohort Replacement Rate 2-6

Figure 2-3. Estimated Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Spawner Abundance, 1970–2002 2-6

Figure 2-4. Geographic and Temporal Distribution of Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon 2-8

Figure 2-5. Mean Daily Water Temperatures in the Sacramento River at Hood during December Through July from 2000 to 2006 2-24

Figure 2-6. Historical Upper Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Spawning Escapement Estimates 2-45

Figure 3-1. Annual Estimated Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Escapement from 1967 to 2006 3-5

Figure 3-2. Spring-run Chinook Salmon Combined Population Estimates for Mill, Deer and Butte Creeks from 1992 to 2006 3-5

Figure 3-3. Life Stage Timing for Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations in the Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group....3-7
Figure 3-4. Life Stage Timing for Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations in the Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group....3-8
Figure 3-5. Life Stage Timing for Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations in the Northwestern California Diversity Group....3-9
Figure 3-6. Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group....3-31
Figure 3-7. Water Temperatures Recorded in Butte Creek Near Chico During the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Embryo Incubation Period (September through January)....3-47
Figure 3-8. Average Daily Water Temperatures in Big Chico Creek Near Chico During the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Adult Immigration and Holding Period March through September (2000-2005)....3-50
Figure 3-9. Average Daily Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek Near Chico During Adult Spring-run Chinook Salmon Spawning Period September through October (2000-2004)....3-51
Figure 3-10. Water Temperatures Recorded in Big Chico Creek Near Chico During the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Embryo Incubation Period (September through January)....3-53
Figure 3-11. Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group....3-69
Figure 3-12. Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group....3-77
Figure 3-13. Beegum Creek Spawning Escapement Estimates (1993 – 2006)....3-82
Figure 3-14. Clear Creek Spawning Escapement Estimates (1993 – 2006)....3-86
Figure 4-1. Estimated Natural Steelhead Run Size on the Upper Sacramento River, 1967 Through 1993....4-5
Figure 4-2. Life Stage Timing for Steelhead Populations in the Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group....4-7
Figure 4-3. Life Stage Timing for Steelhead Populations in the Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group....4-8
Figure 4-4. Life Stage Timing for Steelhead Populations in the Northwestern California Diversity Group....4-9
Figure 4-5. Life Stage Timing for Steelhead Populations in the Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group....4-10
Figure 4-6. Estimated Flows in Auburn Ravine Under Natural and Current Conditions....4-36

List of Tables

Table 1-1. Extant Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations Included in the Threats Assessment Categorized by Diversity Group 1-4

Table 1-2. Extant Central Valley Steelhead Populations Included in the Threats Assessment Categorized by Diversity Group 1-4

Table 2-1. Winter-run Chinook Salmon Releases from Livingston Stone National Fish Hatchery (Brood Years 1998-2004) 2-15

Table 2-2. Excerpt from the Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix 2-49

Table 3-1. Adult Spring-run Chinook Salmon Population Counts for Mill, Deer and Butte Creeks (1995-2001) 3-16

Table 3-2. Water Temperature Exceedances in Butte Creek in 2002 3-43

Table 3-3. Seven Day Maximum Water Temperature Recorded in the Middle Fork, South Fork, and North Fork of Antelope Creek During the First Portion of the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Embryo Incubation Life Stage in 1996, 1997, and 1998 3-67

Table 3-4. Maximum Weekly Average Water Temperatures (ºF) Reported from 1998 Through 2001 in Battle Creek 3-70

Table 3-5. Extant Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations Included in the Threats Assessment Categorized by Diversity Group 3-92

Table 3-6. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Population in the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 3-93

Table 3-7. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Population in the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group 3-93

Table 3-8. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Population in the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Northwestern California Diversity Group 3-93

Table 4-1. Hatcheries Producing Steelhead in the Central Valley 4-16

Table 4-2. Steelhead Passage Above Coleman National Fish Hatchery Barrier Weir, 2001-2006. 4-75

Table 4-3. Putah Creek flow summaries before and after construction of the Solano Project. 4-96

Table 4-4. Extant Central Valley Steelhead Populations Included in the Threats Assessment Categorized by Diversity Group 4-122

Table 4-5. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Steelhead Population in the Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 4-122

Table 4-6. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Steelhead Population in the Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group 4-123

Table 4-7. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Steelhead Population in the Northwestern California Diversity Group 4-123

Table 4-8. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Steelhead Population in the Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group 4-124

List of Acronyms

ACID	Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District
AFRP	Anadromous Fish Restoration Program
AMP	Ambient Monitoring Program
Bay-Delta	San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
Bays	San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun bays
BML	Bodega Marine Laboratory
BO	biological opinion
BRT	Biological Review Team
CDFG	California Department Fish and Game
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
cfs	cubic feet per second
cm	centimeter
cm/sec	centimeters per second
CMP	Sacramento Coordinated Monitoring Program
CNFH	Coleman National Fish Hatchery
CRR	Cohort Replacement Rate
CVI	Central Valley Index
CVP	Central Valley Project
CVPIA	Central Valley Project Improvement Act
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWT	coded wire tag
DDT	Dichloro-Diphenyl-Trichloroethane
Delta	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EEZ	U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone
ENSO	El Niño-Southern Oscillation
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERP	Ecosystem Restoration Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FL	Fork Length
FMP	Salmon Fishery Management Plan
FRFH	Feather River Fish Hatchery
ft/sec	feet per second
GCID	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
GCMs	General Circulation Models
HCP	habitat conservation plan
HCPP	Hamilton City Pumping Plant
km	kilometers
LSNFH	Livingston Stone National Fish Hatchery
mm	millimeter
MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
NCCP	Natural Communities Conservation Plan
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
MRFH	Mokelumne River Fish Hatchery

MRH	Merced River Hatchery
NAHB	National Association of Home Builders
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OCAP	Operations Criteria and Plan
PBDEs	Polybrominated diphenyl ethers
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PFMC	Pacific Fishery Management Council
PDO	Pacific Decadal Oscillation
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
ppt	parts per thousand
PSMFC	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
RBDD	Red Bluff Diversion Dam
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
RM	River Mile
RMIS	Regional Mark Information System
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SDWSC	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel
SMSCS	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure
SRA	shaded riverine aquatic
SSIDD	South Sutter Irrigation District Dam
SVRIC	Stanford Vina Ranch Irrigation Company
SWP	State Water Project
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TCC	Tehama-Colusa Canal
TCD	temperature control device
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VAMP	Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan
WTP	water treatment plant
WUA	weighted usable area
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Past recovery plans generally have focused on the abundance, productivity, habitat and other life history characteristics of a species. While knowledge of these characteristics is certainly important for making sound conservation management decisions, the long-term sustainability of a species in need of recovery can only be ensured by alleviating the threats that are contributing to the status of the species as threatened or endangered. Therefore, the identification of the threats to the species should be a key component of any recovery plan and program (NMFS 2006a).

To be most useful for recovery planning, a threats assessment should be used to determine the relative importance of various threats to a species. A threats assessment includes (1) identifying threats and their sources, (2) evaluating the effects of threats, and (3) ranking each threat based on relative effects. The Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance (NMFS 2006a) 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*."

Applying this recommended approach for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Services' (NMFS) recovery planning process in the Central Valley, threats assessments were conducted for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU), the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and the Central Valley steelhead Distinct Population Segment (DPS). The threats assessments identified, evaluated, and ranked factors affecting these two ESUs and DPS in the ocean, in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Bay-Delta) (**Figure 1-1**), and in Central Valley rivers and tributaries that currently support populations of winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon, and/or steelhead.

Threats to winter-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead in the Bay-Delta were geographically distinguished between the Bay and the Delta using the legal definition of the Delta described in Section 12220 of the California Water Code. This places the Delta's western boundary approximately four miles west of the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. The legal Delta extends northward to the I Street Bridge near Sacramento and southward to near Vernalis.

Threats in the mainstem Sacramento River were geographically distinguished among the lower, middle, and upper part of the river (**Figure 1-2)**. The lower section extends from the I Street Bridge upstream to Princeton (River Mile [RM] 163), the middle section extends from Princeton to Red Bluff Diversion Dam (RBDD) (RM 243), and the upper section extends from RBDD up to Keswick Dam (RM 302).

In-river threats to winter-run Chinook salmon were assessed in the mainstem Sacramento River, which represents the only extant population in the ESU. Similarly, the threats assessments for the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU included rivers that both historically supported, and currently support spring-run Chinook salmon populations[1]. Lindley *et al.* (2004), which describes the population structure of threatened and endangered Chinook salmon ESU's in California's Central Valley Basin was used to identify 12 individual rivers that historically supported and currently support spring-run Chinook salmon populations. These 12 spring-run Chinook salmon populations were categorized into three diversity groups as described by Lindley *et al.* (2007) (**Table 1-1**).

[1] Although the San Joaquin River system historically supported spring-run Chinook salmon, this river system was not included in the threats assessment because: (1) the current absence of spring-run Chinook salmon from the system prevents direct data collection of stressors; and (2) the system is not included in the ESU listing.



Figure 1-1. San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta



Figure 1-2. Mainstem Sacramento River and Tributaries

Table 1-1. Extant Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations Included in the Threats Assessment Categorized by Diversity Group

Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group	Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group	Northwestern California Diversity Group
Feather River Yuba River Butte Creek Big Chico Creek Deer Creek Mill Creek Antelope Creek	Battle Creek Upper Sacramento River	Thomes Creek Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Clear Creek
Source: (Lindley *et al.* 2007)		

For the Central Valley steelhead threats assessment, 26 individual rivers/watersheds[2] in the Sacramento and San Joaquin (**Figure 1-3**) river systems that historically supported and currently support populations of steelhead were identified using literature describing the historical population structure of steelhead in the Central Valley (Lindley *et al.* 2006) and by using the best professional knowledge of Central Valley salmonid biologists regarding the current distribution of steelhead. These 26 steelhead populations were categorized into four diversity groups based on the geographical structure described in Lindley *et al.* (2007) **Table 1-2**.

Table 1-2. Extant Central Valley Steelhead Populations Included in the Threats Assessment Categorized by Diversity Group

Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group	Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group	Northwestern California Diversity Group	Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group
American River Auburn/Coon Creek Dry Creek Feather River Bear River Yuba River Butte Creek Big Chico Creek Deer Creek Mill Creek Antelope Creek	Battle Creek Cow Creek Small tributaries to the Upper Sacramento River[3] Upper Sacramento River (mainstem)	Stony Creek Thomes Creek Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Clear Creek Putah Creek	Mokelumne River Calaveras River Stanislaus River Tuolumne River Merced River San Joaquin River (mainstem)
Source: (Lindley *et al.* 2007)			

This appendix is comprised of three major sections – one for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, one for the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and one for the Central Valley steelhead DPS. Narrative descriptions of the threats affecting each ESU/DPS (Sections 2.3, 3.3, and 4.3, respectively) are organized hierarchically going from location/population to life stage to threats. In addition to narrative descriptions, matrices were developed in order to structure the life stage, population, and threats information so that the threats affecting each ESU/DPS could be ranked, sorted, and prioritized.

[2] It is recognized that more than 26 rivers/watersheds that historically supported and currently support steelhead exist in the Central Valley, however it is assumed that recovery of the Central Valley steelhead DPS is primarily dependent on the 26 populations included in the threats assessment.

[3] Includes steelhead utilizing small tributaries in the Redding area including Stillwater, Churn, Sulphur, Salt, Olney, and Paynes creeks.



Figure 1-3. San Joaquin River and Tributaries

The prioritization of threats was identified as an integral piece in the recovery planning process in NMFS' recovery planning guidance document titled, "*Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance*" (NMFS 2006a).

The prioritized ranking of threats provides a recovery planning tool to help guide the identification of diversity group- and/or population- specific actions to recover each ESU/DPS. Detailed descriptions of how the stressor matrices were developed for each ESU/DPS are presented in Sections 2.4, 3.4, and 4.4, while the diversity group- and population-specific prioritized lists of stressors are displayed in Attachments A through C, respectively.

2.0 SACRAMENTO RIVER WINTER-RUN CHINOOK SALMON

2.1 BACKGROUND

2.1.1 LISTING HISTORY

NMFS listed the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU as a threatened species under emergency provisions of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in August 1989 (54 FR 32085 (August 4, 1989)) and formally listed it as a threatened species in November 1990 (55 FR 46515 (November 5, 1990)). In June 1992, NMFS proposed that winter-run Chinook salmon be reclassified as an "endangered"[4] species (57 FR 27416 (June 19, 1992)). NMFS finalized its proposed rule and re-classified winter-run Chinook salmon as an endangered species on January 4, 1994 (59 FR 440 (January 4, 1994)). NMFS concluded that winter-run Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River warranted listing as an endangered species due to several factors, including: (1) the continued decline and increased variability of run sizes since its first listing as a threatened species in 1989; (2) the expectation of weak adult returns resulting from two small year classes in 1991 and 1993; and (3) continued threats to the "take"[5] of winter-run Chinook salmon (65 FR 42421 (July 10, 2000)). On June 14, 2004, NMFS issued a proposed rule to downgrade the listing status of winter-run Chinook salmon from endangered to threatened (69 FR 33102 (June 14, 2004)). To prevent further decline of the ESU, NMFS proposed to apply the ESA Section 9(a) take prohibitions as the Section 4(d) limits to winter-run Chinook salmon (69 FR 33102 (June 14, 2004)) after this proposed downgrade. Following a series of extensions to the public comment period on the proposed listing determinations, the public comment period closed in November 2004 (69 FR 61348 (October 18, 2004)). On June 28, 2005 NMFS issued a final listing determination for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, which concluded that the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is "in danger of extinction" due to risks to the diversity and spatial structure of the ESU, and therefore, continues to warrant listing as an endangered species under the ESA (70 FR 37160 (June 28, 2005)).

The Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU includes winter-run Chinook salmon spawning naturally in the Sacramento River and its tributaries as well as winter-run Chinook salmon that are part of the artificial propagation program at the Livingston Stone National Fish Hatchery (LSNFH) (70 FR 37160 (June 28, 2005)).

2.1.2 CRITICAL HABITAT

Critical habitat for listed salmonids is comprised of physical and biological features essential to the conservation of the species including: (1) space for the individual and population growth and for normal behavior; (2) cover; (3) sites for breeding, reproduction, and rearing of offspring; and (4) habitats protected from disturbance or are representative of the historical geographical and ecological distribution of the species. The primary constituent elements considered essential for the conservation of listed

[4] Under the ESA, an "endangered species" is *"…any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range…"* (16 USC § 1533(20)).

[5] Section 9 of the ESA makes it illegal to "*take*" (harass, harm, pursue, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect or attempt to engage in any such conduct) any endangered species of fish or wildlife with similar provisions for most threatened species of fish and wildlife (16 USC 1538).

Central Valley salmonids are: (1) freshwater spawning sites; (2) freshwater rearing sites; (3) freshwater migration corridors; (4) estuarine areas; (5) nearshore marine areas; and (6) offshore marine areas.

On August 14, 1992, NMFS published a proposed critical habitat designation for winter-run Chinook salmon (57 FR 36626 (August 13, 1992)). The habitat proposed for designation included: (1) the Sacramento River from Keswick Dam, Shasta County (RM 302) to Chipps Island (RM 0) at the westward margin of the Delta; (2) all waters from Chipps Island westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strait; (3) all waters of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge; and (4) all waters of San Francisco Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge (NMFS 1997).

On June 16, 1993, NMFS issued the final rule designating critical habitat for winter-run Chinook salmon (58 FR 33212 (June 16, 1993)). The habitat identified in the final designation is identical to that in the proposed ruling except that critical habitat in San Francisco Bay is limited to those waters north of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

2.1.3 UNIQUE SPECIES CHARACTERISTICS

2.1.3.1 LIFE HISTORY STRATEGY

Chinook salmon life history strategies are divided into two basic types: stream-type Chinook salmon and ocean type Chinook salmon. Stream-type Chinook salmon adults migrate to freshwater streams before they reach full maturity, in spring or summer, and juveniles spend a relatively long time (usually more than one year) rearing in fresh water. Ocean-type Chinook salmon adults spawn soon after entering fresh water, in late-summer and fall, and juveniles spend a relatively short time (3 to 12 months) rearing in freshwater (Moyle 2002).

Winter-run Chinook salmon are unique to the Sacramento River and exhibit behaviors characteristic of both stream- and ocean-type Chinook salmon (Healey 1991). They typically migrate upstream as immature silvery fish during winter and spring and then spawn several months later in early summer. Specifically, adult winter-run Chinook salmon enter freshwater in winter or early spring, (December through July with peak upstream migration occurring during March) and delay spawning until spring or early summer (a stream-type trait); whereas, juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon exhibit more ocean-type Chinook salmon behavior by migrating to the ocean after only 5 to 10 months of river life. They tend to be smaller than the rest of the runs of Chinook salmon and have low fecundity, mainly because most winter-run Chinook salmon return to spawn as three-year olds.

In the Sacramento River reach between Keswick Dam and RBDD, spawning occurs from mid-April to mid-August, peaking in May and June (Vogel and Marine 1991). Chinook salmon spawn in clean, loose gravel in swift, relatively shallow riffles; or along the margins of deeper river reaches where suitable water temperatures, depths, and velocities favor redd construction and oxygenation of incubating eggs. Winter-run Chinook salmon are adapted for spawning and rearing in the clear, spring-fed rivers of the upper Sacramento River Basin, where summer water temperatures are typically between 50ºF to 59ºF. Historically, these conditions were created by glacial and snowmelt water percolating through porous volcanic formations that surround Mt. Shasta and Mt. Lassen and that cover much of northeastern California. Today, Shasta Dam denies access to winter-run Chinook salmon historical habitats and they persist mainly because water released from Shasta Reservoir during the summer is for the most part cold.

Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon migratory corridors begin downstream of the spawning area and extend through the lower Sacramento River and the Delta. Fry emergence generally occurs at night. Upon emergence from the gravel, fry swim or are displaced downstream (Healey 1991). Fry seek habitats containing beneficial aspects such as riparian vegetation and associated substrates that provide aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates for food, cover for predator avoidance, and slower water velocities for resting (NMFS 1996b). These shallow water habitats have been described as more productive juvenile

salmon rearing habitat than deeper main river channels. Higher juvenile salmon growth rates, partially due to greater prey consumption rates, as well as favorable environmental temperatures have been associated with shallow water habitats (Sommer *et al.* 2001c). Juvenile Chinook salmon migration rates vary considerably presumably depending on the physiological stage of the juvenile and hydrologic conditions. Kjelson (1982) found Chinook salmon fry traveled as fast as 30 kilometers (km) per day in the Sacramento River. Sommer *et al.* (2001a) found rates ranging from approximately 0.5 mile up to more than 6 miles per day in the Yolo Bypass.

As juvenile Chinook salmon grow they move into deeper water with higher current velocities, but still seek shelter and velocity refugia to minimize energy expenditures (Healey 1991). Catches of juvenile salmon in the Sacramento River near West Sacramento by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) exhibited larger juvenile captures in the main channel and smaller sized fry along the margins (USFWS 1997). Where the river channel is greater than 9 to 10 feet in depth, juvenile salmon tend to inhabit the surface waters (Healey 1980). Stream flow and/or turbidity increases in the upper Sacramento River basin are thought to stimulate emigration (Brandes and McLain 2001; Kjelson *et al.* 1982).

Similar to adult salmon upstream movement, juvenile salmon downstream movement is primarily crepuscular. Once downstream movement has commenced, salmon fry might continue this movement until reaching the Delta or they might reside in the stream for a time period that varies from weeks to a year (Healey 1991). The residence time of juveniles in streams is typically 5 to 10 months, followed by an indeterminate time in the Delta.

Emigration of juvenile Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon past RBDD may begin as early as mid-July, typically peaks in September, and can continue through March in dry years (NMFS 1997; Vogel and Marine 1991). From 1995 to 1999, Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon outmigrating as fry passed RBDD by October, and outmigrating pre-smolts and smolts passed RBDD by March (Martin *et al.* 2001).

As Chinook salmon begin the smoltification stage, they are found rearing further downstream where ambient salinity reaches 1.5 to 2.5 parts per thousand (ppt) (Healey 1980; Levy and Northcote 1981). Emigration to the ocean begins as early as November and continues through May (Fisher 1994; Myers *et al.* 1998). The importance of the Delta in the life history of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon is not well understood. However, juvenile Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon are believed to occur in the Delta primarily from November through early May based on data collected from trawls in the Sacramento River at West Sacramento (RM 57) (USFWS 2001). The timing of migration varies somewhat due to changes in river flows, dam operations, and water year type. Winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles remain in the Delta until they reach a fork length (FL) of approximately 118 millimeters (mm).

Within the Delta, juvenile Chinook salmon forage in shallow areas with protective cover, such as tidally influenced sandy beaches and vegetated zones (Healey 1980; Meyer 1979). Cladocerans, copepods, amphipods, and larvae of diptera, as well as small arachnids and ants are common prey items (Kjelson *et al.* 1982; MacFarlane and Norton 2002; Sommer *et al.* 2001b).

Juvenile Chinook salmon movements within the estuarine habitat are dictated by the interaction between tidally driven salt water intrusions through the San Francisco Bay and fresh water outflow from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. Juvenile Chinook salmon follow rising tides into shallow water habitats from the deeper main channels, and return to the main channels when the tides recede (Levy and Northcote 1981). Kjelson (1982) reported that juvenile Chinook salmon demonstrated a diel migration pattern, orienting themselves to nearshore cover and structure during the day, but moving into more open, offshore waters at night. The fish also distributed themselves vertically in relation to ambient light. During the night, juveniles were distributed randomly in the water column, but would school up during the day into the upper three meters of the water column. Juvenile Chinook salmon were found to spend

about 40 days migrating through the Delta to the mouth of San Francisco Bay and grew little in length or weight until they reached the Gulf of the Farallones Islands (MacFarlane and Norton 2002).

Chinook salmon begin their ocean life in the Gulf of the Farallones from where they distribute north and south along the continental shelf primarily between Point Conception and Washington State. Upon reaching the ocean, juvenile Chinook salmon feed voraciously on larval and juvenile fishes, plankton, and terrestrial insects (Healey 1991; MacFarlane and Norton 2002). Chinook salmon grow rapidly in the ocean environment with growth rates dependent on water temperatures and food availability (Healey 1991). The first year of ocean life is considered a critical period of high mortality for Chinook salmon that largely determines survival to harvest or spawning (Beamish and Mahnken 2001; Quinn 2005).

Data from the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) Regional Mark Information System (RMIS) database indicate that Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon adults are not as broadly distributed along the Pacific Coast as other Central Valley Chinook salmon and tend to concentrate between San Francisco and Monterey. This localized distribution may indicate a unique life history strategy related to the observation that Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon also mature at a relatively young age (two to three years old) (Myers *et al.* 1998). Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon remain in the ocean environment for two to four years and tend to enter freshwater as immature fish.

2.1.3.2 HISTORIC SPAWNING HABITAT UTILIZATION

Distribution of winter-run Chinook salmon historically was limited to the upper Sacramento River and its tributaries where cool spring-fed streams supported successful salmon spawning, egg incubation, and juvenile rearing (Slater 1963 and Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998 *in* NMFS 2007). The historical distribution of winter-run Chinook salmon prior to construction of Shasta Dam included the headwaters of the McCloud, Pit, and Little Sacramento rivers and tributaries (e.g., Hat Creek and Fall River) (Myers *et al.* 1998). Since completion of Shasta Dam, the Sacramento River, Battle Creek and the Calaveras River are the only habitats where winter-run Chinook salmon have been reported to occur (USFWS 1987). Primary spawning and rearing habitat in the Sacramento River for winter-run Chinook salmon is now limited to the coldwater areas between Keswick Dam and RBDD. Fish still have access to Battle Creek through the Coleman National Fish Hatchery (CNFH) weir from a fish ladder that is opened during the peak of the winter-run Chinook salmon migration period (Ward and Kier 1999a). Currently, if a winter-run Chinook salmon population exists in Battle Creek; its population size is unknown and is likely very small. In addition, a winter-run Chinook salmon migration to the upper Calaveras River may have occurred between 1972 and 1984, but this information has not been confirmed. Nevertheless, the population seems to have been extirpated by drought, irrigation diversions, and blocked access by the New Hogan Dam (NMFS 1997).

2.1.4 STATUS OF WINTER-RUN CHINOOK SALMON

2.1.4.1 HISTORIC POPULATION TRENDS

Estimates of the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon population (including both male and female salmon) reached nearly 100,000 fish in the 1960s before declining to under 200 fish in the 1990s (**Figure 2-1**) (Good *et al.* 2005 *in* NMFS 2007).



Figure 2-1. Annual Estimate of Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Spawning Escapement from 1967-2006
Source: (CDFG 2007)

2.1.4.2 CURRENT STATUS

Shasta Dam blocks access to the entire historical spawning habitat of winter-run Chinook salmon. It was not expected that winter-run Chinook salmon would survive this habitat alteration (Moffett 1949). However, coldwater releases from Shasta Dam create conditions suitable for winter-run Chinook salmon for roughly 100 km downstream from the dam.

Recent population estimates of 8,218 (2004), 15,730 (2005), and 17,153 (2006) show a three-year average of 13,700 returning salmon (CDFG 2007). Although the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook population has shown improvement over the last six years, existing population abundance (exhibited by spawning escapement estimates) is far below historic numbers. The five-year moving average of the cohort replacement rate (CRR) has been greater than one since 1995, which is an indication of population growth (**Figure 2-2**). The CRR is a measure of population growth rate, and is generally defined as the ratio of naturally-produced returning adult spawners, to adult spawners that naturally-spawned in the river during the previous generation or brood year.

Winter-run Chinook salmon abundance is measured by counting fish that ascend the RBDD fish ladder and by conducting carcass surveys. Both measures indicate that the abundance of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon is increasing. Based on the RBDD counts, the winter-run Chinook salmon population has been growing rapidly since the early 1990s (**Figure 2-3**).



Figure 2-2. Five-year Moving Average of the Winter-run Chinook Salmon Cohort Replacement Rate



Figure 2-3. Estimated Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Spawner Abundance, 1970–2002

Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon may be responding to a number of factors, including wetter than normal winters, changes in ocean harvest regulations since 1995 that have significantly reduced harvests, changes in RBDD operation, improved temperature management on the upper Sacramento River (including installation of a coldwater release device on Shasta Dam), water quality improvements due to remediation of Iron Mountain Mine discharges, changes in operations of the State Water Project (SWP) and federal Central Valley Project (CVP), and a variety of other habitat improvements.

2.1.4.3 EXTINCTION RISK ASSESSMENT

Although the status of the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon population numbers has shown improvement over the lat six years, there is still only one naturally-spawned component of the ESU, and this single population depends on coldwater releases from Shasta Dam on the Sacramento River. Lindley *et al.* (2007) considers the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon population at a moderate risk of extinction primarily due to the risks associated with only one existing population. The viability of an ESU that is represented by a single population is vulnerable to changes in the environment through a lack of spatial geographic diversity and genetic diversity that result from having only one population. A single catastrophe with effects persisting for four or more years could extirpate the entire Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU (Lindley *et al.* 2007). Such potential catastrophes include volcanic eruption of Mt. Lassen, prolonged drought which depletes the coldwater pool in Shasta Reservoir or some related failure to manage coldwater storage, a spill of toxic materials with effects that persist for four or more years, or a disease outbreak. Moreover, an ESU that is represented by a single population is vulnerable to the limitation in life history and genetic diversity that would otherwise increase the ability of individuals in the population to withstand environmental variation.

2.2 LIFE HISTORY AND BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

2.2.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

2.2.1.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Adult winter-run Chinook salmon on their upstream migration enter San Francisco Bay from November through June and migrate past the RBDD from mid-December through early August (Hallock and Fisher 1985) (**Figure 2-4**). The majority of the winter-run Chinook salmon adults pass RBDD between January and May (Hallock and Fisher 1985), with the peak typically occurring during March and April (Snider *et al.* 2001).

2.2.1.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Suitable water temperatures for adult winter-run Chinook salmon migrating upstream to spawning grounds were reported to range from 57°F to 67°F (NMFS 1997). There is evidence suggesting that water temperatures above 70°F may present a thermal barrier to Chinook salmon upstream migration (Boles *et al.* 1988; USFWS 1995c). Water temperature requirements for adult Chinook salmon holding while eggs are developing are more restrictive with maximum temperatures reported at 59°F to 60°F (NMFS 1997). However, adults holding at 55°F to 56°F have substantially better egg viability (Boles *et al.* 1988; NMFS 1997).

Adult Chinook salmon require water deeper than 0.8 feet and water velocities less than 8 feet per second (ft/sec) for successful upstream migration (Thompson 1972). Adult Chinook salmon are less capable of negotiating fish ladders, culverts, and waterfalls during upstream migration than steelhead, due in part to slower swimming speeds and inferior jumping ability (Bell 1986; Reiser *et al.* 2006).

Adult winter-run Chinook salmon hold in deep, cool, well-oxygenated pools to escape warm water temperatures during the early summer months prior to spawning (DWR and Reclamation 2000). Pools utilized by Chinook salmon for holding are generally greater than 5 feet in depth that contain cover from overhanging vegetation, undercut banks, boulders or large woody debris (Lindsay 1985). Water velocities through these pools range from 0.5 to 2.0 ft/sec (Moyle 2002).



Figure 2-4. Geographic and Temporal Distribution of Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon

2.2.2 ADULT SPAWNING

2.2.2.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

The primary spawning area for winter-run Chinook salmon extends 31 miles from Keswick Dam (RM 302) downstream to Battle Creek (RM 271) (Snider *et al.* 2001). Within this 31-mile reach, the majority of spawning occurs in the upper 14 miles from Keswick Dam to the Redding Water Treatment Plant (WTP) (Snider *et al.* 2001). Winter-run Chinook salmon primarily spawn from late-April through mid-August, with peak spawning activity in May and June (NMFS 1997).

2.2.2.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Generally, successful spawning for Chinook salmon occurs at water temperatures below 60°F (NMFS 1997). Both Chambers (1956), and Reiser and Bjornn (1979) report that upper preferred water temperatures for spawning Chinook salmon range from about 55°F to 57°F. The biological opinion (BO) on the Long-Term CVP and SWP Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP) requires water temperatures to be maintained below 56°F in the upper Sacramento River above the RBDD (NMFS 2004a). The 56°F temperature criterion is measured as the average daily water temperature and as such, the criterion may allow water temperatures to exceed 56°F for some periods during a day. Chinook salmon spawn in riffles or runs with water velocities ranging from 0.5 to 6.2 ft/sec (DWR and Reclamation 2000; Healey 1991; Moyle 2002; Vogel and Marine 1991).

Spawning depths can range from as little as a few inches to several feet (Moyle 2002). Preferred water depths appear to range from 0.8 to 3.3 feet (Allen and Hassler 1986; Moyle 2002). Substrate is an important component of Chinook salmon spawning habitat, and generally includes a mixture of gravel and small cobbles (Moyle 2002). NMFS (1997) reports that preferred spawning substrate is composed mostly of gravels from 0.75 to 4.0 inches in diameter.

2.2.3 EMBRYO INCUBATION

2.2.3.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

The winter-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation life stage primarily occurs between Keswick Dam and Battle Creek from April through October (NMFS 2004a; Vogel and Marine 1991).

2.2.3.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Water temperature, dissolved oxygen concentration, and inter-gravel flow are all important factors in successful embryo incubation of Chinook salmon. Within the appropriate water temperature range, eggs normally hatch in 40 to 60 days. Newly hatched fish (alevins) normally remain in the gravel for an additional four to six weeks until the yolk sac has been absorbed (NMFS 1997). Maximum embryo survival is reported at water temperatures ranging from 41°F to 56°F (Moyle 2002; USFWS 1995b). Yoshiyama *et al.* (2001) report good embryo survival at water temperatures up to 58°F. The USFWS reports decreased embryo survival occurs at water temperatures above 56°F, and no survival of eggs was observed at water temperatures above 62°F (USFWS 1995a).

Successful embryo incubation has been observed within a wide range of water depths and velocities, provided that intra-gravel flow is adequate for delivering sufficient oxygen to developing eggs and alevins (Healey 1991). The minimum intra-gravel percolation rate to ensure good survival of incubating eggs and alevins will vary, depending on flow rate, water depth, and water quality. Under controlled conditions, survival rates of 97 percent and greater have been observed with a percolation rate of 0.001 ft/sec (0.03 centimeters per second [cm/sec]), whereas 60 percent survival was observed at a 0.0001 ft/sec (0.0042 cm/sec) percolation rate (Gangmark and Bakkala 1960; Shelton 1955). Raleigh *et al.* (1986) report optimal embryo survival at dissolved oxygen concentration of 10.5 milligrams per liter.

2.2.4 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

2.2.4.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Winter-run Chinook salmon fry emerge from the spawning gravels from mid-June through mid-October (NMFS 1997). The downstream migration of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon past RBDD may begin in late-July, peak in September, and can continue until mid-March (Vogel and Marine 1991). Winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles occur between the RBDD and the confluence of Deer Creek (RM 220) from July through September. Their distribution slowly spreads downstream to Princeton (RM 164) between October and March (Johnson *et al.* 1992; NMFS 1997). Winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles move downstream past Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's (GCID) Hamilton City Pumping Plant (HCPP) from July through March, with peak movement occurring in October and November (CUWA and SWC 2004). The presence of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the Delta may extend from as early as September to as late as June, with a peak from January through April (NMFS 1997). The timing of emigration from the Delta to the Bays and ocean is not well known, but winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles reportedly reside in fresh and estuarine waters for five to nine months before migrating to the ocean from January (possibly late-December) through June (NMFS 1997).

2.2.4.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Optimal water temperatures for juvenile Chinook salmon are reported to range from 53.6°F to 57.2°F (NMFS 1997). A daily average water temperature of 60°F is considered the upper temperature limit for juvenile Chinook salmon growth and rearing (NMFS 1997). Inhibition of Chinook salmon smolt development in the Sacramento River reportedly may occur at water temperatures above 63°F (Marine 1997; Marine and Cech 2004).

Riparian vegetation, including shaded riverine aquatic (SRA) cover, provides juvenile salmon cover from predators, habitat complexity, a source of insect prey, and shade for maintaining water temperatures within suitable ranges for all life stages. Juvenile Chinook salmon prefer riverine habitat with abundant instream and overhead cover (e.g., undercut banks, submerged and emergent vegetation, logs, roots, other woody debris, and dense overhead vegetation) to provide refuge from predators, and a sustained, abundant supply of invertebrate and larval fish prey. On the Sacramento River, juvenile Chinook salmon are more commonly found in association with natural (as opposed to riprapped) riverbanks, and SRA cover (CDFG 1983).

Upon arrival in the Delta, winter-run Chinook salmon tend to rear in the more upstream freshwater portions of the Delta for about two months (Kjelson *et al.* 1981). Within the Delta, juvenile Chinook salmon forage in shallow areas with protective cover, such as intertidal and subtidal mudflats, marshes, channels, and sloughs. Maturing Chinook salmon fry and fingerlings prefer to rear further downstream where ambient salinity is up to 1.5 to 2.5 ppt (Levings and Bouillon 2005). In Suisun Marsh, Moyle *et al.* (1995) reported that Chinook salmon fry tend to remain close to the banks and vegetation, near protective cover, and in dead-end tidal channels. Winter-run Chinook salmon fry remain in the Delta until they reach a FL of about 118 mm (i.e., 5 to 10 months of age) and then begin emigrating to the ocean maybe as early as November and continue through May (Fisher 1994; Myers *et al.* 1998).

2.2.5 SUB-ADULT AND ADULT OCEAN RESIDENCE

2.2.5.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Winter-run Chinook salmon ocean residence normally lasts from two to four years. About one-fourth of the population returns to freshwater as two-year olds, two-thirds as three-year olds and the remainder as four-year olds (NMFS 1997). This age-of-return distribution varies - there are years when overwhelmingly two-year old males return to the upper Sacramento, and years such as 2007 when a substantial component of the returning population are four-year olds. The distribution of sub-adult and adult Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon in the ocean is believed to primarily extend from Monterey to Fort Bragg (NMFS 1997).

2.2.5.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

The availability of food resources and cold water are likely the most important factors controlling the survival of sub-adult and adult Chinook salmon in the ocean. Food resource availability for these fish is largely dependent on the spatial distribution and abundance of plankton, which has been shown to be associated with coastal upwelling in the Pacific Northwest (Nickelson 1986; Pearcy 1997). Coastal upwelling occurs when offshore moving surface water is replaced by water which upwells along the coast from depths of 50 to 100 meters and more (NMFS 1996a). This upwelled water is cooler than the original surface water and typically has much higher concentrations of nutrients such as nitrate, phosphate and silicate that are key to sustaining biological production (NMFS 1996a). Generally, strong upwelling events lasting several months or more bring an abundance of plankton and cold water to the near shore surface waters of the ocean and have been associated with salmon abundance.

2.3 THREATS AND STRESSORS

2.3.1 SUMMARY OF ESA LISTING FACTORS

2.3.1.1 DESTRUCTION, MODIFICATION, OR CURTAILMENT OF HABITAT OR RANGE

The primary threats to the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU have remained the same as when the ESU was first listed in an emergency interim rule in 1989 and final rule in 1990. Dams in the Central Valley have blocked access to the entire historical spawning grounds, altered water temperatures, and reduced habitat complexity, thus posing risks to the abundance, productivity, and especially to the spatial structure and genetic diversity of the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU. These four components of abundance, productivity, spatial structure, and diversity are the basis of how NMFS determines population and ESU/DPS viability for salmonids, as defined in (McElhany *et al.* 2000). The construction and operation of Shasta Dam alone immediately reduced the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU from four independent populations to just one. The remaining available habitat for natural spawners is currently maintained artificially with cool water releases from Shasta and Keswick dams, thereby significantly limiting spatial distribution of this ESU.

RBDD, constructed in 1964, presents an impediment to upstream migrants. The construction and operation of the dam were considered one of the primary reasons for the decline of winter-run Chinook salmon in listing the ESU. Although gates at the dam are now raised to allow for free passage of upstream migrants to access spawning habitat, an estimated 15 percent of the run cannot pass the dam and must spawn downstream from the dam, where the river temperatures are warmer, and the habitat less suitable. RBDD is still partly passable when the gates are down, but it does delay migration and forces some fish to spawn below it.

As described in the final listing determination for the ESU, the flashboard gates at the Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District (ACID) Diversion Dam and the inadequate fish ladders block passage for upstream migrant fish. The seasonal operation of the dam created unsuitable habitat upstream of the dam by reducing flow over the eggs, which has led to reduced egg survival. In 2001, a new fish screen was placed at the diversion and a state-of-the-art fish ladder was installed to address the threats caused by the diversion dam. The success of this project will be evaluated using pre- and post-construction biological monitoring. It is still too early to determine if the goal of the project has been achieved.

In the first listing determination of the ESU, pollution from Iron Mountain Mine was considered one of the main threats to the ESU. Acid mine drainage produced from the abandoned mine degraded spawning habitat of winter-run Chinook salmon and resulted in high salmon and steelhead mortality. Remediation of Iron Mountain Mine and restoration efforts as outlined in the 2002 Restoration Plan (that was developed by the Iron Mountain Mine Trustee Council composed of several federal and state agencies) are considered to adequately mitigate the threats posed to the ESU. Pollution from Iron Mountain Mine is no longer considered a main factor threatening the ESU. Pollution from agricultural runoff carrying pesticides and fertilizers, however, is still a threat to winter-run Chinook salmon.

Bank stabilization structures to prevent bank erosion may affect the quality of rearing and migration habitat along the river. Juvenile salmon prefer natural streambanks as opposed to riprapped, leveed, or channelized sections of the Sacramento River. Bank stabilization projects in the Sacramento River are beginning to incorporate conservation measures in some areas to provide more suitable seasonal habitat for juvenile salmon as well as reduce predation in the artificially created habitat.

Additionally, the sediment balance of the Sacramento River may be highly disrupted, resulting in reduced inputs of gravel due to dams and regulated flows, as well as gravel mining and removing gravel (The Nature Conservancy 2006).

2.3.1.2 OVERUTILIZATION FOR COMMERCIAL, RECREATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, OR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes no longer appears to have a significant impact on winter-run Chinook salmon populations, but warrants continued assessment. Commercial fishing for salmon is managed by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) and is constrained by time and area to meet the Sacramento River winter-run ESA consultation standard, and restrictions requiring minimum size limits and use of circle hooks for anglers. Ocean harvest restrictions since 1995 have led to reduced ocean harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon (i.e., Central Valley Chinook salmon ocean harvest index, or Central Valley Index (CVI), ranged from 0.55 to nearly 0.80 from 1970 to 1995, and was reduced to 0.27 in 2001). While overutilization does not seem to be a significant factor under current ocean and terrestrial climate conditions, this could change due to global climate change implications.

Scientific and educational projects permitted under Sections 4(d) and 10(a)(1)(A) of the ESA stipulate specific conditions to minimize take of winter-run Chinook salmon individuals during permitted activities. There are currently four active permits in the Central Valley that may affect winter-run Chinook salmon. These permitted studies provide information about winter-run Chinook salmon that is useful to the management and conservation of the ESU.

2.3.1.3 DISEASE OR PREDATION

Naturally occurring pathogens may pose a threat to winter-run Chinook salmon, and artificially propagated winter-run Chinook salmon are susceptible to disease outbreaks such as the Infectious Hematopoietic Necrosis Virus (IHNV) and Bacterial Kidney Disease.

Predation is a threat to winter-run Chinook salmon, especially in the Delta where there are high densities of non-native fish (e.g., small and large mouth bass, striped bass, catfish, and sculpin) that prey on outmigrating salmon. The presence of man-made structures in the environment that alter natural conditions likely also contributes to increased predation by altering the predator-prey dynamics often favoring predatory species. In the upper Sacramento River, rising of the gates at the RBDD reduces potential predation at the dam by pikeminnow. In the ocean, and even the Delta environment, salmon are common prey for harbor seals and sea lions.

2.3.1.4 INADEQUACY OF EXISTING REGULATORY MECHANISMS

Over the past 10 to 15 years, many protective measures have been implemented to help increase the abundance and productivity of winter-run Chinook salmon.

FEDERAL EFFORTS

There have been several federal actions to reduce threats to the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU. Actions undertaken pursuant to Section 7 BOs have helped to increase the abundance and productivity of winter-run Chinook salmon. The BO for the CVP and SWP has led to increased freshwater survival, and the BOs for ocean harvest have led to increased ocean survival and adult escapement. There have also been several habitat restoration efforts implemented under the Central Valley Project Impact Act (CVPIA) and CALFED programs that have led to increased abundance and productivity. There has been successful implementation of the artificial propagation program at LSNFH to supplement the abundance of naturally spawning winter-run Chinook salmon and preserve the ESU's genetic resources. Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA authorizes habitat conservation plans (HCP) for non-federal actions. However, many private parties are hesitant to engage in the HCP process because it can be costly and time-consuming. Developing an HCP is usually a voluntary process, thus, there are no guarantees that large-scale, long-term planning efforts will occur.

However, despite federal actions to reduce threats to the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU through conservation efforts, there is still a lack of diversity within the ESU and there still remains only one single extant population. Although there has been a marked increase in abundance of winter-run Chinook salmon over the last several years, the spatial distribution of winter-run Chinook salmon spawners has not expanded. It is uncertain whether ongoing efforts to restore habitat and passage to Battle Creek through the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) will lead to successful establishment of a second independent population. The funding and implementation of that program remains uncertain. Many federal projects have languished. As noted in Lindley *et al*. (2006), at least two additional populations need to be successfully established to attain ESU viability for winter-run Chinook salmon, but there has not been an active push to establish additional populations. NMFS does not believe that current protective efforts being implemented for the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU provide sufficient certainty that the ESU will not be in danger of extinction in the foreseeable future.

NON-FEDERAL EFFORTS

A wide range of restoration and conservation actions have been implemented or are in the planning stages of development to aid in the recovery of the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU. Most of these actions are pursuant to implementation of conservation and restoration actions in the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, which is composed of 25 state and federal agencies, and has aided to increase abundance and productivity of winter-run Chinook salmon. The state of California listed winter-run Chinook salmon as endangered in 1989 under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). The state's Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) involves long-term planning with several stakeholders. The state has also implemented freshwater harvest management conservation measures, and increased monitoring and evaluation efforts in support of conserving this ESU. Local governments, such as the City of Redding, and grassroots organizations, such as the Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy, are engaged in the development and implementation of conservation and recovery measures to improve conditions for winter-run Chinook salmon.

Despite federal and non-federal efforts and partnerships, the winter-run Chinook salmon ESU remains at risk of extinction because the existing regulatory mechanisms do not provide sufficient certainty that efforts to reduce threats to the ESU will be fully funded or implemented. The effectiveness of regulations depends on compliance, and tracking and enforcement of compliance has not occurred consistently within this ESU.

2.3.1.5 OTHER NATURAL AND MANMADE FACTORS AFFECTING THE SPECIES' CONTINUED EXISTENCE

Artificial propagation programs for winter-run Chinook salmon conservation purposes were developed to increase abundance and diversity of winter-run Chinook salmon, but it is still unclear what the effects of the program are to the productivity and spatial structure of the ESU (i.e., fitness and productivity). Global and localized climate changes, such as El Niño ocean conditions and prolonged drought conditions, may play a significant role in the decline of salmon, with unstable Chinook salmon populations potentially reaching lower levels. The ESU is highly vulnerable to drought conditions. During dry years, less cold water is available for release from Shasta Dam, which is the sole provider of cold water on which the fish are dependent. The resulting increased water temperature reduces availability of suitable spawning and rearing conditions.

Unscreened water diversions entrain outmigration juvenile salmon and fry. Unscreened water diversions (e.g., RBDD, Tehama-Colusa Canal [TCC], GCID) and CVP and SWP pumping plants entrain juvenile salmon, leading to fish mortality. The cumulative effect of entrainment at these diversions and delays in outmigration of smolts caused by reduced flows may affect winter-run Chinook salmon fitness.

Although the status of winter-run Chinook salmon is improving, there is only one population, and it depends on cold water releases from Shasta Dam, which would be vulnerable to a prolonged drought. Increasing the number of independent populations has yet to occur. With only one extant population of winter-run Chinook salmon, there is a need to ensure more diversity within this ESU, because it is more susceptible to catastrophic events arising from natural and/or anthropogenic processes. The need for a second naturally spawning population has been recognized and plans have been proposed to establish a second population in Battle Creek, but implementation of restoration in this watershed continues to be delayed. However, there is no guarantee that this planned protective effort will provide enough certainty to reduce the risk to the population of becoming extinct. Additional opportunities exist to provide further protection to the species, but actions to minimize threats will require close collaboration with many agencies, stakeholders, and special interest groups.

2.3.2 NON-LIFE STAGE-SPECIFIC THREATS AND STRESSORS

Potential threats to the California Central Valley winter-run Chinook salmon population that are not specific to a particular life stage include the potential negative impacts of the current artificial propagation program utilizing the LSNFH; the small wild population size; the genetic integrity of the population due to both hatchery influence and small population size; and the potential effects of long-term climate change. Each of these potential threats is discussed in the following sections.

2.3.2.1 ARTIFICIAL PROPAGATION PROGRAM

A conservation hatchery program for winter-run Chinook salmon was initiated in 1989 at the CNFH on Battle Creek; a tributary of the upper Sacramento River above the RBDD. The purpose of the program is to reduce the risk of extinction by conservation of the winter-run Chinook salmon genome and supplementation of the wild winter-run Chinook salmon spawning population in the upper Sacramento River. Potential winter-run Chinook salmon broodstock have been collected in fish traps at Keswick Dam and RBDD, and were originally spawned at CNFH. As additional insurance, captive broodstock programs also were adopted to provide gametes for artificial propagation as needed, by rearing program winter-run juveniles to maturity in captivity. A captive rearing program was initiated in 1991 at the University of California Bodega Marine Laboratory (BML), where it played a role in winter-run research studies; and at Steinhart Aquarium, which provided a forum to educate the public to the status of the endangered Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon. All conservation hatchery winter-run Chinook salmon have been protected under the ESA and have been part of the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU.

The first release of hatchery-raised winter-run fry occurred in 1990, with an average annual release of 30,600 juveniles from CNFH between brood years 1991 and 1995. Although the intent of the program is to contribute winter-run adults to the spawning population in the upper Sacramento River, the CNFH winter-run juveniles imprinted on Battle Creek water and returned instead to Battle Creek as mature adults. In addition, genetic analyses indicated that 8 of the 129 Chinook salmon used for hatchery propagation in 1993, 1994 and 1995 were likely spring-run (NMFS 1997b). Hybrid fish inadvertently were included in program winter-run releases in 1993 and 1994, but were held back in 1995 (NMFS 1997b). At the time, the microsatellite locus, *Ots-2,* was being used exclusively to determine run assignment on captured fish; however, most of the major alleles at this locus are shared by both winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon (Hedgecock *et al.* 1996). In response to the need to identify fish to run before being used as program broodstock, the genetics team at BML (Banks 1996) identified a number of highly polymorphic microsatellite loci in winter-run which have since been refined with multi-allelic gene markers. While these issues were being addressed, BML operations provided program fish from 1996 through 1998 while a conservation hatchery facility on the upper Sacramento River was being planned. The winter-run conservation program was moved to the LSNFH in 1998 and a third captive rearing program was established at LSNFH. Winter-run production fish are marked with coded wire tags

(CWT) and adipose fin-clipped, and released in the upper Sacramento River as pre-smolts each winter in late January or early February. In the CALFED Science Conference of 2003 (Brown and Nichols 2003) it was reported that winter-run conservation program has contributed to the abundance of returning adult winter-run Chinook salmon. **Table 2-1** shows the annual number of winter-run Chinook salmon released from the facility from 1999 through 2005. The table also provides information based on data acquired during mark-recapture studies on the amount of time required by the smolts to reach the Delta.

Table 2-1. Winter-run Chinook Salmon Releases from Livingston Stone National Fish Hatchery (Brood Years 1998-2004)

Brood Year	Upper Sacramento River Release Date[1]	Number of Pre-Smolts Released[1]	Initial Delta Recapture Date[2]	Number of Smolts in Delta Recapture[2]
1998	1/28/1999	153,908	3/15/1999	106,142
1999	1/28/2000	30,840	2/22/2000	5,459
2000	2/01/2001	166,495	3/05/2001	37,113
2001	1/30/2002	252,684	3/07/2002	158,285
2002	1/30/2003	233,613	2/14/2003	184,080
2003	2/05/2004	218,517	2/20/2004	171,584
2004	2/03/2005	168,261	2/22/2005	124,409
2005	2/02/2006	173,344		
2006	2/08/2007	196,268		
Source: ([1]USFWS Red Bluff 1998-2006; [2]Kimmerer 2006)				

There is evidence that hatchery fish may negatively affect the genetic constitution of wild fish (Allendorf *et al.* 1997; Hindar *et al.* 1991; Waples 1991). One indication of this is the observation of a reduction in wild fish populations following the initiation of a hatchery release program (Hilborn 1992; Washington and Koziol 1993). An explanation offered for this observation is that hatchery fish are adapted to the hatchery environment; therefore, natural spawning with wild fish reduces the fitness of the natural population to the natural environment. The winter-run conservation program has a broodstock collection target limit of 15 percent of the estimated upriver winter-run escapement, up to a maximum of 120 natural-origin winter-run but no fewer than 20 fish. The number of hatchery-origin winter-run Chinook salmon that may be incorporated as broodstock cannot exceed 10 percent of the total number of winter-run Chinook salmon being spawned. Broodstock collection is based on the historic migration timing of winter-run past RBDD. Collected adults are assessed for phenotypic indicators of winter-run classification and may be selected for the program only after tissue samples are genetically confirmed. The majority of winter-run hatchery releases have been F1 generation (progeny of wild fish crosses spawned at LSNFH). The annual production goal is a maximum of 250,000 pre-smolt winter-run Chinook salmon sub-yearlings for release, which was met in 2001 (Table 2-1). There may be a trade-off over time between reducing the demographic risks and increasing the genetic risks to the wild population with hatchery supplementation; conservation hatchery programs are intended to be phased out as the natural population recovers. USFWS has begun this process with the phase out of the winter-run captive rearing programs at BML and LSNFH in 2005 and 2006, respectively (Steinhart Aquarium discontinued as a captive broodstock site in 2001). Recently, NMFS reports that the rising proportion of hatchery fish among returning adults threatens to shift the population from a low to moderate risk of extinction. Lindley *et al.* (2007) recommend that in order to maintain a low risk of genetic introgression with hatchery fish, no more than five percent of the naturally spawning population should be composed of hatchery fish. LSNFH provides a higher level of survival to winter-run at the egg, alevin and early juvenile salmon life stages than what is found in nature. Since 2001, hatchery origin winter-run Chinook

salmon have made up more than five percent of the run and in 2005, the contribution of hatchery fish exceeded 18 percent (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

A potential consequence of the hatchery program to the winter-run ESU may be dominant hatchery influence, if the number of successful hatchery spawners continues at the current level of contribution to the natural spawning population.

2.3.2.2 SMALL POPULATION SIZE COMPOSED OF A SINGLE EXTANT POPULATION

One of the main threats to the Central Valley winter-run Chinook salmon population is the small population size. The Biological Review Team (BRT) (Good *et al.* 2005) suggests that one of the chief threats to the winter-run Chinook salmon population in the Sacramento River is small population size. The population declined from an escapement of near 100,000 in the late 1960s to less than 200 in the early 1990s (Good *et al.* 2005). The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) estimated that 191 winter-run Chinook salmon returned in 1991 and that 189 returned in 1994 (Arkush *et al.* 1997). Runs increased to 1,361 in 1995 and 1,296 in 1996 (Arkush *et al.* 1997). Escapements increased to 8,120, 7,360 and 8,133 in 2001, 2002 and 2003 respectively (CDFG 2004b). However, a significant portion of these fish are likely returns from the winter-run Chinook salmon propagation program at the LSNFH.

A small population is particularly vulnerable to changes in environmental conditions such as droughts, El Niño events, and hazardous material spills, any of which could result in a year class failure. Magnifying the problem of a small population size of winter-run Chinook salmon in the Central Valley is that virtually all spawning activity occurs in the upper Sacramento River between the RBDD and Keswick Dam. A problem in this reach of the river could potentially destroy an entire year class. Historically, winter-run Chinook salmon spawned in several different tributaries of the upper Sacramento River including the McCloud, Pit and Little Sacramento rivers (NMFS 1997). Small population sizes are also vulnerable to adverse genetic effects as discussed in Section 2.3.2.3 below.

Botsford and Brittnacher (1998) propose a delisting criterion of >10,000 spawning females over any 13 consecutive years. Furthermore, due to the limited accuracy in measuring spawner abundance and the finite number of samples used to estimate population growth rate, estimates must be based on at least 13 years of data (Botsford and Brittnacher 1998).

2.3.2.3 GENETIC INTEGRITY

Available literature suggests several concerns with hatchery stocks reproducing with wild stocks. For example, Fleming and Gross (1992) documented the competitive inferiority of hatchery coho when attempting to spawn with wild stocks. Hatchery males were less aggressive, more submissive, and were denied access to spawning females; hatchery females spawned smaller portions of their eggs than did wild females and lost more eggs to redd destruction by other females. Busack and Currens (1995) report that raising fish in an artificial environment for all or part of their lives imposes different selection pressures on them than does the natural environment. Fish in hatchery environments may be exposed to higher densities, different food, flow regimes, substrate, protective cover, etc. These changes allow more fish to survive in the hatchery than in the wild but they also create an opportunity for genetic change in the overall population (Busack and Currens 1995). Doyle *et al.* (1995) report that the presence of a hatchery rearing stage in the life cycle of a fish will inevitably select for improved hatchery performance even when the hatchery broodstock is collected every generation from the wild. Because the correlation of hatchery fitness and fitness in nature is usually negative, this has created a problem in many enhancement programs. Lindley *et al.* (2007) recommend that in order to maintain a low risk of genetic introgression with hatchery fish, no more than five percent of the naturally spawning population should be composed of hatchery fish. Since 2001, hatchery-origin winter-run Chinook salmon have made up more than five

percent of the run and in 2005, the contribution of hatchery fish exceeded 18 percent (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

In contrast to the concerns expressed above, Campton (1995) reviewed the literature on genetic effects of hatchery fish and wild stocks of Pacific salmon and steelhead and concluded that most genetic effects detected to date appear to be caused by hatchery or fishery management practices and not biological factors intrinsic to hatcheries or hatchery fish. Additionally, Olson *et al.* (1995) reported that based on data gathered on wild and hatchery spring-run Chinook salmon and summer steelhead in an Oregon stream, hatchery production is providing increased contribution to tribal and sport fisheries while not adversely affecting wild stock production.

Another potential problem of a small natural population is the potential for artificial propagation to reduce the effective size of the naturally spawning wild population. Ryman and Laikre (1991) suggest that supplementation may, under certain circumstances, decrease the overall effective population size and that the greatest danger of such a reduction occurs when the effective population of the natural proportion of the population is small. Small population sizes also reduce genetic variation in the population. Arkush *et al.* (2007) suggest that pathogen susceptibility in winter-run Chinook salmon will increase if further genetic variation is lost. These are the very circumstances that might occur in the case of an endangered or threatened salmonid species (NMFS 1997).

The winter-run captive broodstock program maintained representation of winter-run family groups and maximized genetic variation in spawning matrices. The artificial propagation program collects broodstock on the basis of historic run-timing and abundance of winter-run past RBDD. Collected adults are assessed for phenotypic indicators of winter-run classification and may be selected for the program only after tissue samples are genetically confirmed through molecular and statistical methods.

Adult hatchery winter-run returns are intended to contribute to the effective spawning population (N_e) by supplementing the abundance of the natural population. N_e is a measure of the rate of genetic drift within a population, and is directly related to the rate of loss of genetic diversity and the rate of increase in inbreeding within a population (Riemann and Allendorf 2001). USFWS conducts an annual analysis on the likelihood of loss of genetic variation in the winter-run effective population as a consequence of releases of hatchery-origin winter Chinook salmon. Two estimates of N_e are calculated for the winter-run population: one assumes genetic contribution by 10 percent of the run size estimate (Bartley *et al.* 1992) and one assumes genetic contribution by 33 percent of the run size estimate (R. Waples, NMFS Northwest Fisheries Science Center, pers. comm. to USFWS).

2.3.2.4 LONG-TERM CLIMATE CHANGE

California's Central Valley is located at the extreme southern limit of Chinook salmon distribution. The southern limit of Chinook salmon distribution is likely a function of climate. In California, observations reveal trends in the last 50 years toward warmer winter and spring temperatures, a smaller fraction of precipitation falling as snow, a decrease in the amount of spring snow accumulation in lower and middle elevation mountain zones and an advance in snowmelt of 5 to 30 days earlier in the spring (Knowles *et al.* 2006). Given this trend, it is likely that most species currently at the southern extent of their range, including Chinook salmon, will experience less desirable environmental conditions in the future.

Although current models are broadly consistent in predicting increases in global air temperatures, there are considerable uncertainties about precipitation estimates. For example, many regional modeling analyses conducted for the western United States indicate that overall precipitation will increase, but uncertainties remain due to differences among larger scale General Circulation Models (GCMs) (Kiparsky and Gleick 2003). Some researchers believe that climate warming might push the storm track on the West Coast further north, which would result in drier conditions in California. At the same time, relatively newer GCMs, including those used in the National Weather Assessment, predict increases in California precipitation (Roos 2003). Similarly, two popular models, including HadCM2 developed by

the U.K. Hadley Center and PCM developed by the U.S. National Center for Atmospheric Research, also predict very different future scenarios. The HadCM2 predicts wetter conditions while the PCM predicts drier conditions (Brekke *et al.* 2004).

While much variation exists in projections related to future precipitation patterns, all available climate models predict a warming trend resulting from the influence of rising levels of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere (Barnett *et al.* 2005). The potential effects of a warmer climate on the seasonality of runoff from snowmelt in California's Central Valley have been well-studied and results suggest that melt runoff would likely shift from spring and summer to earlier periods in the water year (Vanrheenen *et al.* 2004). Currently, snow accumulation in the Sierra Nevada acts as a natural reservoir for California by delaying runoff from winter months when precipitation is high (Kiparsky and Gleick 2003). Despite the uncertainties about future change in precipitation rates, it is generally believed that higher temperatures will lead to changes in snowfall and snowmelt dynamics. Higher atmospheric temperatures will likely increase the ratio of rain to snow, shorten and delay the onset of the snowfall season, and accelerate the rate of spring snowmelt, which would lead to more rapid and earlier seasonal runoff relative to current conditions (Kiparsky and Gleick 2003). Studies suggest that the spring streamflow maximum could occur about one month earlier by 2050 (Barnett *et al.* 2005).

If air temperatures in California rise significantly, it will become increasingly difficult to maintain appropriate water temperatures in order to manage coldwater fisheries, including winter-run Chinook salmon. A reduction in snowmelt and increased evaporation could lead to decreases in reservoir levels and, perhaps more importantly, coldwater pool reserves (California Energy Commission 2003). As a result, water temperatures in rivers supporting anadromous salmonids, including winter-run Chinook salmon, could potentially rise and no longer be able to support over-summering life stages (i.e., winter-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation, fry emergence, and juvenile emigration). The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) (2006) suggests that under a warmer climate scenario, water temperature standards in the upper Sacramento River likely could not be maintained.

2.3.3 SAN FRANCISCO, SAN PABLO, AND SUISUN BAYS

Adult winter-run Chinook salmon on their upstream migration enter San Francisco Bay from November through June (Hallock and Fisher 1985). Migration through the Delta and into the lower Sacramento River occurs from December through July, with a peak during the period extending from January through April (USFWS 1995a). The majority of the winter-run Chinook salmon adults pass the RBDD between January and May (Hallock and Fisher 1985), with the peak typically occurring during March and April (Snider *et al.* 2001). See Section 2.2.1 for a more complete description of the biological requirements and description of this life stage. Factors that may adversely affect winter-run Chinook salmon adult immigration and holding are similar in each of the three river reaches described below although the magnitude of the effects may differ.

2.3.3.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Suisun Marsh is one of the largest contiguous brackish water tidal marshes in the United States and is situated west of the Delta and north of Suisun Bay. In 1978, water salinity standards for Suisun Marsh were established by the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) Decision 1485 (D-1485) to improve waterfowl food plant production and to preserve the Suisun Marsh as a brackish water tidal marsh. In response to D-1485, DWR initiated a "Plan of Protection for the Suisun Marsh," which proposed actions to improve the water quality of the inner marsh. The Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure (SMSCS), which spans the entire 465-foot width of Montezuma Slough, includes permanent barriers adjacent to the levee on each side of the slough, gates with flashboards, and a boat lock. The

SMSCS was installed in 1989 to control salinity levels in the marsh. The gates are operated from September through May, by closing on flood tides and opening on ebb tides (NMFS 2004a).

The SMSCS may delay and block immigration of adult Chinook salmon attempting to return to their natal spawning areas. Operation of the SMSCS reverses the net tidal flow within Montezuma Slough from a net eastward to a net westward flow. In addition, water flowing out of Montezuma Slough contains water from the Sacramento River. These hydrologic conditions may increase the attraction of adult Chinook salmon into the slough. Adult Chinook salmon that have entered the lower end of Montezuma Slough from the Delta cannot access spawning areas in the upper Sacramento River watershed and may be blocked or hindered by the SMSCS when they attempt to return to the Delta (NMFS 1997).

Several studies conducted to assess the effects of the SMSCS on adult salmon passage have confirmed that Chinook salmon may be attracted into Montezuma Slough and subsequently delayed or blocked from reaching spawning habitats in the Sacramento or San Joaquin rivers (CDFG 1996a; DWR and CDFG 2002). In an attempt to minimize passage problems associated with the SMSCS, the flashboards on the gates were modified by incorporating slots for fish to pass through. A SMSCS Steering Group analyzed data collected during salmon passage studies conducted in 1998 and 1999 and concluded that the modified flashboards were not improving salmon passage at the SMSCS (DWR Website 2007a). Results from ultrasonic telemetry studies conducted each year from 2001 through 2004 indicated that Chinook salmon were able to effectively pass upstream and downstream of the SMSCS when the boat lock was open. Subsequently, the OCAP BO included a term and condition stating that the boat lock will be held open when the flashboards are installed (NMFS 2004a). In addition, the OCAP BO states that the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and DWR should remove the flashboards on the SMSCS in a timely and efficient manner between September and May during periods when the operation of the SMSCS is not required to meet water quality standards in Suisun Marsh. In response to the OCAP BO, DWR and Reclamation developed a proposal describing the operational strategy for minimizing adverse effects of the SMSCS on Chinook salmon migration (DWR and Reclamation 2005).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Most fishery impacts on winter-run Chinook salmon occur in the recreational and commercial hook-and-line fisheries off the coast of California (NMFS 1997). Presumably, some harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon adults occurs within the Bays, but the effect of this harvest is likely negligible relative to the ocean harvest.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) gage near Carquinez, which is located just east of San Pablo Bay, fluctuates annually between about 46°F and 73°F (USGS Website 2000). Because winter-run Chinook salmon reportedly immigrate through the Bay-Delta from November through June (Hallock and Fisher 1985), when water temperatures are seasonally cool, these fish are not expected to experience thermal stress migrating through this location. Although water temperatures at Carquinez during May and June may reach up to 68°F, a water temperature that reportedly has been stressful to Chinook salmon (Marine 1992; Ordal and Pacha 1963), the majority of winter-run Chinook salmon have already migrated through the Bay-Delta by this time (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998).

WATER QUALITY[6]

Water quality in the Bay-Delta has improved because of regulations that followed the passage of the Clean Water Act (CWA) in 1972. Those regulations have largely have alleviated problems with organic waste and nutrients to led to algae blooms. However, Bay-Delta faces problems with industrial toxins and urban and agricultural runoff. According to the San Francisco Estuary Institute, mercury (total mercury and methylmercury), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and dioxins are believed to have the most severe impacts on San Francisco Bay water quality because they are distributed throughout the entire bay at concentrations well above established thresholds. Selenium, legacy pesticides (i.e., Dichloro-Diphenyl-Trichloroethane (DDT), Dieldrin, and Chlordane), and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are also of concern because, either the entire bay or several bay locations are included on the 303(d) list and concentrations are above established thresholds of concern. The 303(d) list refers to Section 303(d) of the CWA, which requires states to identify water bodies that do not meet water quality standards (SFEI 2007).

The SFEI classifies Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs), pyrethroids, sediment toxicity, and pollutant mixtures as rising concerns because although water quality objectives have not yet been established for these pollutants in order to place them on the 303(d) list of impaired waters, there is a significant amount of concern about their impacts on the bay. These concerns are growing, either because of increasing rates of input into the bay or advances in understanding of their hazards (SFEI 2007).

Managers have recently shifted their attention toward implementing provisions originally included in the CWA that have not previously enforced. The CWA calls for the development of cleanup plans known as Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for pollutants on the 303(d) List. A TMDL recently adopted for mercury and TMDLs in development for PCBs, dioxins, selenium, and legacy pesticides will address some of the most serious current threats to water quality. Implementation of the mercury TMDL is now beginning, with a major focus on the remaining challenge of reducing loads from urban runoff and other pathways that were not an emphasis in the first wave of implementation of the CWA (SFEI 2007).

Poor water quality has been demonstrated to affect many aquatic organisms in the Bay-Delta, and particularly has adversely affected organisms at lower trophic levels (e.g., benthic snails) (Thompson *et al.* 2006). The extent of contaminant effects on fish in the Bay-Delta is not well understood due to the lack of information on the effects of long-term, low-level exposures of fish to contaminants. However, some fairly recent studies (Bacey *et al.* 2005; Bennett *et al.* 1995; Kuivla and Moon 2004; Teh *et al.* 2005; Weston *et al.* 2004) have shown that contaminants are having some effects on Bay-Delta fish species, although the consequences for fish populations are uncertain (Thompson et al. 2007). Specific to salmonids, Clifford (2005) reported that juvenile Chinook salmon exposed to 100 ng/g of the pyrethroid pesticide esfenvalerate in sediment had reduced time to death compared to the controls after being exposed to the hemapoetic viral necrosis virus. Considering the water quality problems in the Bay-Delta resulting from industrial toxins and urban and agricultural runoff, and the associated effects that have been demonstrated to occur in the aquatic community, water quality is believed to be an important stressor to juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon. However, the adult immigration and holding life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon is likely not substantially affected by water quality problems in the Bay-Delta.

[6] The San Francisco Estuary Institute conducts a Regional Monitoring Program for Water Quality in San Francisco Bay and publishes an associated annual report title, *The Pulse of the Estuary*. Much of the information in this section was directly derived from the 2007 annual report, which is available at the following website: http://www.sfei.org/rmp/pulse/2007/Pulse2007_full_report_web2.pdf.

2.3.3.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER QUALITY

Poor water quality in the Bay-Delta, which results from both point- and non-point sources of pollution, introduces the risk of acute toxicity and mortality or long-term toxicity and associated detrimental physiological responses, such as reduced growth or reproductive impairment to Chinook salmon and other organisms utilizing the Bay-Delta (CALFED 2000a). Point source pollution in the Bay-Delta includes the discharge of selenium and contaminants from various municipal and industrial discharges. Non-point source pollution affecting the Bay-Delta includes high levels of suspended sediments and contaminants from stormwater runoff, and agricultural drainage containing high levels of nutrients, herbicides, and pesticides (NMFS 1997). Between both point- and non-point sources, an estimated 5,000 to 40,000 tons of contaminants enter the Bay-Delta annually (CALFED 2000a).

The major sources of selenium entering the Bay-Delta include (1) agricultural drainage via direct discharge to the Bay-Delta; (2) effluents from the North Bay oil refineries; (3) San Joaquin River inflows which include agricultural drainage; and (4) Sacramento River inflows (USGS Website 2007). Selenium dissolves in water as selenite and selenate. Effluents from North Bay oil refineries contain concentrations of selenite, while selenium from agricultural drainages is principally in the form of selenate (NMFS 1997). Several laboratory studies have documented the adverse effects of the bioaccumulation of selenium in Chinook salmon (Hamilton 2003). None of these studies were designed to mimic selenium concentrations found in the Bay-Delta, but the results indicate the potential for reduced growth and survival of Chinook salmon in the Bay-Delta.

Another factor which may contribute to reduced growth and survival of fish in the Bay-Delta is the effect that inputs of ammonium (NH_4) have on the food web. Dugdale *et al.* (2007) concluded that low annual primary production in San Francisco Bay is partially controlled by high concentrations of NH_4 that can prohibit phytoplankton from accessing nitrate (NO_3), effectively reducing the occurrence of phytoplankton blooms in the spring. Secondary production by higher trophic levels is adversely affected by this reduced spring phytoplankton production, which results from relatively high (i.e., > 4 $\mu mol\ L^{-1}$) NH_4 concentrations (Dugdale et al. 2007). Reducing anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve target concentrations below 4 $\mu mol\ L^{-1}$ may be a viable management action to promote increased primary and secondary production in the Bay-Delta.

LOSS OF TIDAL MARSH HABITAT

Reclamation of land at the edge of the Bay-Delta filled in or altered 85 to 95 percent of the wetlands in the Bay-Delta (SFEP 1999). In San Francisco Bay, remaining tidal marshes are located in isolated pockets or in linear strips along sloughs or bay-front dikes. The largest marshes in the Bay-Delta are in Suisun Bay, along the Petaluma, Sonoma, and Napa rivers, and along the northern shore of San Pablo Bay (NMFS 1997).

The importance of marsh habitat to juvenile Chinook salmon in the Bay-Delta is unclear. Some Chinook salmon have been collected in tidal marsh areas near Liberty Island and Little Holland Tract (NMFS 1997), but data supporting that juvenile Chinook salmon extensively rely on tidal marsh habitat in the Bay-Delta for rearing do not exist or at least have not been published. However, research in the Pacific Northwest has demonstrated that tidal marsh habitat is important to the growth and survival of juvenile Chinook salmon (Bottom *et al.* 2005; Levy and Northcote 1981). The benefits of tidal marshes to juvenile Chinook salmon include the availability of rich feeding habitat, refugia from predators, and increasing the overall productivity of tidal habitats. The lack of tidal marsh habitat in the Bay-Delta, relative to estuaries in the Pacific Northwest, may partially explain why juvenile Chinook salmon produced in the Central Valley spend little time rearing in the Bays and Delta, and exhibit slow growth and decreased condition while there (MacFarlane and Norton 2002).

The need to restore tidal marsh habitats in the Bay-Delta has been recognized. The first attempt to prescribe restoration needs for the entire Bay-Delta was in 1993, when the Governor and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan for the Bay-Delta (San Francisco Estuary Project Website). Three North American Wetland Conservation Act grants totaling nearly $3 million have been allocated for wetland conservation actions in Suisun Marsh and in the Yolo and Delta basins. For a comprehensive list of wetland restoration projects that have been implemented around the San Francisco Bay, see the database and maps available at the Wetlands and Water Resources web site, www.swampthing.org (SFEP and CALFED 2006).

INVASIVE SPECIES/FOOD WEB CHANGES

Although there is a dearth of information on the feeding and growth of juvenile Chinook salmon as they migrate through the Delta and bays, the available data suggest that these fish may be food limited (Kjelson *et al.* 1982; MacFarlane and Norton 2002). MacFarlane and Norton (2002) examined the migration timing, diet, and growth of juvenile fall-run Chinook salmon collected at locations spanning from the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers to the Golden Gate Bridge and in the coastal waters of the Gulf of the Farallones. These fish migrated from the confluence to the Golden Gate Bridge in about 40 days and grew little compared to juvenile Chinook salmon in most estuaries to the north. Further evidence that residence in the Bays and Delta may not be beneficial to juvenile salmon is that their condition (K-factor) declined while migrating through the Bay-Delta. The authors argued that the decline in condition occurred because the quantity and/or quality of prey available to juvenile Chinook salmon was limited, not because of stomach fullness or metabolic state (e.g., smoltification). Once juvenile Chinook salmon reached the Gulf of the Farallones they began to grow rapidly and improve in condition (MacFarlane and Norton 2002).

Substantial food web alterations in the Bays and Delta that have occurred over the last few decades may have reduced the availability of preferred prey for juvenile Chinook salmon (and steelhead) rearing and migrating through those locations. These food web changes, which were primarily caused by unintentional introductions of non-native species (Carlton *et al.* 1990; Kimmerer *et al.* 1994), are one of several factors identified by the Interagency Ecological Program's Pelagic Organism Decline Team as causing the recent decline in the abundance of pelagic fish (i.e., longfin smelt, threadfin shad, juvenile striped bass, and delta smelt) in Suisun Bay and the Delta. Because the trophic feeding level of juvenile Chinook salmon overlaps with that of the pelagic fish species that are declining in abundance, at least partially due to food limitation, it is reasonable to assume that juvenile salmon in the San Francisco Estuary may also be food limited.

ENTRAINMENT

Entrainment of winter-run Chinook salmon in San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun bays (Bays) is not considered to be a major factor controlling this species' abundance. Although some level of entrainment may occur at pumping facilities in the Bays, the Delta is the region where entrainment is a serious threat that must be minimized or alleviated. Nevertheless, opportunities to decrease entrainment in the Bays should be identified and implemented.

PREDATION

Little is known regarding the level of predation on juvenile salmonids occurring in the Bays. Known predators of salmon occurring in abundance in the Bays include striped bass, water birds such as cormorants and terns, and pinnipeds. Further study is needed in order to develop quantitative information on the effect that these predators may be having on Chinook salmon in the Bays.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Hatchery fish are assumed to utilize the Bay-Delta similar to wild salmonids, for some amount of time to complete acclimation to the marine environment. It does not appear that there is much opportunity for feeding within the habitat. Hatchery fish may aggressively compete with natural juveniles over limited available prey during their residency. Salmonid residence time in the Bays may be very short, which would limit the effects of hatchery winter-run on the natural population. Larger hatchery salmonids occupying the Bays such as juvenile or adult steelhead may predate on smaller-sized winter-run juveniles.

2.3.4 SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA

2.3.4.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel (SDWSC) branches off Cache Slough near Ryer Island and extends 25 miles to West Sacramento. At the upstream end of the SDWSC is an 86-foot wide, 640-foot long navigation lock. Adult salmon have been caught close to the lock at the upstream end of the channel and also have been observed to be blocked from migrating upstream by the lock (NMFS 1997). DWR conducted a study in 2003 to provide fish passage information to the Delta Cross Channel/Through Delta Facilities Team and CALFED. During this study, 35 Chinook salmon adults, categorized as winter-run based on month of capture (i.e., November through June) and size, were sampled at the upstream end of the SDWSC, indicating that the SDWSC is a threat to adult winter-run Chinook salmon migrating through the Delta (NMFS 1997).

Additionally, any adult winter-run Chinook salmon that migrate upstream through the central Delta rather than directly up the Sacramento River are blocked from entering the Sacramento River by the Delta Cross Channel gates, which are closed from December to May. These fish must turn around and migrate downstream through the San Joaquin River in order to locate the mouth of the Sacramento River. Thus, the Delta Cross Channel can be a passage barrier that delays winter-run Chinook salmon from reaching their spawning areas.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

There is no commercial fishery for salmon in the Delta. Little information is available on the magnitude of harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon in the Delta, but it is believed to be insignificant largely due to sportfishing regulations designed to protect winter-run Chinook salmon. In freshwater, winter-run Chinook salmon harvest should be near zero based on the current regulations.

The extent of poaching of winter-run Chinook salmon in the Delta is unknown. There are no man-made structures that would increase salmon densities in particular areas allowing for easy poaching. Although some level of illegal harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon likely occurs in the Delta, it is not considered a substantial threat to the species.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Delta are generally suitable throughout the winter-run Chinook salmon adult immigration and holding life stage period (i.e., December through July), except for during June and July (**Figure 2-5**). Water temperatures in the Delta during June and July are frequently warmer than 67°F, which is reported to be the upper limit of the range acceptable for adult Chinook salmon immigration (NMFS 1997). For example, mean daily water temperatures in the Sacramento River at Hood were warmer than 67°F for all of June and July in 2001, 2002, and 2004, and were warmer than 67°F for 46 days in 2003, 32 days in 2005, and 42 days in 2006. However, most winter-run Chinook salmon adults

are expected to have migrated to cooler areas upstream of the Delta before warm water temperatures occur in the Delta.



Figure 2-5. Mean Daily Water Temperatures in the Sacramento River at Hood during December Through July from 2000 to 2006. *Source: http://cdec.water.ca.gov/*

WATER QUALITY

Like in the San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun bays, water quality is considered an important stressor to the aquatic community, but likely does not substantially affect adult winter-run Chinook salmon migrating through the Delta.

2.3.4.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon depend on the Delta for rearing and smoltification and may be present there from as early as September to as late as June (NMFS 1997). The highest numbers of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the Delta occurs from January through April (NMFS 1997). The timing of emigration from the Delta to the San Francisco Bay and ocean is not well known but is believed to occur from late-December through June (NMFS 1997).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Delta likely do not adversely affect winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles until the spring (April through June) (NMFS 1997).

WATER QUALITY

An estimated 5,000 to 40,000 tons of contaminants enter the Bay-Delta system annually (CALFED 2000c). Contaminants entering the system are distributed by complex flow patterns influenced by inflow

from the rivers and the amount of water being pumped from the Delta. Contaminants include inorganic substances such as heavy metals, nitrates and phosphates, organic contaminants such as PCBs, pesticides, plastics, detergents and fertilizers, and biological pathogens such as bacteria, viruses and protozoans (CALFED 2000c). The origin of these contaminants is from both point and non-point sources.

Currently there are several sources of point-source pollution in the Delta, including the Mothball Fleet. The State Lands Commission identified two oil terminals, three paper processors, four oil production facilities, and several manufacturing facilities, all of which discharge into the Delta (NMFS 1997). Studies examining the uptake of contaminants by juvenile Chinook salmon indicate elevated levels of PCBs and other chlorinated pesticides. The source of these contaminants is not known but likely stem from non-point sources such as stormwater and urban runoff as well as agricultural drainage. The effects of these contaminants include the suppression of immune competence and reduced growth (NMFS 1997).

Increased regulation on organophosphate insecticide use has led to increased use of pyrethroid insecticides for both urban and agricultural uses. Pyrethroid use in the Central Valley in 2000-2003 was nearly double that in 1991-1995. Pyrethroid insecticides are hydrophobic compounds with a strong tendency to adsorb to sediments instead of dissolving in the water column. As such, pyrethroid transport likely occurs with mass transport of sediment and particulates during storm and irrigation runoff events. In addition, pyrethroids are most likely to cause toxicity to benthic organisms. Pyrethroids are very toxic to both fish and invertebrates. However, environmental pyrethroid concentration (exposure) data is needed to determine the risk to aquatic organisms in the Delta system. Although pyrethroids are relative insoluble in water, all are sufficiently soluble to cause adverse biological effects. Amphipods and copepods are among the most sensitive to pyrethroids insecticides. Pyrethroid insecticides have been detected in sediments from Central Valley agricultural and urban drainage dominated water bodies at concentrations high enough to contribute to toxicity to sensitive aquatic species. In agricultural drainage dominated water bodies the highest concentrations are detected shortly after their peak use in July (Oros and Werner 2005).

As described in Section 2.3.3.2, one factor that may contribute to reduced growth and survival of fish in the Bay-Delta is the effect that inputs of ammonium (NH_4) have on the food web. Dugdale *et al.* (2007) concluded that low annual primary production in San Francisco Bay is partially controlled by high concentrations of NH_4 that can prohibit phytoplankton from accessing nitrate (NO_3), effectively reducing the occurrence of phytoplankton blooms in the spring. Secondary production by higher trophic levels is adversely affected by this reduced spring phytoplankton production, which results from relatively high (i.e., > 4 μmol L^{-1}) NH_4 concentrations (Dugdale *et al.* 2007). Reducing anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve target concentrations below 4 μmol L^{-1} may be a viable management action to promote increased primary and secondary production in the Bay-Delta.

Mercury contamination in the Bay/Delta and its tributaries has long been recognized as a serious problem. Water column mercury concentrations in the Bay/Delta often exceed the California state standard of 12 ng Hg L-1 (Choe *et al*. 2003). Although mercury exists in many forms in the aquatic environment, Methylmercury is the form of primary concern because it is readily accumulated in the food web and poses a toxicological threat to highly exposed species. A statewide review of fish monitoring data from the past 30 years concluded that methylmercury contamination is common in California aquatic food webs, with long-term trends indicating little change over the past few decades (SFEI 2007). Little research has been conducted exploring the effects of methylmercury accumulation on fish survival or behavior during any life stage.

FLOW CONDITIONS

CVP and SWP operations have changed the seasonal flow regimes in the Delta from historic conditions. Generally, the natural variability in flows has been reduced with flows in late spring and summer less than

historic conditions and increased flows in the late summer and fall. Peak flows to the Delta generally occur in the winter and early spring when juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon are present.

During the winter and early spring, when both the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers are at peak discharge, net flows in the Delta move downstream towards the west. During the year, as the quantity of water exported from the Delta increases relative to Sacramento River outflow, water can be drawn upstream through the lower channels of the San Joaquin River creating reverse flow conditions. Additionally, flow patterns are altered when the Delta Cross Channel is opened (generally June through November) and a proportion of the Sacramento River flow is diverted through the Delta Cross Channel. This water is conveyed in a southerly direction towards the CVP and SWP pumping plants. Historically, juvenile Chinook salmon migrated from the Sacramento River into the central Delta via Georgiana and Three Mile sloughs, in proportion to the amount of water transporting them, which was estimated to be about 20 percent (NMFS 1997). Now, with the Delta Cross Channel in operation, as much as 70 percent of Sacramento River flow may be diverted into the central Delta (NMFS 1997). Mark recapture studies with fall-run Chinook salmon have suggested that salmon smolts entering the central Delta via the Delta Cross Channel and Georgiana Slough have a much lower survival index than those remaining in the mainstem Sacramento River (NMFS 1997). Currently, the Delta Cross Channel gates are closed from the beginning of February through May and may be closed an additional 45 days at the discretion of the resource agencies from the beginning of October through January in order to protect juvenile salmonids (Brown and Nichols 2003). However, with the gates closed, large numbers of emigrating salmonids can be entrained into Georgiana Slough. Taking this route through the interior Delta as compared to remaining in the mainstem Sacramento River has been shown to increase mortality (Brown and Nichols 2003).

The primary factors causing mortality of winter-run Chinook salmon in the Delta are considered to be the diversion of juveniles from the mainstem Sacramento River into the central and southern Delta where environmental conditions are poor and reverse flow conditions exist which may move them into the lower San Joaquin River and into the south Delta waterways (NMFS 1997). Survival through central Delta migratory routes is substantially lower than through northern routes. The numbers of juveniles arriving at the export pumps is lower as river flows increase, pumping decreases, and the Delta Cross Channel gates are closed (Cramer *et al.* 2003).

CVP and SWP operations have profoundly affected flow patterns in the Delta. These changes have resulted in a longer migration route to the ocean. The channel complexity and reverse flow conditions in the central Delta likely delay migration to the ocean thereby increasing the length of time that fish may be exposed to adverse conditions. Historically, the central Delta probably provided beneficial habitat for rearing juvenile Chinook salmon due to the extensive acreage of tidal marsh habitat and associated nutritional and cover benefits. However, degradation of the central Delta waterways have resulted in adverse conditions for the rearing and migration of juvenile Chinook salmon (NMFS 1997).

Potential temporary passage impediments also occur when levees protecting Delta islands breach in very wet years as a result of land subsidence and levee failures. A levee breach essentially creates a large-scale diversion that can draw several thousand acre-feet of water onto Delta islands. Levees are generally repaired while or after the islands are emptied. During drainage, fish can be stranded or are potentially harmed passing through the pumps. The magnitude of this potential problem has not been quantified, however, accounts of extensive fish stranding during the 1996 draining of Prospect Island following a levee breach suggest that mortality can be substantial (CALFED 2000c). In 2005, the Jones Tract levee broke causing fish to become trapped inside the tract.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Much of the historic riparian habitat in the Delta has been lost because of urban and agricultural development as well as levee construction for flood control and water delivery operations.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Prior to European colonization, the Delta was a vast marshland complex of multiple channels, natural levees, and frequently inundated islands composed largely of organic rich sediments (CALFED 2000b). Water delivery operations of the CVP and SWP, levee construction, agricultural and urban development have all served to change natural conditions in the Delta.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Most of the historic flood plain habitat in the Delta has been converted to agriculture and urban uses. Agricultural and urban areas that were once part of the historic flood plain are now protected by levees.

LOSS OF TIDAL MARSH HABITAT

Few empirical studies on the importance of tidal marsh habitat have been conducted in the Delta. Some monitoring in the Delta has verified the use of this habitat by juvenile Chinook salmon (NMFS 1997). Research conducted in the Pacific Northwest has found that tidal marsh habitat is important to juvenile salmonids (NMFS 1997). Of all the salmonid species, juvenile Chinook salmon show the highest tendency to utilize this habitat type. The benefits of tidal marshes to juvenile Chinook salmon include: (1) the contribution of nutrients to the detritus-based food chain, (2) the availability of rich feeding habitat, (3) refugia from predators, and (4) the provision of suitable habitat for juveniles to undergo smoltification.

Historically, tidal marsh was one of the most common habitat types in the Delta. At present, only two percent of historical tidal marsh habitat remains in the Delta (NMFS 1997). In the Delta, tidal marsh habitat is now restricted to remnant patches mainly in channels where the area between levees is wide enough or where substrate has been deposited high enough for tules and reeds to survive.

The relative importance of tidal marsh habitat to juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon likely depends on water year type. This habitat may be more important in wetter years or in storm events during dry years when fry may be flushed into the Delta with early storms and require more time for rearing prior to undergoing the smoltification process.

INVASIVE SPECIES/FOOD WEB CHANGES

Historically, the San Joaquin River has been an important source of nutrients to the Delta. Most of the San Joaquin River is now being diverted from the south Delta by CVP/SWP operations. The resultant loss in nutrients has likely contributed to an overall decrease in fertility of the Delta, limiting its ability to produce food (NMFS 1997). Additionally, pumping operations may result in a loss of zooplankton reducing their abundance in the Delta. Poor food supply may limit the rearing success of winter-run Chinook salmon.

Extensive areas of the Delta are below mean high tide, but because of levees and flapgates installed throughout the Delta, these areas are no longer subject to tidal action. This effectively reduces the volume of water subject to tidal mixing and the size of the Delta floodplain. Reduced residence time of Delta water and associated nutrients restricts the development of foodweb organisms (CALFED 2000c).

Invasive species include both plants and animals, most of which have been introduced to the Delta unintentionally through ship ballast. However, some species have been introduced intentionally by resource agencies for sportfishing or forage.

Invasive aquatic plants have become established in many areas of the Delta. Establishment of invasive aquatic plants can harm or kill native aquatic species because they form dense mats that block sunlight and deplete oxygen supplies. Most of these aquatic weeds were introduced to the Delta unintentionally and include water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*), hydrilla (*Hydrilla verticillata*) and egeria (*Egeria*

densa). Within the Delta, the construction of levees and the conversion of adjacent riparian communities to other land uses have substantially changed the ecosystem. These changes have stressed native aquatic flora and fauna allowing infestation of invasive aquatic weeds. Invasive weeds flourish in the disturbed environment and may reduce foodweb productivity potentially harming fish and wildlife (CALFED 2000c).

The majority of clams, worms and bottom dwelling invertebrates currently inhabiting the Delta are non-native species. Non-native species also comprise an increasing proportion of the zooplankton and fish communities in the Bay-Delta system. It is estimated that a new non-native species is identified in the Bay-Delta every 15 weeks (CALFED 2000c). Many fish known to prey on juvenile anadromous salmonids were introduced by resource agencies to provide sportfishing. These fish include striped bass, American shad and largemouth bass.

Although introductions have increased diversity in the Bay-Delta system, this increase in diversity has been at the expense of native species, many of which have declined precipitously or become extinct through predation and competition for resources (CALFED 2000c). At the same time, many non-native species are performing vital ecological functions such as serving as primary consumers of organic matter or as a food source for native fish and other wildlife populations (CALFED 2000c).

ENTRAINMENT

Fish in the Delta are vulnerable to entrainment in flows leading to export facilities in the southern Delta. Although facilities associated with the export facilities are designed to salvage fish from the water and return them to the Delta, the process is not very efficient (Kimmerer 2006). The efficiency of the fish salvage facilities varies from 14 to 80 percent depending on the size of the fish. For salmonids, unknown losses occur due to predation and cleaning operations, when fish screens are lifted out of the water. Mortality of fish associated with export pumping has been blamed in part for declines of numerous fish species including striped bass and Chinook salmon. Additionally, many fish are lost to predation in waterways leading to the fish facilities (Kimmerer 2006).

According to NMFS (1997), entrainment of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon is one of the most ubiquitous causes of mortality in the Sacramento River and Delta. A primary source of entrainment is unscreened or inadequately screened diversions. Diversion facilities in the Delta range from small siphons diverting 20 cubic feet per second (cfs) or less to the large export facilities operated by Reclamation and DWR in the southern Delta with a combined capacity of up to 12,000 cfs. A survey by CDFG indicated that a minimum of 2,050 unscreened diversions are present in the Delta (NMFS 1997). Some of these diversions include the Jones Pumping Plant, Banks Pumping Plant, Contra Costa Water District's unscreened Rock Slough, West Stanislaus Water District's unscreened diversion, Barker Slough (which is screened but not monitored), as well as numerous agricultural diversions. However, the magnitude of these diversions and the extent to which these diversions cause juvenile losses has not been adequately studied (NMFS 1997).

Under current CVP/SWP operations, many juvenile salmon are entrained in the Clifton Court Forebay. The Clifton Court Forebay serves as a regulating reservoir providing a reliable water supply for pumping operations at the Banks Pumping Plant (DWR and Reclamation 1996). The forebay has a maximum capacity of 31,000 acre-feet. Five radial gates are opened at high tide to allow the forebay reservoir to fill and closed at low tide to retain water that supplies the pumps. Fish that enter the forebay may take up residence, be eaten by other fish, taken by anglers, further entrained at the Banks Pumping Plant, impinged on fish screens at the Skinner Fish Protection Facility or bypassed and salvaged at the fish protection facility.

Two large fossil fuel power plants are operated in the Bay-Delta, one is located in Antioch and the other in Pittsburg. Each of these plants utilizes large screened intake systems for cooling. The screens utilize

1950s technology and do not effectively screen juvenile fish. Although the water is returned to the Delta, many entrained juvenile fish are killed by mechanical damage or heat stress (CALFED 2000c).

PREDATION

Most of the predation on juvenile Chinook salmon in the Delta likely occurs from introduced species such as striped bass, black crappie, white catfish, largemouth bass and bluegill. Native Sacramento pikeminnow and steelhead also occur in the Delta and are known to prey on juvenile salmonids. Of these predatory species, striped bass are likely the most important predator.

Early studies in the Delta indicate that Chinook salmon comprise one to six percent of striped bass diet (NMFS 1997). However, predation at fish salvage release sites is particularly heavy. For example, Orsi (1967) found that predation occurred on approximately 10 percent of the fish released and that 80 percent of that predation was by striped bass. Similarly, Pickard *et al.* (1982 cited *in* NMFS 1997) conducted predator studies at salvage facilities and found high densities of striped bass and Sacramento pikeminnow. Additionally, predation rates for salmon smolts entering the Clifton Court Forebay have been estimated to range from 68 to 99 percent. In mark recapture studies, mortality rates for juvenile salmon were estimated at 91.3 percent per mile compared to 2.7 percent in the central Delta. This difference in mortality rates was thought to be due to the higher number of predators, primarily striped bass, as well as hydraulic conditions and the operational characteristics of the Clifton Court Forebay (NMFS 1997).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Winter-run hatchery production is released in the upper Sacramento River in late-January or early-February, and has been documented as reaching the Delta pumps within 14 days of release (B. Oppenheim, NMFS, pers. comm.). Up to 250,000 pre-smolt winter-run are released on average at 85 mm FL and may reach 100 mm FL in size by the time they reach the Delta pumps (B. Oppenheim, NMFS, pers. comm.). Natural-produced winter-run begin to appear at the Delta pumps in December through March at 100 to 150 mm FL, peaking in early March. There is likely some competition between hatchery- and naturally-produced winter-run over prey sources and refugia; it is unclear if there are behavioral differences between hatchery and wild winter-run during residency in the Delta. The Delta serves primarily as a migratory corridor for winter-run, and in general, it is thought that salmonids do not remain in the Delta for any significant length of time. The USFWS is currently providing fish tissue, scale and otolith samples for a study that has the potential to determine residency time of salmon in the Delta (K. Niemela, USFWS, pers. comm.).

2.3.5 LOWER SACRAMENTO RIVER (PRINCETON [RM 163] TO THE DELTA)

2.3.5.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

In the lower section of the Sacramento River, the potential threats to the adult immigration and holding life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon include passage impediments, harvest in the sportfishery and poaching, adverse water temperatures, poor water quality, and adverse flow conditions.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The SDWSC branches off Cache Slough near Ryer Island and extends 25 miles to West Sacramento. At the upstream end of the SDWSC is an 86-foot wide, 640-foot long navigation lock. Adult salmon have been caught close to the lock at the upstream end of the channel and also have been observed to be blocked from migrating upstream by the lock (NMFS 1997). DWR conducted a study in 2003 to provide fish passage information to the Delta Cross Channel/Through Delta Facilities Team and CALFED. During this study, 35 Chinook salmon adults, categorized as winter-run based on month of capture (i.e.,

November through June) and size, were sampled at the upstream end of the SDWSC, indicating that the SDWSC presents a potential passage barrier and may delay upstream migration of winter-run Chinook salmon (NMFS 1997).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

There is no commercial fishery for salmon in the Sacramento River. The in-river sportfishery allows for the taking of salmon generally from mid-July through January 1. Little information is available on the magnitude of in-river harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon. Hallock and Fisher (1985) report that the freshwater sport fisheries caught an average of 10 percent of the winter-run Chinook salmon run for the 1968 to 1975 period. More recently, the PFMC's Sacramento River Winter- and Spring Chinook Salmon Workgroup calculated a harvest rate of 24 percent based on the 1998 cohort reconstruction (PFMC 2003). Currently, sportfishing regulations in the Sacramento River are designed to prevent the taking of salmon during the time periods that adult winter-run Chinook salmon are present. However, Sacramento River regulations allow for the taking of salmon up to January 1 and some early migrating winter-run Chinook salmon are likely taken. For example, CDFG's Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Harvest Monitoring Project indicated that a relatively high inland sport harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon may have occurred in late December 2000 and early January 2001. Winter-run Chinook salmon were identified by CWT hatchery-origin fish (CDFG 2004c). However, since the no-retention of salmon regulation was changed from January 15 to January 1 in 2003, no additional CWT winter-run Chinook salmon have been observed in the inland sport harvest.

The extent of poaching of winter-run Chinook salmon in this reach of the river is unknown. There are no terminal barriers that would unnaturally increase densities allowing for easy poaching. However, some level of poaching likely occurs at the Fremont, Colusa, and Tisdale weirs.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Suitable water temperatures for adult winter-run Chinook salmon migrating upstream to spawning grounds range from 57°F to 67°F (NMFS 1997). However, winter-run Chinook salmon are immature when upstream migration begins and need to hold in suitable habitat for several months prior to spawning. The maximum suitable water temperature for holding is 59°F to 60°F (NMFS 1997). Because water temperatures in the lower Sacramento River generally begin exceeding 60°F in April, it is likely that little if any suitable holding habitat exists in this reach and that it is only used by adults as a migratory corridor. Adult Chinook salmon migrating into the lower Sacramento River after April may experience water temperatures exceeding 65°F which may result in reduced energy supplies needed for spawning, pre-spawning mortality, and reduced gamete viability (NMFS 1997). The potential for diseases in adults also increases as water temperatures increase.

NMFS (1997) reports that water temperatures in the lower Sacramento River may have risen by as much as 4°F to 7°F since the late 1970s. The cumulative losses of riparian habitats and associated shade along the river may have influenced water temperatures in this reach.

WATER QUALITY

Agricultural runoff and low water velocities in the lower Sacramento River can lead to poor water quality conditions, especially during late spring and summer. Because adult winter-run Chinook salmon use the lower Sacramento River strictly as a migratory corridor on their way to upstream holding and spawning habitats, they likely are not substantially affected by water quality in the lower river. Furthermore, most winter-run adults have migrated upstream to the middle and upper sections of the Sacramento River before the worst water quality conditions set in during the summer months.

FLOW CONDITIONS

During high flow or flood events, water is diverted into the Sutter and Yolo bypasses upstream of the City of Sacramento. Adult winter-run Chinook salmon migrating upstream may enter these bypasses, where their migration may be delayed or blocked by control structures. To date, there have not been any measures implemented to protect adult winter-run Chinook salmon from entrainment into the flood control bypasses (NMFS 1997).

The lower Sacramento River flows through both agricultural land and a large and growing metropolitan region. This area often is affected by in-water or near-river construction projects. These construction activities have the potential to adversely affect fisheries and aquatic resources through the inadvertent discharge of toxic substances, increased sedimentation, aquatic habitat modification, and vibration and hydrostatic pressure waves generated by blasting activities. Because of the number of construction projects that take place in the area, there is potential for adverse impacts on fish species occurring in the area, including winter-run Chinook salmon. However, this potential is minimized by key environmental regulations governing environmental degradation, species protection, water pollution, hazardous wastes, and reporting requirements including the ESA, CEQA, NEPA, the CWA, the Porter-Cologne Act, RCRA, the Hazardous Control Law, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, the Hazardous Substances Account Act, and the Toxic Substances Control Act. As such, short-term in-water construction in the area is not considered to be a major threat to the adult immigration and holding life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon.

2.3.5.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Factors that may adversely affect the juvenile rearing and outmigration of winter-run Chinook salmon in this reach of the river include fluctuating flow regimes; physical habitat alteration; water quality parameters including temperature and both point and non-point source pollution; predation; and entrainment into water diversions. Each of these factors is described below.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Optimal water temperatures for juvenile Chinook salmon range from 53.6°F to 57.2°F (NMFS 1997). A daily average water temperature of 60°F is considered the upper temperature limit for juvenile Chinook salmon growth and rearing (NMFS 1997). Winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles are most abundant in the lower Sacramento River during winter months when average water temperatures are normally less than 60°F. It is possible that early or late outmigrating juveniles are exposed to water temperatures above 60°F. Additionally, late outmigrating winter-run Chinook salmon may be exposed to warmwater releases from the Colusa Drain at Knights Landing. Warm water is released from the drain to the river mainly from April through June. Releases from the drain can exceed 2,000 cfs and 80°F.

WATER QUALITY

The major point source threat of pollution in the Sacramento River is the Iron Mountain Mine as described below in Section 2.3.7.3. However, because the Iron Mountain Mine is located many miles north of the lower Sacramento River section, most heavy metal contaminants from the mine have likely either settled out or have been diluted to acceptable EPA standards by the time water reaches this reach of the river.

The main non-point sources of pollution in the lower Sacramento River are urban runoff and agricultural drainage. Stormwater runoff from the city of Sacramento has been shown to be acutely toxic to aquatic invertebrates (NMFS 1997). Significant urban runoff also occurs during the dry season and is created from domestic/commercial landscape irrigation, groundwater infiltration, pumped groundwater discharges and construction projects (NMFS 1997). The Colusa Basin Drain is the largest source of agricultural

return flow in the Sacramento River. It drains agricultural areas serviced by the Tehama-Colusa and Glenn-Colusa Irrigation districts and discharges to the Sacramento River below Knights Landing. The drain has been identified as a major source of warm water, pesticides, turbidity, suspended sediments, dissolved solids, nutrients and trace metals (NMFS 1997).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flood control structures in the lower Sacramento River are designed to divert water from the river during a major flood event into the Butte Creek basin and the Sutter and Yolo bypasses. The diversions can be significant. For example, the flood control system can divert as much as four to five times more flow down the bypasses than remains in the river (NMFS 1997). Juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon migrating down the river may enter the diversions during storm events. Studies conducted on the Sutter Bypass show that the highest proportion of flows are diverted from December through March with a peak occurring in February, corresponding to the range and peak outmigration patterns for juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon (NMFS 1997). Juveniles diverted into the bypasses may experience migration delays, potential stranding as flood flows recede and increased rates of predation. However, both the Sutter and Yolo bypasses provide high quality rearing habitat for juveniles, potentially resulting in greater survival relative to fish that stay in the Mainstem (Sommer *et al.* 2001).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The lower Sacramento River has been channelized for flood control measures. Channelization of the lower river has involved riprapping the banks in many areas. Rip-rapping the river bank involves removing vegetation along the bank and upper levees which removes most instream and overhead cover in nearshore areas. Woody debris and overhanging vegetation within SRA habitat provide escape cover for juvenile salmonids from predators. Aquatic and terrestrial insects are an important component of juvenile salmon diet. These insects are dependent on a healthy riparian habitat.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Flood control measures, regulated flow regimes and river bank protection measures have all had a profound effect on riparian and instream habitat in the lower Sacramento River. Levees constructed in this reach are built close to the river in order to increase streamflow, channelize the river to prevent natural meandering, and maximize the sediment carrying capacity of the river (NMFS 1997). Additionally, nearshore aquatic areas have been deepened and sloped to a uniform gradient, such that variations in water depth, velocity and direction of flow are replaced by consistent moderate to high velocities. Juvenile Chinook salmon prefer slow and slack water velocities for rearing and the channelization of the river has removed most of this habitat type.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The process of channelizing the lower Sacramento River has resulted in a loss of connectivity with the floodplains which serves as an important source of woody debris and gravels that aid in establishing a diverse riverine habitat.

ENTRAINMENT

Entrainment is defined as the redirection of fish from their natural migratory pathway into areas or pathways not normally used. Entrainment also includes the take, or removal, of juvenile fish from their habitat through the operation of water diversion devices and structures such as siphons, pumps and gravity diversions (NMFS 1997). A primary source of entrainment is unscreened or inadequately

screened diversions. A survey by CDFG identified 350 unscreened diversions along the Sacramento River downstream of Hamilton City.

Entrainment of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon has been identified as one of the most significant causes of mortality in the Sacramento River and Delta (NMFS 1997). In addition, a program to flood rice field stubble during the winter has been implemented extending the period for potential entrainment (NMFS 1997). Outmigrating juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon also may be diverted into the Yolo or Sutter bypasses during high flow or flood events and stranded as flood waters recede. Additionally, Sacramento River water is diverted into the SDWSC, and outmigrating juvenile Chinook salmon may enter the channel where water quality, flow levels and rearing conditions are extremely poor (NMFS 1997).

PREDATION

Only limited information on predation of winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles is available. Native species that are known to prey on juvenile salmon include Sacramento pikeminnow and steelhead. Predation by pikeminnow can be significant when juvenile salmon occur in high densities such as below dams or near diversions. Although Sacramento pikeminnow are a native species and predation on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon is a natural phenomenon, loss of SRA habitat and artificial instream structures tend to favor predators and may change the natural predator-prey dynamics in the system favoring predatory species (CALFED 2000c). Non-native striped bass may also be a significant predator on juvenile salmon. Although no recent studies of striped bass predation on juvenile salmon have been completed, Thomas (1967 *in* NMFS 1997) found that in the lower Sacramento River, salmon accounted for 22 percent of striped bass diet. Lindley and Mohr (Lindley and Mohr 2003) estimate that the current striped bass population consumes about nine percent of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon outmigrants.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

In the lower Sacramento River, hatchery steelhead from the Feather River Fish Hatchery (FRFH) are planted in the Feather River below Yuba City at a large enough size and at a time when they could intercept outmigrating winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles (NMFS 1997).

SRA habitat along this river reach is severely limited and would be competed over by salmonids for rearing and outmigrating refugia. Hatchery fish are more aggressive and typically larger than their wild counterparts, and have a greater chance to displace them from SRA habitat, forcing smaller juveniles into fast-moving flows and leaving them vulnerable to predation and detrimental environmental variables.

2.3.6 MIDDLE SACRAMENTO RIVER (RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM [RM 243] TO PRINCETON [RM 163])

2.3.6.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

In the middle section of the Sacramento River, the potential threats to the adult immigration and holding life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon include passage impediments, harvest in the sportfishery and poaching, adverse water temperatures, poor water quality, and adverse flow conditions.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no known passage impediments or barriers in the middle section of the Sacramento River. Although the GCID HCPP (~RM 205) and associated water diversions may present problems for emigrating juvenile salmonids, adults are likely not affected.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Adverse effects due to harvest and poaching in this reach of the river are likely similar to those occurring in the lower Sacramento River as described above in Section 2.3.5.1.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the middle section of the Sacramento River are similar to, and sometimes slightly cooler than those occurring in the lower Sacramento River. However, some holding of adult winter-run Chinook salmon may occur downstream of the RBDD in deep coldwater pools. With the installation of the temperature control device at Shasta Dam in 1997, water temperatures have cooled slightly and suitable water temperatures for adult holding likely extend downstream of the RBDD for a short distance.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the middle reach of the Sacramento River is not at a level to cause adverse effects on immigrating adult salmonids.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the middle Sacramento River are sufficient to support upstream migration of adult winter-run Chinook salmon.

2.3.6.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Factors that may adversely affect juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the middle Sacramento River are similar to those that occur in the lower river as described above. However, in addition to those factors there is a potential downstream passage impediment at the GCID HCPP at RM 205.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the middle Sacramento River are similar to those described above in the lower Sacramento River. Water temperatures normally exceed 60°F from July through September and in dry years can often exceed 66°F (NMFS 1997).

WATER QUALITY

The only point source pollution that has been identified and may potentially affect this reach of the river is the Iron Mountain Mine described in Section 2.3.7.3. Non-point source pollution sources include both urban and agricultural runoff similar to that described above for the lower Sacramento River. Urban runoff is likely not as great in this reach of the river as that occurring in the lower Sacramento River but agricultural runoff is likely similar or greater.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Historically, the GCID HCPP at RM 205 has created downstream migration problems for winter-run juvenile Chinook salmon. The GCID pumping plant may divert up to 20 percent of the Sacramento River. Rotary drum fish screens were installed in 1972 to help protect juvenile salmon but they were largely ineffective and never met NMFS or CDFG screen design criteria. Flat plate screens were installed in front of the rotary screens in 1993 to help alleviate the problem until a more permanent solution could be found. Juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon are exposed to the GCID pumping plant facilities as early as mid-July extending through their peak downstream movement during August and September, and into late-November when the diversion season ends.

The interim flat-plate screens are an improvement over the rotary drum screens but are still likely to subject juvenile salmon to impingement due to high approach velocities along the screens, inadequate sweeping to approach velocities, and long exposure time at the screen (USFWS 1995 *in* NMFS 1997). Construction of a new screening facility was completed in 2001 and the testing and monitoring program for the facility are now underway (Reclamation 2007). The testing and monitoring of the new facility is scheduled to be completed during 2007 (Reclamation 2007).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the middle reach of the Sacramento River is similar to that described above for the lower reach.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Physical habitat alteration that has occurred in the middle Sacramento River is similar to that described above for the lower Sacramento River. The river is not quite as confined in this reach as levees are constructed further from the channel than those occurring in the lower river.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Similar to the lower Sacramento River, the channelization and construction of levees along the middle reach of the Sacramento River has caused the river to become disconnected from the floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

The exact number of unscreened diversions in this reach of the river is not known. A study by the California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout completed in 1987 reported that over 300 unscreened irrigation, industrial, and municipal water supply diversions occur on the Sacramento River between Redding and Sacramento (NMFS 1997). Although most of these diversions are small, cumulatively they likely entrain a large number of outmigrating juvenile salmonids.

Studies are currently underway to determine the effectiveness of new fish screens at the GCID HCPP to determine the effectiveness of new fish screen installed in 2001 (Reclamation 2007). Historically, of the four Sacramento River Chinook salmon races, winter-run Chinook salmon have probably been the most vulnerable to entrainment because newly emerged fry occur in the vicinity of the pumping plant's intake facility during the July through August time periods of high diversion (NMFS 1997). However, juvenile emigration data suggest that peak winter-run Chinook salmon movement past the GCID facility occurs in October and November, when pumping volume is low or has ceased for the season (CUWA and SWC 2004).

PREDATION

Predation on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the middle Sacramento River is likely occurring from native Sacramento pikeminnow, native and hatchery-reared steelhead and striped bass. Although the extent of predation is unknown, predation from Sacramento Pikeminnow and striped bass is likely similar to that occurring in the lower Sacramento River as described above.

Opportunities for high predation rates also may be present at the GCID HCPP. The plant is described above as a passage impediment. Studies have indicated that Sacramento pikeminnow are the primary predator at the pumping plant, although striped bass were also found with Chinook salmon in their stomachs (CALFED 2000c). Vogel and Marine (1995) report that predation is likely in the vicinity of the fish screens associated with the diversion.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Predation from hatchery steelhead is likely somewhat less than that occurring in the lower Sacramento River because the Feather River hatchery-reared steelhead enter the Sacramento River downstream of this reach. Additionally, steelhead released from the CNFH are likely more evenly distributed throughout the river by the time they reach this section.

SRA habitat is not as limiting along this stretch of the river, and competition between hatchery and natural fish for SRA may not be as intense in years other than dry years when river flow may be limiting and temperatures higher than normal. In those cases, the effects would be the same as previously described for the lower stretch.

2.3.7 UPPER SACRAMENTO RIVER (KESWICK DAM [~RM 302] TO RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM)

2.3.7.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

In the upper section of the Sacramento River, the primary threats to the adult immigration and holding life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon include potential passage impediments at the RBDD, the ACID Dam, harvest in the sportfishery and poaching. Keswick Dam, at the upstream terminus of this reach of the river presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Keswick Dam (~RM 302) presents an impassable barrier to the upstream migration of all winter-run Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River. The ACID Dam (RM 298.5) was constructed in 1917 about three river miles downstream of the current Keswick Dam. Originally the dam was a barrier to upstream fish migration until 1927 when a poorly designed fish ladder was installed (NMFS 1997). The dam is a 450-foot long flashboard structure which has the capability of raising the backwater level 10 feet. The dam is only installed during the irrigation season which typically runs from early April to October or early November. As mentioned above, the fish ladder providing passage around the dam was poorly designed and although winter-run Chinook salmon were able to negotiate the ladder, it did present a partial impediment to upstream migration. In 2001, a new fish ladder was installed. Post-project monitoring indicates that the new fish ladder is operating effectively (CDFG 2004c). Another potential problem associated with the facility is that high volume releases from the ACID's canal downstream of the dam may create false attraction flows for migrating adult salmon where they could be stranded (NMFS 1997).

The proportion of the spawning run that is affected by ACID Dam is uncertain. Although data on the spatial distribution of winter-run Chinook salmon spawning indicate that most spawning occurs between Keswick Dam and ACID Dam (CDFG 2004), data on the temporal distribution of winter-run Chinook salmon upstream migration suggest that in wet years about 50 percent of the run has passed the RBDD by March, and in dry years, migration is typically earlier, with about 72 percent of the run having passed the RBDD by March (CUWA and SWC 2004). Therefore, if winter-run Chinook salmon continue to quickly migrate upstream as far as possible after they pass RBDD, they may make it upstream of ACID Dam before it is installed in early April.

The RBDD at RM 243 is a concrete structure 52 feet high and 740 feet long. The dam has 11 gates which are raised or lowered to control the level of Lake Red Bluff enabling gravity diversion into the TCC. Permanent fish ladders are located on each abutment of the dam. The fish ladders are inefficient in allowing upstream migration of adult salmonids (NMFS 1997). In several radio tagging studies of adult winter-run Chinook salmon, 43 to 44 percent of tagged fish were blocked by the dam (Vogel *et al.* 1988,

Hallock *et al.* 1982 *in* NMFS 1997). Tagged winter-run Chinook salmon that eventually passed the dam were delayed by an average of 125 hours in one study (Vogel *et al.* 1988 *in* NMFS 1997) and 437 hours in a previous study (Hallock *et al.* 1982 *in* NMFS 1997). At present, the dam gates are kept in the raised position from September 15 through May 14 allowing free passage for about 85 percent of the run (NMFS 1997). However, there are intermittent closures during this time period of up to 10 days. The remaining portion of the run (migrating upstream past May 15) is likely to be delayed or blocked from passing the dam.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Although California sportfishing regulations are designed to protect winter-run Chinook salmon from recreational harvest, early arriving fish may still be harvested prior to January 1. Additionally, higher densities of fish in this portion of the river may lead to higher early harvest rates. Higher densities of fish, particularly below dams, likely create opportunities for both illegal poaching of salmon and the inadvertent or intentional snagging of fish.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Following the installation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997, water temperatures in this reach of the river seldom exceed 60°F and are suitable for adult immigration and holding.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in this reach of the Sacramento River is not at a level to cause adverse effects on immigrating adult salmonids.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions in the upper Sacramento River are not likely to adversely affect the upstream adult immigration period for winter-run Chinook salmon.

2.3.7.2 SPAWNING

Spawning escapements of winter-run Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River have declined from near 100,000 in the late 1960s to less than 200 in the early 1990s (Good *et al.* 2005). The CDFG estimated that 191 winter-run Chinook salmon returned in 1991 and that 189 returned in 1994 (Arkush *et al.* 1997). Runs increased to 1,361 in 1995 and 1,296 in 1996 (Arkush *et al.* 1997). Escapements increased to 8,120, 7,360 and 8,133 in 2001, 2002 and 2003 respectively (CDFG 2004c). However, a significant portion of these fish are likely returns from the winter-run Chinook salmon propagation program at the LSNFH.

In the Sacramento River, winter-run Chinook salmon spawn from late-April through mid-August with peak spawning activity in May and June (NMFS 1997). See Section 2.2.2 for a more complete description of the biological requirements and description of this life stage. Factors that may adversely affect winter-run Chinook salmon spawning are similar in both river reaches described below although the magnitude of the effects may differ.

Spawning in this reach of the Sacramento River may be affected by adverse flow conditions, physical habitat alteration, recreational sportfishing and poaching, and poor water quality (water temperature). Each of these potential effects is described below.

Although lower water temperatures in this reach of the Sacramento River make spawning habitat more suitable, the adverse effects of changing flow regimes, physical habitat alteration, sportfishing harvest and poaching are likely magnified in this reach due to higher densities of winter-run Chinook salmon spawning.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Keswick Dam presents an impassable barrier to upstream salmonid migration and, therefore, marks the upstream extent of potential spawning habitat in this reach of the Sacramento River. Depending on flow conditions, passage at the ACID may be partially impaired.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Sport fishing regulations in the Sacramento River are designed to minimize the legal take of winter-run Chinook salmon. However, because the taking of salmon is permitted after August 1, some late spawning winter-run Chinook salmon may be taken. Additionally, the Sacramento River is a popular year-round fishery and some salmon may be inadvertently caught or incorrectly identified by anglers fishing for rainbow trout.

Unnaturally high densities of salmon may occur below the RBDD during certain flow conditions when dam passage is difficult. This may lead to the inadvertent or deliberate snagging of salmon and may create increased poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Because of suitable water temperatures in this reach of the river and only marginal water temperature conditions downstream of the RBDD, almost all spawning activity occurs in the upper Sacramento River. Other factors affecting winter-run Chinook salmon spawning in the upper Sacramento River are similar to those affecting spawning in the middle Sacramento River described above. Water temperatures in this reach of the river are slightly lower than those found in the middle Sacramento reach making spawning habitat more suitable.

Generally, successful spawning for Chinook salmon occurs at water temperatures below 60°F (NMFS 1997). The NMFS OCAP BO requires water temperatures to be maintained below 56°F. The 56°F temperature criterion is measured as the average daily water temperature and as such, the criteria may allow water temperatures to exceed 56°F for some periods during a day. However, water temperatures are not likely to exceed 56°F for more than a few hours. Prior to 1997, during some years, water temperatures began exceeding 60°F in May and during July and August, water temperatures were frequently above 60°F (NMFS 1997). In 1997, a TCD was installed at Shasta Dam allowing better management of water temperatures in the Sacramento River. CDFG (2004c) reports that the TCD is working well and that very low egg loss occurred due to adverse water temperatures in 2002 and 2003. Currently the 56°F compliance point is at Bend Bridge near the town of Red Bluff. Downstream of this point, water temperatures likely increase rather quickly during the summer months because of the warm weather and warmwater agricultural return flows.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the upper Sacramento River is similar to that described in the idle reach described above. Because of the proximity of the Iron Mountain Mine, point source pollutants may be more concentrated in this reach of the river but effects on spawning are likely negligible.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Large flow fluctuations are the main concern regarding adverse flow conditions in the middle and upper Sacramento River. The largest and most frequent flow reductions have occurred in the late summer and early fall when flashboards at the ACID Dam require adjustment. However, because the largest flow reductions normally occur after spawning has taken place, it is not likely that adverse flow conditions in this reach of the river have a significant negative effect on winter-run Chinook salmon spawning.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

It is generally thought that available spawning habitat in the upper Sacramento River is sufficient to support the winter-run Chinook salmon population at its currently low level (NMFS 1997). However, as the population recovers, spawning gravel availability could become a limiting factor (NMFS 1997).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Chinook salmon require clean loose gravel from 0.75 to 4.0 inches in diameter for successful spawning (NMFS 1997). The construction of dams in the upper Sacramento River has eliminated the major source of suitable gravel recruitment to reaches of the river below Keswick Dam. Gravel sources from the banks of the river and floodplain have also been substantially reduced by levee and bank protection measures. Levee and bank protection measures restrict the meandering of the river which would normally release gravel into the river through natural erosion and deposition processes.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Hatchery effects that are not specific to a particular life stage are discussed above in Section 2.3.2.1. Potential negative effects specific to spawning are discussed below.

The first release of hatchery-raised winter-run Chinook salmon fry from the CNFH occurred in 1990. Use of the CNFH for the propagation program was unsuccessful primarily because fish imprinted on Battle Creek and adults returned to Battle Creek where instream conditions are too warm to allow successful spawning and embryo incubation. Additionally, genetic analyses showed that some spring-run Chinook salmon were misidentified as winter-run and used for hatchery propagation in 1993, 1994 and 1995 (NMFS 1997). Subsequently, hybrids were released in 1993 and 1994.

The LSNFH has been producing and releasing winter-run Chinook salmon since 1998. The fish are marked with CWTs, adipose fin clipped and released as pre-smolts each winter in late-January or early-February.

Broodstock for the winter-run conservation program is collected from fish traps at Keswick Dam and RBDD, decreasing the number of potentially spawning adults in the natural population. The overall strategy of the program is to increase the abundance of the natural population and bring it closer to recovery status. Fish are trapped throughout migration run-timing at Keswick Dam; however, many fish do not reach the upper Sacramento River but hold in the reach above RBDD and therefore, some representation of run timing may not be always adequately represented. Not all components of the run can be collected at RBDD because the gates remain open for the bulk of the run. There have also been some instances of predation on trapped fish before their collection, which has precipitated changes in trapping protocols. The greatest potential effect on spawning may be dominance of hatchery influence on the natural population. High survival is afforded to hatchery juveniles. Artificial propagation of winter-run preferentially spawns natural adults, but with the limitations of current collection methods, there may be skewing of genetic representation of the population not par with natural selection. Preferential survival of hatchery fish over time may disrupt gene complexes of the natural population with those inherited through artificial selection. Taylor (1991) reports that because hatchery fish are adapted to the hatchery environment, natural spawning with wild fish reduces the fitness of the natural population. Recently, NMFS (2007a) reported that the rising proportion of hatchery fish among returning adults threatens to shift the population from a low to moderate risk of extinction. Additionally, Lindley *et al.* (2007) recommend that in order to maintain a low risk of genetic introgression with hatchery fish, no more than five percent of the naturally spawning population should be composed of hatchery fish.

Since 2001, hatchery-origin winter-run Chinook salmon have made up more than five percent of the run and in 2005, the contribution of hatchery fish exceeded 18 percent (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

2.3.7.3 EMBRYO INCUBATION

In the Sacramento River, winter-run Chinook salmon spawning occurs from late-April through mid-August. Fry emergence occurs from mid-June through mid-October (NMFS 1997). Therefore, embryo incubation is believed to occur from mid-April through mid-October. Nearly all spawning of winter-run Chinook salmon occurs in the upper Sacramento River upstream of the RBDD. In 2002, one redd was observed downstream of RBDD, while in 2003, three redds were observed below this point (CDFG 2004). Embryo incubation is defined as the time span from fertilized egg deposition until fry emergence from the gravel. Within the appropriate water temperature range, eggs normally hatch in 40 to 60 days. Newly hatched fish (alevins) normally remain in the gravel for an additional four to six weeks until the yolk sac has been absorbed (NMFS 1997). See Section 2.2.3 for a more complete description of the biological requirements and description of this life stage. Factors that may affect winter-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation are similar in both river reaches and are described below; however, the magnitude of the effects may differ.

Factors affecting winter-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation in the upper Sacramento River are similar to those affecting embryo incubation in the middle Sacramento River described above. Water temperatures in this reach of the river are lower than those found in the middle Sacramento River reach making embryo incubation habitat more suitable and warm water temperatures are seldom a problem for developing embryos in this reach of the river.

The adverse effects of fluctuating flow regimes and water pollution from both point and non-point sources are likely magnified in this reach of the river because of the higher densities of embryo development.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because recreational fishing in the Sacramento River is permitted year-round, it is possible that incubating embryos in redds could be disturbed by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The embryo incubation life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon is the most sensitive to elevated water temperatures. Preferred water temperatures for Chinook salmon egg incubation and embryo development range from 46°F to 56°F (NMFS 1997). A significant reduction in egg viability occurs at water temperatures above 57.5°F and total mortality may occur at 62°F (NMFS 1997). Additionally, several diseases that can adversely affect developing embryos become more virulent as water temperatures increase. For example, Saprolegnia is a common fungal disease, which spreads rapidly and suffocates developing eggs in a redd. The rate of fungal growth rises exponentially as water temperatures increase from the mid-50s to the low-60s (NMFS 1997). Historically, water temperatures in the middle Sacramento River typically exceeded 60°F from July through September and in drier years may have exceeded 66°F (NMFS 1997). Winter-run Chinook salmon that spawned downstream of the RBDD normally did not produce viable offspring because of lethal water temperatures (Hallock and Fisher 1985). However, with implementation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997 suitable water temperatures for embryo incubation may extend downstream of Bend Bridge. Currently, river water temperatures just below the RBDD only marginally exceed the incipient lethal level for incubating eggs during June through September, by reaching 57°F to 58°F. These water temperatures are in the range that would typically cause mortality for 10 to 20 percent of eggs (Cramer *et al.* 2003).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality issues that may produce adverse effects on winter-run Chinook salmon include both point source and non-point source pollution. Non-point source pollution consists of sediments from storm

events, stormwater runoff in urban and developing areas and agricultural runoff. Sediments constitute nearly half of the material introduced to the river from non-point sources (NMFS 1997). Excess silt and other suspended solids are mobilized during storm events from plowed fields, construction and logging sites and mines. High sediment loading can interfere with eggs developing in redds by reducing the ability of oxygenated water to percolate down to eggs in the gravel. Stormwater runoff in urban areas can transport oil, trash, heavy metals and toxic organics all of which are potentially harmful to incubating eggs. Agricultural runoff can contain excess nutrients, pesticides and trace metals.

The inactive Iron Mountain Mine in the Spring Creek watershed near Keswick Dam creates the largest point source discharge of toxic material into the Sacramento River. The three metals of particular concern are copper, cadmium and zinc. The early life stages of salmon are the most sensitive to these metals (NMFS 1997). The acid mine drainage from Iron Mountain Mine is among the most acidic and metal laden anywhere in the world (NMFS 1997). Historically, discharge from the mine has produced massive fish kills.

In 1983, the Iron Mountain Mine site was declared a superfund site. Since that time various mitigation measures have been implemented including a neutralization plant that has improved the ability to control metal loadings to the river. (NMFS 1997) reported that although significant improvements have been made, basin plan objectives were not yet achieved by 1997. Since that time, other mitigation measures have been implemented resulting in a 95 percent reduction in historic copper, cadmium and zinc discharges (EPA 2006). At present, acid mine waste still escapes untreated from waste piles and seepage on the north side of Iron Mountain and flows into Boulder Creek, which eventually flows into the Sacramento River (EPA 2006). However, there were no significant exceedances of dissolved metal concentrations in the Sacramento River in 2002 and 2003 (CDFG 2004c). Another point source of pollution in the upper Sacramento River is the Simpson Mill near Redding, which discharges PCBs into the river (NMFS 1997).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow fluctuations are a serious concern related to potential adverse effects on the embryo incubation life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon. For example, if spawning salmon construct redds during periods of high flow, those redds could become dewatered during subsequent periods of low flow. Historically, the largest and most rapid flow reductions have occurred during the irrigation season when adjustments are required at the ACID Dam. To accommodate these adjustments, Sacramento River flows at times have been decreased by one-half or greater, over the course of a few hours (NMFS 1997). Flow fluctuations adversely affecting winter-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation do not occur every year and can be controlled by dam operations. Adherence to NMFS ramping criteria and the use of CVPIA B2 water serve to minimize the adverse effects of flow fluctuations.

2.3.7.4 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles rearing in the upper Sacramento River exhibit peak abundance during September, with outmigration past the RBDD occurring from July through March (Reclamation 1992; Vogel and Marine 1991). NMFS (1997) reports juvenile rearing and outmigration extending from June through April. Outmigration of juveniles past Knights Landing, approximately 155 river miles downstream of the RBDD, reportedly occurs between November and March peaking in December (Snider and Titus 2000). See Section 2.2.4 for a more complete description of the biological requirements and description of this life stage. Factors that may adversely affect winter-run Chinook salmon juvenile rearing and outmigration are similar in each of the three river reaches described below although the magnitude of the effects may differ.

Factors that may adversely affect juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the upper Sacramento River are similar to those described above in the middle Sacramento River and include passage impediments,

physical habitat alteration, water quality, predation, and entrainment. In addition to those factors described above, adverse flow conditions in this reach of the river likely have a greater impact on juveniles as described below.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Following the installation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997, water temperatures in this reach of the river seldom exceed 60°F and are suitable for juvenile salmon rearing year-round.

WATER QUALITY

Point source pollution may occur from both the Iron Mountain Mine and the Simpson Mill as described above. Because the juvenile life stage of Chinook salmon is the most susceptible to adverse effects from pollution and the proximity of these two potential sources of pollution, potential adverse effects are likely more profound in the upper Sacramento River compared to the lower reaches. Effects of non-point source pollution from urban runoff and agricultural drainage are similar to those described above for the middle Sacramento River. However, pollution associated with urban runoff is likely higher due to the proximity of the cities of Redding and Red Bluff.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Almost all spawning and embryo incubation of winter-run Chinook salmon occurs in the upper Sacramento River upstream of the RBDD. Therefore, there is a high density of newly emerged fry in this section of the river. The emergence of fry from the gravel coincides with the irrigation season when flashboard adjustments at the ACID Dam are required and cause reductions in flow. Winter-run Chinook salmon fry prefer shallow nearshore areas with slow current and cover during the late summer and fall. Sudden flow reductions associated with flashboard adjustments at the ACID Dam may strand fry in shallow pools or sidechannels where they may be dewatered or subjected to high water temperatures.

Keswick Dam at RM 302 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migrating adult Chinook salmon, and hence represents the upstream extent of winter-run Chinook salmon habitat. The ACID Dam, located about three miles below Keswick Dam, represents the furthest upstream impediment to juvenile outmigration. The dam is only in place during the irrigation season which typically extends from April through November. During the rest of the year neither upstream adult migration nor downstream juvenile outmigration is hindered. However, peak juvenile outmigration occurs in September and October while the dam is in place. Juveniles migrate past the dam by either dropping as much as ten feet over the dam to the river below or moving through the bypass facility. In either case, juveniles may become disoriented and more susceptible to predation.

The RBDD, at the downstream extent of the upper Sacramento River, creates the final passage impediment to downstream outmigration in this reach of the river. The dam is described in Section 2.3.7.1. When the dam gates are lowered, Lake Red Bluff is formed slowing flows and delaying juvenile outmigration allowing more opportunities for predation as described below under Predation. Historically there was both direct and indirect mortality associated with fish using an ineffective juvenile fish bypass facility at the dam. A “Downstream Migrant Fish Facility” was installed in 1992, which appears to have reduced mortality associated with use of the bypass facility.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Physical habitat alteration in the upper Sacramento River is similar to that described above for the middle Sacramento River. However, the adverse effects of loss of riparian habitat on juvenile Chinook salmon rearing in the upper Sacramento River may be more profound because of the higher densities of juveniles in this river reach. Whereas the lower reaches of the river serve more as a migratory corridor, the upper Sacramento River is where initial juvenile rearing occurs.

Levee building, bank protection measures and the disconnection of the river from its historic floodplain have all had negative effects on riparian habitat. Woody debris and SRA habitat provide important escape cover for juvenile salmon. Aquatic and terrestrial insects, a major component of juvenile salmon diet, are dependent on riparian habitat. Aquatic invertebrates are dependent on the organic material provided be a healthy riparian habitat and many terrestrial invertebrates also depend on this habitat. Studies by the CDFG as reported in NMFS (NMFS 1997) demonstrated that a significant portion of juvenile Chinook salmon diet is composed of terrestrial insects, particularly aphids, which are dependent on riparian habitat.

ENTRAINMENT

Adverse effects due to entrainment of outmigrating juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon at unscreened diversions are similar to those described above for the middle Sacramento River. Although there is a fish bypass facility at the ACID Dam, the screening does not operate consistently, particularly under high flow or debris load conditions and some entrainment may occur. The new downstream migrant fish facility at the RBDD may have reduced entrainment problems at the RBDD.

PREDATION

Significant predators of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the upper Sacramento River include Sacramento pikeminnow and both hatchery and wild steelhead. Striped bass, a significant predator in lower reaches of the river typically do not utilize the upper Sacramento River; however, they are present immediately below the RBDD.

The most serious adverse effect due to predation occurs in the vicinity of the RBDD. Passage through Lake Red Bluff can delay outmigrating juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon and increases the opportunities for predation by both fish and birds (Vogel and Smith 1986 as citied *in* NMFS 1997). Winter-run Chinook salmon juveniles passing under the gates at the RBDD are heavily preyed upon by both striped bass and Sacramento pikeminnow (NMFS 1997). Large concentrations of Sacramento pikeminnow have been observed accumulating immediately below the RBDD when juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon begin outmigration in late summer and early fall (Garcia 1989 in NMFS 1997).

The extent of predation on juvenile Chinook salmon by hatchery reared steelhead is not known. However, steelhead releases by the CNFH may have a high potential for inducing high levels of predation on naturally produced Chinook salmon (CALFED 2000b). The CNFH has a current production target of releasing approximately 600,000 steelhead in January and February at a size of 125 to 275 mm (CALFED 2000b). There is also evidence of residualization of CNFH steelhead in the upper Sacramento River, which would compound the effects of annual CNFH steelhead releases.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The extent of predation on juvenile Chinook salmon by hatchery-reared steelhead is not known. However, steelhead releases by the CNFH may have a high potential for inducing high levels of predation on naturally produced Chinook salmon (CALFED 2000c). The CNFH has a current production target of releasing approximately 600,000 steelhead in January and February at sizes of 125 to 275 mm (CALFED 2000c)

LSNFH releases up to 250,000 pre-smolt winter-run at 85 to 90 mm FL, a larger size than their wild counterparts. LSNFH winter-run appear to leave the upper Sacramento River enmass, and may precipitate the outmigration of wild winter-run they encounter through a “pied-piper effect.” The net effect of this phenomenon is two-fold: a smaller wild fish may leave before its development triggers an outmigration response and compete poorly for refugia and prey, but it may be afforded some protection by traveling amid a large number of fish.

2.3.8 SUB-ADULT AND ADULT OCEAN RESIDENCE

2.3.8.1 HARVEST

The recent increase in abundance of winter-run Chinook salmon is attributed to the harvest management measures developed by the PFMC in accordance with the NMFS 1996 and 1997 supplemental BOs on the FMP restricting recreational and commercial fisheries south of Point Arena, California (NMFS 2000). The harvest index (CVI) ranged from 0.55 to about 0.80 from 1970 to 1995, when harvest rates were restricted to protect winter-run Chinook salmon. In 2001, the CVI fell to 0.27.

The recent release of a significant number of adipose fin-clipped juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon has provided new information on the harvest rates of winter-run Chinook salmon in coastal recreational and troll fisheries. The PFMC's Sacramento River Winter and Spring Chinook Salmon Workgroup performed a cohort reconstruction of the 1998 brood year (NMFS 2003). Winter-run Chinook salmon are mainly vulnerable to ocean fisheries at age 3. The workgroup estimated that the ocean fishery impact rate on 3-year olds was 0.23, and the in-river sportfishery impact rate was 0.24. These impacts combine to reduce escapement by 59 percent of what it would have been in the absence of fisheries mortalities, assuming no natural mortality during the fishing season. The high estimated rate of harvest from the in-river sportfishery is a consequence of the recovery of eight coded-wire tags, and was not anticipated due to fishery closures from January 15 to July 31 to reduce impacts on winter-run Chinook salmon. Currently (2007), the in-river sportfishery is closed from December 31 through July 16 to avoid harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon during the tail end of the late-fall Chinook salmon run.

While the fishing regulations prevent the retention of salmon, there are mortalities associated with the capture and subsequent release of fish. The hook-and-release mortality rate for Chinook salmon of all sizes released from recreational ocean fisheries was estimated to be 14 percent by the Salmon Technical Team (PFMC 2000). In addition, the Salmon Technical Team recommended using a *drop-off-mortality-rate* (i.e., the proportion of fish encountered by fishing gear that are killed without being brought into the vessel) of 5 percent.

Pacific coast salmon management is based largely on the analysis of CWT recoveries from hatchery fish. The CWT contains information on the fish's origin, brood year, year of release and other information. The recent recoveries of CWT fish in the ocean and river have provided data to re-examine the impact of ocean harvest on winter-run Chinook salmon. The CWT data indicate that the harvest fraction on winter-run Chinook salmon was 0.54 for the brood year 1992 (NMFS 1996c). The NMFS Biological Assessment indicates that this harvest fraction was estimated based on relatively limited data due to the small size of juveniles tagged. However, the recovery of tagged winter-run Chinook salmon verifies the incidence of harvest and provides a rough approximation of present ocean impacts.

It was determined that the 0.54 harvest rate was acceptable because it was below levels sustained by other Chinook salmon stocks. However, the winter-run Chinook salmon population has shown low spawning abundances and therefore, it may be that a harvest fraction of 0.50 is too high to sustain the winter-run Chinook salmon population.

A biological opinion on the winter-run Chinook salmon ocean harvest suggests that for brood years 1998, 1999, and 2000, the spawner reduction rates associated with winter-run ocean harvest were 0.26, 0.23, and 0.24, respectively. The spawner reduction rate is the observed fishery mortality in terms of adult-equivalents (fish that are expected to survive natural mortality and spawn) divided by the predicted number of spawners that would survive natural mortality in the absence of fishery mortality (NMFS 2004b).



Figure 2-6. Historical Upper Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Spawning Escapement Estimates

2.3.8.2 OCEAN CONDITIONS

In recent years scientific evidence supports hypotheses about the direct and indirect effects of climate change on the ocean production of salmon. Most of this research has focused on the effects of oceanic climate change on the growth and abundance of salmonids (Hollowed *et al.* 2001; Kruse 1998; Myers *et al.* 2000; Pearcy 1997). Two of the most researched phenomena are the El Niño-Southern-Oscillation (ENSO) and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO). ENSO is a short-term (8 to 15 months) climate change event that occurs at irregular intervals (approximately every 3 to 7 years) and alternates between two phases, the El Niño (warm) and the La Nina (cool).

The PDO is a multi-decadal (20 to 30 year) ENSO-like pattern of North Pacific climate change. The PDO seems to be associated with an inverse relationship between salmon abundance in the Alaska and the U.S. Pacific Coast regions. During a positive PDO phase, the abundance of Alaska salmon is high, and the abundance of U.S. West Coast salmon is low.

ENSO has been shown to produce dramatic effects on marine communities. Alterations in the physical oceanographic properties of the marine environment can be observed as far north as Alaska. Less known is the phenomenon of La Nina, the cool phase of ENSO events that follows El Niño. During the 1982-1983 El Niño event there were observable alternations in oceanic plankton distributions, fish community structure, and reduced ocean catches off the coastal waters of southern California. Along central California coast, the 1992-1993 El Niño corresponded to delayed phytoplankton blooms, changes in the abundance and distribution of invertebrates, an increase in the productivity of southern fish species; however there was a dramatic decline in the northerly rockfish species. More recently, the largest decline in macrozooplankton abundance off central southern California occurred during the 1997-1998 El Niño (Brodeur and Pearcy 1992a).

Brodeur *et al.* (1992b) found that juvenile Chinook and coho salmon have the potential to easily exhaust prey resources during years when ocean productivity is low (e.g., El Niño), but during most years they consume less than 1 percent of the total prey production.

2.4 STRESSOR PRIORITIZATION

2.4.1 STRESSOR MATRIX DEVELOPMENT

2.4.1.1 STRESSOR MATRIX OVERVIEW

A stressor matrix[7], in the form of a single Microsoft Excel worksheet, was developed to structure the winter-run Chinook salmon population, life stage, and stressor information into hierarchically related tiers so that stressors to the ESU could be prioritized. The individual tiers within the matrix, from highest to lowest, are: (1) population; (2) life stage; (3) primary stressor category; and (4) specific stressor. These individual tiers were related hierarchically so that each variable within a tier had several associated variables at the next lower tier, except at the lowest (i.e. fourth) tier.

The general steps required to develop and utilize the winter-run stressor matrix are described as follows:

1. Each life stage within the population was weighted so that all life stage weights in the population summed to one;
2. Each primary stressor category within a life stage was weighted so that all primary stressor category weights in a life stage summed to one;
3. Each specific stressor within a primary stressor category was weighted so that all specific stressor weights in a primary stressor category summed to one;
4. A composite weight for each specific stressor was obtained by multiplying the product of the population weight, the life stage weight, the primary stressor weight, and the specific stressor weight by 100;
5. A normalized weight for each specific stressor was obtained by multiplying the composite weight by the number of specific stressors within a particular primary stressor group; and
6. The stressor matrix was sorted by the normalized weight of the specific stressors in descending order.

The completed stressor matrix sorted by normalized weight is a prioritized list of the life stage-specific stressors affecting the ESU. Specific information explaining the individual steps taken to generate this prioritized list is provided in the following sections.

2.4.1.2 POPULATION IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

The winter-run Chinook salmon threats assessment was limited to the Sacramento River population, which represents the only extant[8] population in the ESU. Thus, this population received a weight of one in the stressor matrix.

[7] For winter-run Chinook salmon, a single stressor matrix was developed corresponding to the mainstem upper Sacramento River population, whereas for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead, multiple individual stressor matrices were developed corresponding to each of the extant populations for these species.

[8] Historically, winter-run Chinook salmon inhabited the Little Sacramento River, Pit-Fall-Hat Creeks, the McCloud River, and Battle Creek.

2.4.1.3 LIFE STAGE IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

For the purpose of developing the stressor matrices, the freshwater life cycle for winter-run Chinook salmon was broken up into four commonly acknowledged life stages: (1) adult immigration and staging (winter-run Chinook salmon)/holding (spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead); (2) spawning; (3) embryo incubation; and (4) juvenile rearing and outmigration. When weighting stressors in the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage, the temporal and spatial distribution of post-emergent fry, young-of-year, and yearling/smolts was considered along with the factors affecting each of these juvenile age/size classes.

The individual life stages of winter-run Chinook salmon were weighted in relative importance according to: (1) the relative importance of each life stage in establishing initial year class strength; and (2) relative vulnerability of each life stage to current stressors. It is recognized that each life stage is important to the production the subsequent year class and, as such, life stages were ranked unequally only when differences were clearly warranted. For example, for winter-run Chinook salmon, the adult immigration and staging life stage was given a lower (i.e., 0.1) ranking relative to the three other life stages because flows are generally high and water temperatures are generally cool during this life stage making the life stage relatively less vulnerable to current stressors. The other three winter-run Chinook salmon life stages were ranked relatively equal (i.e., 0.25-0.35) to one another. The life stage weightings for each spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead population are presented in Appendices B and C, respectively.

2.4.1.4 STRESSOR IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

The primary stressors affecting winter-run Chinook salmon throughout its life cycle were identified by: (1) conducting three public workshops; (2) reviewing published literature, including the proposed Sacramento winter-run Chinook salmon recovery plan published in 1997 (NMFS 1997), Chinook salmon status review documents (Myers *et al.* 1998), and numerous other technical sources related to Central Valley salmon; and (3) utilizing the technical expertise of several Central Valley salmonid biologists. The threats lists generated from the public workshops were used as a starting point for identifying and categorizing threats. The following is a list of the primary stressor categories ultimately considered for the stressor matrix development.

1. Passage Impediments/Barriers
2. Harvest/Angling Impacts
3. Water Temperature
4. Water Quality
5. Flow Conditions
6. Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover
7. Loss of Natural River Morphology and Function
8. Loss of Floodplain Habitat
9. Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat
10. Spawning Habitat Availability
12. Physical Habitat Alteration (e.g., lack of instream gravel supply, watershed disturbance)
13. Invasive Species/Food Web Changes
14. Entrainment
15. Predation
17. Hatchery Effects

The primary stressor categories presented were not necessarily considered to be an exhaustive list of stressors. However, the list contains the major threats and stressors to the Sacramento River population that can potentially be alleviated through recovery actions. Threats to the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon population not on this list include low abundance as well as changes in ocean conditions that may adversely affect the ocean food web (i.e., altered ocean currents that limit upwelling). The threat

of low abundance should be reduced if the primary stressors considered in the stressor matrix are minimized or eliminated. The threat of an altered oceanic food distribution adversely affecting the population is an impossible threat to alleviate through recovery actions.

Some of the primary stressor categories are self explanatory, while others require some elucidation to fully understand their context and how they were considered in the stressor matrix. "Passage Impediments/Barriers" were considered to be threats affecting both the adult immigration and staging, and the spawning life stages, because the impediments/barriers may physically block access to historic staging and spawning habitats. As a consequence, they also eliminate the spatial segregation of spawning habitat that historically existed for spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon. "Harvest/Angling Impacts" include recreational and commercial harvest in the ocean[9], Bay-Delta, and river systems, as well as incidental impacts of anglers physically disturbing incubating embryos while wading through the river. "Flow Conditions" includes flow dependent habitat availability in-river systems and the anthropogenically altered hydrology in the Delta. For example, the CVP and SWP have resulted in changing the Delta from a tidally driven saline-estuarine-freshwater system to one that is primarily fresh water. Additionally, the C.W. Jones (formerly Tracy) and the Harvey O. Banks pumping plants affect Delta flow conditions in several ways including: (1) by creating reverse flow conditions in Old and Middle Rivers; (2) by effectively pulling Sacramento River water down into the central Delta. "Loss of Natural River Morphology and Function" is the result of river channelization and confinement, which leads to a decrease in riverine habitat complexity, and thus, a decrease in the quantity and quality of juvenile rearing habitat. Additionally, this primary stressor category includes the effect that dams have on the aquatic invertebrate species composition and distribution, which may have an effect on the quality and quantity of food resources available to juvenile salmonids. For example, in a natural river system without one or more large dams, there is an upstream source of lotic aquatic invertebrate species available to juvenile salmonids, whereas on a river with a large terminal dam, the upstream drift of food resources to juvenile salmonids is drastically altered. The "Spawning Habitat Availability" category was considered to include the quantity and quality of spawning habitat currently accessible to the fish, whereas, as previously mentioned, the loss of access to historic spawning habitat was considered in the "Passage Impediments/Barriers" category. The "Invasive Species/Food Web Changes" category included the potential effects of native (i.e., microsystis) and non-native (e.g., Asian clam, *A. aspera*) species on the quantity and quality of food available to juvenile salmonids in the Bay-Delta system. The "Hatchery Effects" primary stressor category was considered a threat to the spawning and the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages. The spawning life stage is affected due to the potential for hatchery-origin salmon to compete with naturally-origin for spawning habitat, and due to the potential for reduced genetic integrity when hatchery-origin salmon spawn with natural-origin salmon. The juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage is affected due to competition between hatchery- and natural-origin for habitat and food, and due to predation by yearling-sized or larger steelhead released from hatcheries on young-of-year Chinook salmon.

Specific stressors are the individual physical structures or locations at which the primary stressor category is affecting the species. As shown in **Table 2-2**, four river sections of the Sacramento River system (i.e., the Delta, and the lower, middle, and upper Sacramento River) are identified as specific stressors within the water temperature primary stressor category.

[9] For ease of application to the stressor matrix, the impact of ocean harvest was considered in the adult immigration and holding/staging life stage.

Table 2-2. Excerpt from the Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix

Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	Number of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.325	4	1.30	**M**
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.488	4	1.95	**H**
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.650	4	2.60	**H**
Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.163	4	0.65	**L**

The criteria considered when evaluating and weighting primary stressor categories and specific stressors were adapted from the Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance (NMFS 2006):

- Scope – The geographic scope of the threat to the species. Impacts can be widespread or localized.
- Severity – A measure of the level of damage to the species or system that can reasonably be expected within 10 years under current circumstances. Ranges from total destruction, serious or moderate degradation or slight impairment.
- Magnitude – The severity plus scope.
- Frequency – A temporal measure of the threat.
- Immediacy – There are varying degrees of immediacy, including , a species is intrinsically vulnerable to threats, or identifiable threats can be "mapped" and seen as increasing or decreasing, or the threats are reasonably predictable.
- Persistence – To identify a persistent threat, the active and historical sources of the stress are evaluated.

In order to account for variation in the number of specific stressors within primary stressor categories, it was necessary to normalize the composite weight. Without this normalization, a given set of specific stressors that have an equal affect on the species may inappropriately receive an unequal weighting if some specific stressors in the set are within a primary stressor category containing only a few specific stressors while the other specific stressors in the set are within a primary stressor category containing several specific stressors. Normalizing the composite weight was accomplished by multiplying the composite weight by the number of specific stressors within a particular primary stressor group.

After all of the variables in the matrix were identified and weighted, and all of the normalized weights were calculated, the matrix was sorted by normalized weight in descending order. This sort put the highest weighted stressors – those with the largest biological impact – at the top of the matrix and the

lowest weighted stressors at the bottom. After this initial sort, the matrix was reviewed for stressors that appeared to be inappropriately weighted, slight adjustments were then made until the sorted matrix reasonably represented a prioritized list of stressors.

It is important to discuss and understand the application of the stressor matrix results. Although the matrix provides a pseudo-quantitative means of comparatively ranking individual stressors, we want to avoid attributing unwarranted specificity to the prioritized stressor list. As such, the prioritized stressor list was distributed into four separate quartiles which represent four tiers of stressor importance. The stressors in the quartile with the highest normalized weights were identified as having "Very High" importance. The stressors in the other three quartiles were identified as having either a "High", "Medium", or "Low" importance depending on the magnitude and distribution of the normalized weights. For example, a population with 100 individual stressors with distinct (i.e., unequal) normalized weights would have 25 stressors that were considered of "Very High" importance, 25 with "High" importance, 25 with "Medium" importance, and 25 with "Low" importance. However, if the calculated normalized weight of some of the stressors were equal, then the distribution could be altered such that not all importance categories received the same number of stressors. Staying with this example, if the 25th and 26th ranked stressors in the sorted list of 100 stressors were equal, then the "Very High" importance stressor category would contain 26 stressors. The "High" importance category would receive 25 or more stressors depending on whether the normalized weights for the stressors at the quartile cutoff were equal or not, and so on.

2.4.2 STRESSOR MATRIX RESULTS

Each life stage of winter-run Chinook salmon is affected by stressors of "Very High" importance. These stressors include:

- The barriers of Keswick and Shasta dams, which block access to historic staging and spawning habitat;
- Ocean harvest;
- Flow fluctuations, water pollution, water temperatures in the upper Sacramento River during embryo incubation;
- Loss of juvenile rearing habitat in the form of lost natural river morphology and function, and lost riparian habitat and instream cover;
- Predation during juvenile rearing and outmigration; and
- Changes in Delta hydrology, diversion into the central Delta, and entrainment of juveniles at the C.W. Jones and Harvey O. Banks pumping plants.

The complete prioritized list of life stage-specific stressors to the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU is presented in Attachment A.

3.0 CENTRAL VALLEY SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON

3.1 BACKGROUND

3.1.1 LISTING HISTORY

Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon was proposed as "endangered" by NMFS on March 9, 1998 (63 FR 11482 (March 9, 1998)). NMFS concluded that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU was in danger of extinction because native spring-run Chinook salmon have been extirpated from all tributaries in the San Joaquin River Basin, which represented a large portion of the historic range and abundance of the ESU as a whole. Moreover, the only streams considered to have wild spring-run Chinook salmon at that time were Mill and Deer Creeks, and possibly Butte Creek (tributaries to the Sacramento River). These populations were considered relatively small with sharply declining trends. Hence, demographic and genetic risks due to small population sizes were considered to be high. NMFS also determined that habitat problems were the most important source of ongoing risk to this ESU. Spring-run Chinook salmon cannot access most of their historical spawning and rearing habitat in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins (which is now above impassable dams), and current spawning is restricted to the mainstem and a few river tributaries in the Sacramento River (63 FR 11482 (March 9, 1998)). NMFS reported that the remaining spawning habitat accessible to fish is severely degraded. Important juvenile rearing habitat and migration corridor also were degraded. General degradation conditions to rearing and migrating habitat included elevated water temperatures, agricultural and municipal diversions and returns, restricted and regulated flows, entrainment of migrating fish into unscreened or poorly screened diversions, and the poor quality and quantity of remaining habitat. In addition, serious concern existed for threats to genetic integrity posed by hatchery programs in the Central Valley. Most of the spring-run Chinook salmon production in the Central Valley is of hatchery-origin, and naturally spawning populations could be interbreeding with both fall/late fall- and spring-run hatchery fish. NMFS reported that this problem was exacerbated by the increasing production of spring-run Chinook salmon from the Feather River and Butte Creek hatcheries. Hatchery strays also were considered to be an increasing problem due to the management practice of releasing a larger proportion of fish off station (into the Delta and San Francisco Bay) (NMFS 2007b).

On September 16, 1999, NMFS listed the Central Valley ESU of spring-run Chinook salmon as a "threatened" species (64 FR 50394 (September 16, 1999)). Although in the original Chinook salmon status review and proposed listing it was concluded that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU was in danger of extinction (Myers *et al.* 1998), in the status review update, the BRT majority shifted to the view that this ESU was not in danger of extinction, but was likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future. A major reason for this shift was data indicating that a large run of spring-run Chinook salmon on Butte Creek in 1998 was naturally produced, rather than strays from Feather River Hatchery (NMFS 2007b).

On March 11, 2002, pursuant to a January 9, 2002 rule issued by NMFS under Section 4(d) of the ESA (15 USC § 1533(d)), the take restrictions that apply statutorily to endangered species began to apply to the Central Valley ESU of spring-run Chinook salmon (67 FR 1116 (January 9, 2002)).

On June 14 2004, NMFS proposed that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon remain a "threatened" species based on the BRT strong majority opinion that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook ESU is ''*likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future*.'' The BRT based its conclusions on the greatly reduced distribution of Central Valley spring Chinook ESU and hatchery influences on natural population. In addition, the BRT noted moderately high risk for the abundance, spatial structure, and diversity Viable Salmonid Population criteria, and a lower risk for the productivity

criterion reflecting positive trends. On June 28, 2005, NMFS reaffirmed the threatened status of the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU (70 FR 37160 (June 28, 2005)). All naturally spawned populations of spring-run Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River and its tributaries in California, and the Feather River Hatchery spring-run Chinook salmon population are included as part of the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU.

3.1.2 CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATION

On March 9, 1998, NMFS designated critical habitat for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon to include all river reaches accessible to Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River and its tributaries in California. Also included were river reaches and estuarine areas of the Delta, all waters from Chipps Island westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strait, all waters of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge, and all waters of San Francisco Bay (north of the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge) from San Pablo Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge.

In response to litigation brought by National Association of Homebuilders (NAHB) on the grounds that the agency did not adequately consider economic impacts of the critical habitat designations (NAHB v. Evans, 2002 WL 1205743 No. 00–Central Valley–2799 (D.D.C.)), NMFS sought judicial approval of a consent decree withdrawing critical habitat designations for 19 Pacific salmon and *O. mykiss* ESUs. The District Court in Washington DC approved the consent decree and vacated the critical habitat designations by Court order on April 30, 2002 (NAHB v. Evans, 2002 WL 1205743 (D.D.C. 2002)).

NMFS proposed new critical habitat for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon on December 10, 2004, and published a final rule designating critical habitat for this species on September 2, 2005. The critical habitat encompasses 1,158 miles of stream habitat in the Sacramento River Basin and 254 square miles of estuary habitat in the San Francisco-San Pablo-Suisun Bay complex (70 FR 52488 (September 2, 2005)). For a list of designated critical habitat units, see the September 2, 2005 Federal Register Notice (70 FR 52488 (September 2, 2005)).

3.1.3 UNIQUE SPECIES CHARACTERISTICS

Spring-run Chinook salmon enter rivers as immature fish in spring and early summer and exhibit a classic stream type history pattern, although the stay of some juveniles in fresh water may be less than a year (Moyle 2002). Spring-run Chinook salmon require freshwater streams with cold temperatures over the summer and suitable gravel for reproduction (CALFED 2000a).

Adult Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon leave the ocean to begin their upstream migration in late January and early February (CDFG 1998) and enter the Sacramento River between March and September, primarily in May and June (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998, Moyle 2002). While maturing, adults typically hold in large, deep (usually > 2 meters) and cold pools, typically with bedrock bottoms and moderate velocities. These fish can reach higher elevations before the onset of elevated water temperatures and low flows that inhibit access to these areas in the fall (Myers *et al.* 1998).

Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon spawn on the mainstem Sacramento River between RBDD and Keswick Dam and in tributaries such as Mill, Deer, and Butte Creeks. Spawning occurs at the tails of holding pools between late-August and early-October, peaking in September (Moyle 2002; NMFS 2007b). Redds sites are apparently chosen in part by the presence of subsurface flow. Chinook salmon usually seek a mixture of gravel and small cobbles with low silt content to build their redds. Females deposit their eggs in nests in gravel-bottom areas of relatively swift water. Each female produces 2,000 to 17,000 eggs (Moyle 2002).

Adult Pacific Chinook salmon usually die after spawning (Allen and Hassler 1986; Moyle 2002). However, mature 1-year-old males that have never gone to sea are assumed to spawn by sneaking into the nest of large adults, and may actually survive to spawn a second time. These precocious parr have

enormous testes – about 21 percent of the body weight. In addition, behavior includes the presence of small jack males that also spawn as streakers. The combination of regular and irregular males endures a high degree of fertilization of eggs – more than 90 percent (Moyle 2002).

The length of time for eggs to develop depends largely on water temperatures. In Butte and Big Chico creeks, emergence occurs from November through January and in the colder waters of Mill and Deer creeks, emergence typically occurs from January through March (Moyle 2002). For maximum embryo survival, water temperatures reportedly must be between 41ºF and 55.4ºF and oxygen levels must be close to saturation (Moyle 2002). Under those conditions, embryos hatch in 40 to 60 days and remain in the gravel as alevins for another 4 to 6 weeks, usually after the yolk sac is fully absorbed. After emerging, Chinook salmon fry tend to seek shallow, nearshore habitat with slow water velocities and move to progressively deeper, faster water as they grow. However, fry may disperse downstream, especially if high-flow events correspond with emergence (Moyle 2002). Movement occurs mostly at night and tends to cease after a couple of weeks, when fry settle down into rearing habitat in streams or estuaries.

Spring-run Chinook salmon fry emerge from the gravel from November to March (Moyle 2002). Emigration timing is highly variable, as they may migrate downstream as young-of-the year, juveniles, or yearling juveniles. The average size of fry migrants (approximately 40 mm between December and April in Mill, Butte, and Deer Creeks) reflects a prolonged emergence of fry from the gravel (Lindley *et al.* 2004). Studies in Butte Creek (Ward *et al.* 2003a; Ward and McReynolds 2001) found the majority of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon migrants to be fry moving downstream primarily during December, January and February; and that these movements appeared to be influenced by flow. Small numbers of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon remained in Butte Creek to rear and migrated as yearlings later in the spring. Juvenile emigration patterns in Mill and Deer Creeks are very similar to patterns observed in Butte Creek, with the exception that Mill and Deer Creek juveniles typically exhibit a later young-of-the year migration and an earlier yearling migration (Lindley *et al.* 2004).

Spring-run Chinook salmon juveniles may reside in freshwater habitat for 12 to 16 months, but many juveniles migrate to the ocean as young-of-the-year in the winter or spring within eight months after hatching (CALFED 2000a). The social behavior of juveniles varies from schooling to territoriality. Spring-run Chinook salmon emigration tends to peak in the Sacramento River during winter (January and February) and spring (April) (Moyle 2002).

Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon migratory corridors begin downstream of the spawning area and extend through the lower Sacramento River and the Delta. Spring-run Chinook salmon in Butte Creek move out as both fry and smolts. Downstream movements of juveniles of all runs serve not only to disperse and move them toward the ocean, but also to provide access to temporary habitats in which slightly warmer water temperatures and abundant food may encourage rapid growth. The tendency of juveniles in rivers to move toward shallow edges, especially during the day, puts them in heavy cover or among emergent vegetation, where invertebrates are abundant and where many predators have a hard time finding them.

Riverine and estuarine habitats of the Bay-Delta are important rearing areas for these migrants. Maslin *et al.* (1999) also have found that substantial numbers of spring-run juveniles use tributaries for non-natal rearing. While small tributaries generally have insufficient flow for spawning adults, juveniles can move upstream to rear, depending on the size, gradient, and quality of the tributary. In the Delta, terrestrial insects are by far the most important food, but crustaceans are also eaten. Juvenile Chinook salmon feed mostly during the day, with peak feeding occurring at dawn and during the afternoon.

Chinook salmon spend two to four years maturing in the ocean before returning to their natal streams to spawn. In the ocean, juvenile Chinook salmon become voracious predators on small fish and crustaceans.

Recovery of CWT Chinook salmon from the Feather River Hatchery in the ocean recreational and commercial fisheries (PSMFC RMIS Database) indicates that Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon

adults are broadly distributed along the Pacific Coast from Northern Oregon to Monterey. Like other stream-type Chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon are found far from the coast in the central North Pacific (Healey 1983; Myers *et al.* 1984). Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon remain in the ocean for two to four years and then home to their natal region over great distances (NMFS 2007). Once they reach the region of the stream mouth, many "landmarks" are available to guide them further, including geomagnetic anomalies, visual cues and distinctive odors of their home stream. Upstream migration takes place mainly during the day, with fish apparently tracking stream odors on which they imprinted when small. Some Chinook salmon stray to other streams. Straying is presumably also an adaptive mechanism, allowing Chinook salmon to colonize newly opened areas and to mix genetically with other runs, especially those in other streams close to the natal streams (Moyle 2002).

3.1.4 STATUS OF SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON

Historically, spring-run Chinook salmon were predominant throughout the Central Valley occupying the upper and middle reaches (1,000 to 6,000 feet) of the San Joaquin, American, Yuba, Feather, Sacramento, McCloud and Pit rivers, with smaller populations in most tributaries with sufficient habitat for adult salmon holding over the summer months (Stone 1874, Rutter 1904, Clark 1929 *in* NMFS 2007). Clark (1929) estimated that there were historically 6,000 stream miles of salmonid habitat in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin, but only 510 miles remained by 1928. Completion of Friant Dam extirpated the native population from the San Joaquin River and its tributaries (NMFS 2007b).

Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon were once the most abundant run of salmon in the Central Valley (Campbell and Moyle 1992). The Central Valley drainage as a whole is estimated to have supported spring-run Chinook salmon runs as large as 600,000 fish between the late 1880s and 1940s (CDFG 1998). More than 500,000 Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon were caught in the Sacramento-San Joaquin commercial fishery in 1883 (CDFG 1998; Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Before construction of Friant Dam, nearly 50,000 adults were counted in the San Joaquin River (Fry 1961). The San Joaquin populations essentially were extirpated by the 1940s, with only small remnants of the run persisting through the 1950s in the Merced River (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Populations in the upper Sacramento, Feather, and Yuba rivers were virtually eliminated with the construction of major dams during the 1950s and 1960s (NMFS 2007b).

The Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU has displayed broad fluctuations in adult abundance between 1967 and 2006 (**Figure 3-1**). Sacramento River tributary populations in Mill, Deer, and Butte Creeks are probably the best trend indicators for the Central Valley spring-run Chinook ESU as a whole because these streams contain the primary independent populations with the ESU. Generally, these streams have shown a positive escapement trend since 1992 (**Figure 3-2**). Escapement numbers are dominated by Butte Creek returns, which have averaged over 7,000 fish since 1995 (NMFS 2007b).

During this period (1992-2006), there have been significant habitat improvements (including the removal of several small dams and increases in summer flows) in these watersheds, as well as reduced ocean fisheries and a favorable terrestrial and marine climate (NMFS 2007b).

On the Feather River, significant numbers of spring-run Chinook salmon, as identified by run timing, return to the Feather River Hatchery. Coded-wire tag, information from these hatchery returns, however, indicates that substantial introgression has occurred between fall-run and spring-run Chinook salmon populations within the Feather River system due to hatchery practices. This introgression has compromised the genetic integrity of the spring-run Chinook salmon stock. For this reason, the Feather River spring-run Chinook population numbers are not included in the discussion of ESU abundance (NMFS 2007b). In addition, the Central Valley hatchery practice of trucking fall-run production for out-of-basin release, and the use of large numbers of hatchery fall-run juveniles for monitoring studies, has resulted in high straying rates of returning adults, and threatening the genetic integrity of all extant spring-run populations as well as natural fall-run populations (Williamson and May 2003).



Figure 3-1. Annual Estimated Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Escapement from 1967 to 2006
Source: (CDFG 2007)



Figure 3-2. Spring-run Chinook Salmon Combined Population Estimates for Mill, Deer and Butte Creeks from 1992 to 2006
Source: (CDFG 2007)

Although recent Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon population trends are positive, annual abundance estimates display a high level of fluctuation, and the overall number of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon remains well below estimates of historic abundance. Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon have some of the highest population growth rates in the Central Valley, but other than Butte Creek and the hatchery-influenced Feather River, population sizes are relatively small compared to fall-run Chinook salmon populations (Good *et al.* 2005).

The viability of the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, essentially represented by three populations located within the same ecoregion, is vulnerable to changes in the environment through a lack of spatial geographic diversity. The current geographic distribution of viable populations makes the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU vulnerable to catastrophic disturbance (Lindley *et al.* 2007). Such potential catastrophes include volcanic eruption of Mt. Lassen, prolonged drought conditions reducing coldwater pool adult holding habitat, and a large wildfire (approximately 30 kilometer maximum diameter) encompassing the Deer, Mill and Butte creek watersheds. Because the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is spatially confined to relatively few remaining streams, continues to display broad fluctuations in abundance, and a large proportion of the population (i.e., in Butte Creek) faces the risk of high mortality rates due to elevated water temperatures during the adult holding period, the population remains at a moderate to high risk of extinction (NMFS 2007b).

3.2 LIFE HISTORY AND BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

3.2.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

3.2.1.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Adult Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon leave the ocean to begin their upstream migration in late-January and early February (CDFG 1998), and enter the Sacramento River between March and September, primarily in May and June (Moyle 2002; Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Figures **3-3, 3-4, and 3-5** show the timings of this life stage by diversity group.

3.2.1.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Similar to the winter-run, spring-run Chinook salmon generally enter rivers as sexually immature fish and must hold in freshwater for up to several months before spawning (Moyle 2002). Habitat requirements to support the biological needs of spring-run Chinook salmon adult immigration and holding are similar to those for winter-run described above in Section 2.2.2.2.

3.2.2 ADULT SPAWNING

3.2.2.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Spawning of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon generally takes place from about mid-August through October but may vary somewhat among individual streams within each diversity group as shown in Figures 3-3, 3-4 and 3-5.

3.2.2.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Spawning of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon normally occurs between mid-August and early October, peaking in September (Moyle 2002). Habitat requirements to support the biological needs of spring-run Chinook salmon spawning are similar to those for winter-run described above in Section 2.2.3.2.



Figure 3-3. Life Stage Timing for Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations in the Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group



Figure 3-4. Life Stage Timing for Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations in the Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group



Figure 3-5. Life Stage Timing for Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations in the Northwestern California Diversity Group

3.2.3 EMBRYO INCUBATION

3.2.3.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

In the Sacramento River, putative spring-run Chinook salmon spawning occurs from August through October. Embryo incubation is defined as the time span from fertilized egg deposition until fry emergence from the gravel. Within the appropriate water temperature range, eggs normally hatch in 40 to 60 days. Newly hatched fish (alevins) normally remain in the gravel for an additional four to six weeks until the yolk sac has been absorbed (NMFS 1997). Therefore; embryo incubation is expected to last from August potentially through January as shown in Figures 3-3, 3-4 and 3-5.

3.2.3.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

The length of time required for embryo incubation and emergence from the gravel is dependant on water temperature. For maximum embryo survival, water temperatures reportedly must be between 41°F and 55.4°F and oxygen saturation levels must be close to maximum (Moyle 2002). Under those conditions, embryos hatch in 40 to 60 days and remain in the gravel as alevins (the life stage between hatching and egg sack absorption) for another 4 to 6 weeks before emerging as fry (Moyle 2002). Spring-run Chinook salmon fry emerge from the gravel from November to March (Moyle 2002). Habitat requirements to support the biological needs of spring-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation are similar to those for winter-run Chinook salmon described above in Section 2.2.3.2.

3.2.4 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

3.2.4.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Juvenile rearing and outmigration varies by stream within each diversity group as shown in Figures 3-3, 3-4 and 3-5.

3.2.4.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Upon emergence from the gravel, juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon may reside in freshwater for 12 to 16 months, but some migrate to the ocean as young-of-the-year in the winter or spring months within eight months of hatching (CALFED 2000e). The average size of fry migrants (approximately 40 mm between December and April in Mill, Butte and Deer creeks) reflects a prolonged emergence of fry from the gravel (Lindley *et al.* 2004). Studies in Butte Creek (Ward *et al.* 2003a) found the majority of spring-run migrants to be fry moving downstream primarily during December, January and February; and that these movements appeared to be influenced by flow. Small numbers of spring-run juveniles remained in Butte Creek to rear and migrate as yearlings later in the spring. Juvenile emigration patterns in Mill and Deer creeks are very similar to patterns observed in Butte Creek, with the exception that Mill and Deer creek juveniles typically exhibit a later young-of-the-year migration and an earlier yearling migration (Lindley *et al.* 2004). In contrast, data collected on the Feather River suggests that the bulk of juvenile emigration occurs during November and December (DWR and Reclamation 1999; Painter *et al.* 1977). Seesholtz *et al.* (2003) speculate that because juvenile rearing habitat in the Low Flow Channel of the Feather River is limited, juveniles may be forced to emigrate from the area early due to competition for resources. Other habitat requirements to support the biological needs of spring-run Chinook salmon juvenile rearing and outmigration are similar to those for winter-run described above in Section 2.2.4.2.

3.2.5 SMOLT OUTMIGRATION

3.2.5.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Generally smolt outmigration occurs from late fall through early spring. However, the timing of smolt outmigration may differ by stream of origin within each diversity group as shown in figures 3-3, 3-4 and 3-5.

3.2.5.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Little is known about estuarine residence time of spring-run Chinook salmon. MacFarlane and Norton (2002) concluded that unlike populations in the Pacific Northwest, Central Valley Chinook salmon show little estuarine dependence and may benefit from expedited ocean entry. Spring-run Chinook salmon yearlings are larger in size than the other runs of Chinook salmon and are ready to smolt upon entering the Delta; therefore, they probably spend little time rearing in the Delta.

3.2.6 SUB-ADULT AND ADULT OCEAN RESIDENCE

3.2.6.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon generally spend from one to four years in the ocean before returning to spawn in their natal streams. Fisher (1994) reports that 87 percent of returning spring-run Chinook salmon are three year olds as determined by catches at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam. Adults normally leave the ocean and enter the Sacramento River between March and July as immature fish and hold in cool water pools until sexually mature.

3.2.6.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Habitat requirements to support the biological needs of spring-run Chinook salmon sub-adult and ocean residence are similar to those for winter-run described above in Section 2.2.5.2.

3.3 THREATS AND STRESSORS

3.3.1 SUMMARY OF ESA LISTING FACTORS

Threats to Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon generally fall into three broad categories: loss of most historical spawning habitat, degradation of remaining habitat, and genetic threats from the Feather River Hatchery spring-run Chinook salmon program.

Native spring-run Chinook salmon have been extirpated from all tributaries in the San Joaquin River Basin, which represents a large portion of the historic range and abundance of the ESU. Yoshiyama *et al*. (2001) estimated that 72 percent of salmon spawning and rearing habitat has been lost in the Central Valley. This figure is for fall- as well as spring-run Chinook salmon; hence NMFS (2005) reported that the amount of spring-run Chinook salmon habitat lost is presumably higher because spring-run Chinook salmon spawn and rear in higher elevations, areas more likely to be behind impassable dams. Naturally-spawning populations of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon currently are restricted to accessible reaches of the upper Sacramento River, Antelope Creek, Battle Creek, Beegum Creek, Big Chico Creek, Butte Creek, Clear Creek, Deer Creek, Feather River, Mill Creek, and Yuba River (CDFG 1998). These populations are likely relatively small. The Feather River population is supplemented by the Feather River Hatchery production, and may be hybridized with fall-run Chinook salmon. Little is known about the status of the spring-run Chinook salmon population on the Yuba River, other than that it appears to be small. The upper Sacramento River supports a small spring-run Chinook salmon population, but

population status is poorly documented, and the degree of hybridization with fall-run Chinook salmon is unknown (CDFG 1998).

Habitat problems are one of the most important sources of ongoing risk to the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon (NMFS 1998). Like most spring-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon require cool freshwater while they mature over the summer. In the Central Valley, summer water temperatures are reportedly suitable for Chinook salmon only above 150 to 500-meter elevations, and most such habitat is now upstream of impassable dams (NMFS 2005). Current spawning is restricted to the mainstem and a few river tributaries in the Sacramento River, where the habitat is severely degraded (NMFS 1998).

General degradation of rearing and migrating habitat includes elevated water temperatures, agricultural and municipal diversions and returns, restricted and regulated flows, entrainment of migrating fish into unscreened or poorly screened diversions, predation by nonnative species, and the poor quality and quantity of remaining habitat (NMFS 1998). Hydropower dams and water diversions in some years have greatly reduced or eliminated instream flows during spring-run migration periods (NMFS 1998).

In addition, hatchery programs in the Central Valley may pose threats to spring-run Chinook salmon stock genetic integrity (NMFS 1998). Most of the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon production is of hatchery-origin, and naturally spawning populations may be interbreeding with both fall/late fall- and spring-run Chinook salmon hatchery fish. This problem has been exacerbated by the increasing production of spring-run Chinook salmon from the Feather River Hatchery, especially in light of reports suggesting a high degree of introgression between spring- and fall/late fall-run broodstock in the hatcheries. In the 1940s, trapping of adult Chinook salmon that originated from areas above Keswick and Shasta dams may have resulted in stock mixing, and further mixing with fall-run Chinook salmon apparently occurred with fish transferred to the CNFH. Deer Creek, one of the locations generally believed most likely to retain essentially native spring-run Chinook salmon, was a target of adult outplants from the 1940s trapping operation, but the success of those transplants is uncertain (NMFS 2005).

Hatchery strays are considered to be an increasing problem due to the management practice of releasing a larger proportion of fish off-site (NMFS 1998). Any activity involving the release of hatchery fish away from their natal stream source will result in the straying of some component of the release, with a direct correlation between distance from stream source and rate of straying (CDFG *et al.* 2001). Since 1967, artificial production has focused on the program at the Feather River Hatchery. The Feather River Hatchery began trucking and releasing its spring-run Chinook salmon production into San Pablo Bay, causing high rates of straying (CDFG 2001a). Cramer and Demko (1997) reported that half of the hatchery-reared spring-run Chinook salmon returning to the Feather River did not return to the hatchery, but spawned naturally in the river. The number of FRFH spring-run which straying into other Central Valley streams is unknown due to the current lack of adequate monitoring. Given the large number of juveniles released off station, the potential contribution of straying adults to rivers throughout the Central Valley is considerable (NMFS 2005). Previously, the small number of CWT marked FRFH spring-run fish and the absence of spring-run carcass surveys for most river systems prevented the accurate estimation of the contribution of naturally spawning hatchery strays (NMFS 2005). Cramer and Demko (1997) reported that up to 20 percent of the Feather River spring-run Chinook salmon are recovered in the American River sportfishery. Furthermore, the use of a fixed date to distinguish returning spring- and fall-run fish at the Feather River Hatchery may have resulted in considerable hybridization between the two runs (Campbell and Moyle 1990 *in* NMFS 2005).

Protective efforts aimed at the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon include: (1) the CVPIA; (2) CALFED Bay-Delta ERP; (3), CDFG's Salmonid Restoration Program for coastal watersheds; (4) NMFS and state-funded multi-county conservation planning efforts in California; (5) the ongoing ESA Section 7 and habitat conservation planning efforts within the range of currently listed species; (6) the state listing

of Sacramento River (Central Valley) spring-run Chinook salmon as a threatened species under the CESA; (7) the joint effort of NMFS, DWR and CDFG to address hatchery concerns; incorporating conservation elements into the FRFH spring-run hatchery program; (8) state-implemented freshwater harvest management conservation measures; and (9) increased monitoring and evaluation efforts in support of conservation of this ESU. Specifically, in the Sacramento River Basin, significant efforts are underway to restore habitat in the Battle Creek drainage in the upper Sacramento River. NMFS, USFWS, and CDFG reached agreement with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to restore access to nearly 42 miles of high quality spawning and rearing habitat. Significant habitat restoration efforts also were conducted in Butte, Deer, Mill and Clear Creeks to remove barriers, improve streamflows, and improve riparian habitat conditions. Major new fish screen projects also were initiated or completed. Additional habitat restoration efforts were funded in the Delta region, which should benefit anadromous salmonids in the Central Valley, San Joaquin River, and the Delta.

Unfortunately, existing protective efforts have proved inadequate to ensure that the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is no longer at risk of becoming endangered. Risks persist to the spatial structure and diversity of the ESU. Only three extant independent populations exist, and they are especially vulnerable to disease or catastrophic events because they are in close proximity. In addition, until there are means to spatially separate the spring-run and fall-run populations in the lower basin of the Feather River, some level of genetic introgression of the races is expected to continue.

3.3.1.1 DESTRUCTION, MODIFICATION, OR CURTAILMENT OF HABITAT OR RANGE

Habitat degradation is the most important source of ongoing risk to spring-run Chinook salmon. The distribution of spring-run Chinook salmon is limited by access to historical spawning habitat above impassable dams and degraded habitat in the Sacramento. Current spawning habitat is restricted to the mainstem and a few tributaries to the Sacramento River. Current spawning habitat is restricted to the mainstem and a few tributaries to the Sacramento River. The remaining accessible habitat for spawning or juvenile rearing is severely degraded by elevated water temperatures, agricultural and municipal diversions and returns, restricted and regulated flows, and entrainment of migrating fish into unscreened or poorly screened diversions. Dams and water diversions for agriculture, flood control, domestic and hydropower purposes have greatly reduced or eliminated historically accessible habitat, and degraded remaining habitat.

3.3.1.2 OVERUTILIZATION FOR COMMERCIAL, RECREATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, OR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific or educational purposes does not appear to have a significant impact on spring-run Chinook salmon populations but warrants continued assessment. Commercial fishing for salmon is managed by the PFMC and is constrained by time and area to meet the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESA consultation standard, and includes restrictions requiring minimum size limits and use of circle hooks for anglers. Ocean harvest restrictions since 1995 have led to reduced ocean harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon (i.e., Central Valley Chinook salmon ocean harvest index, or CVI, ranged from 0.55 to nearly 0.80 from 1970 to 1995, and was reduced to 0.27 in 2001.

The permits NMFS issues for scientific or educational purposes stipulate specific conditions to minimize take of spring-run Chinook salmon individuals during permitted activities. There are currently five active permits in the Central Valley that may affect spring-run Chinook salmon. These permitted studies provide information about spring-run Chinook salmon that is useful to the management and conservation of the ESU.

3.3.1.3 DISEASE OR PREDATION

Chinook salmon are exposed to bacterial, protozoan, viral, and parasitic organisms in spawning and rearing areas, hatcheries, migratory routes, and the marine environment. Naturally spawned fish tend to be less susceptible to pathogens than hatchery-reared fish, which are more susceptible to disease such as IHNV outbreaks that are common in hatcheries.

Predation is a threat to spring-run Chinook salmon, especially in the Delta where there are high densities of non-native fish (e.g., small and large mouth bass, striped bass, catfish, sculpin) that prey on outmigrating salmon. Currently, studies are proposed to evaluated predation rates of juvenile salmonids in riprapped banks in the mainstem Sacramento River and at the oxbow channel near the GCID fish screen. In the ocean environment, salmon are common prey for harbor seals and sea lions.

3.3.1.4 INADEQUACY OF EXISTING REGULATORY MECHANISMS

FEDERAL EFFORTS

There have been several federal actions to try to reduce threats to the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU. Actions undertaken pursuant to Section 7 BOs have helped to increase the abundance of spring-run Chinook salmon. Actions taken under the BO for the CVP and SWP has led to increased freshwater survival, and the BOs for ocean harvest have led to increased ocean survival and adult escapement. There have also been several habitat restoration efforts implemented under CVPIA and CALFED programs that have led to several projects involving fish passage improvements, fish screens, floodplain management, habitat restoration, watershed planning, and other projects that have led to improved fish habitats and increased abundance of spring-run Chinook salmon. There are several important projects that have been initiated or implemented in the Central Valley, such as restoring salmonid habitat in the Battle Creek drainage, improving fish passage, riparian habitat, and streamflows in Butte, Deer, Mill and Clear creek tributaries in the upper Sacramento River, and installing major new fish screens at large diversions in the Sacramento River.

However, despite federal actions to reduce threats to the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, the existing protective efforts are inadequate to ensure the ESU is no longer at risk of becoming endangered. There remain risks to the spatial structure and diversity of the ESU. There are only three extant independent populations, and they are especially vulnerable to disease or catastrophic events because they are in close proximity.

NON-FEDERAL EFFORTS

A wide range of restoration and conservation actions have been implemented or are in the planning states of development to help the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU. Most of these actions are pursuant to implementation of conservation and restoration actions in the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, which is composed of 25 state and federal agencies, and has contributed to increased abundance and productivity of the spring-run Chinook salmon ESU. The state of California listed spring-run Chinook salmon as threatened in 1998 under CESA. The state's NCCP involves long-term planning with several stakeholders. CDFG has established specific in-river fishing regulations to protect spring-run Chinook salmon. CDFG and DWR have started a marking/tagging and recovery program to evaluate the contribution of hatchery and natural production in naturally spawning populations in the Feather River, as well as to review and modify hatchery operating criteria to help ensure natural stock integrity. CDFG's 1994 Fish Screen Policy requires screening of all diversions located with the essential habitat of a CESA-listed species. Several spring-run Chinook salmon tributaries have been identified and assigned a high priority for implementing corrective actions and receive restoration funding. Grassroots organizations, such as the Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy, are engaged in the development and implementation of conservation and recovery measures to improve conditions for spring-run Chinook salmon.

However, despite federal and non-federal efforts and joint partnerships, some of the ongoing protective efforts are very recent and few address salmon conservation at a scale that is adequate to protect and conserve the entire ESU.

3.3.1.5 OTHER NATURAL AND MANMADE FACTORS AFFECTING THE SPECIES' CONTINUED EXISTENCE

In the last two decades, the abundance of spring-run Chinook salmon has shown a positive trend in productivity, but the increase in fish numbers does not address the concern for lack of spatial structure and diversity within the ESU. The hatchery stock of spring-run Chinook salmon in the Feather River contributes to the ESU in terms of abundance. In the past three years, CDFG has been restoring and enhancing the spring-run genotype at the Feather River Hatchery, in an effort to isolate fish arriving at the hatchery early in the season from those arriving late. If efforts to isolate the spring-run phenotype in the Feather River are successful, the risks to the ESU's spatial structure and diversity would be reduced.

Changes in climatic events and global climate, such as El Niño ocean conditions and prolonged drought conditions, may be a significant factor in the decline of salmon as unstable Chinook salmon populations reach particularly low levels. The ESU is highly vulnerable to drought conditions. With the three independent populations located in such close proximity (Deer, Mill and Butte creeks), any regional catastrophic event may have severe impacts to the remaining independent populations.

Unscreened water diversions entrain outmigrating juvenile salmon and fry. Unscreened water diversions (e.g., RBDD, TCC, GCID) and CVP and SWP pumping plants entrain juvenile salmon, leading to fish mortality. The cumulative effect of entrainment at these diversions and delays in outmigration of smolts caused by reduced flow may affect spring-run Chinook salmon fitness.

3.3.2 NON-LIFE STAGE-SPECIFIC THREATS AND STRESSORS FOR THE ESU

Potential threats to the California Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon population that are not specific to a particular life stage include the potential negative impacts of the current artificial propagation program utilizing the FRFH; the small wild population size; the genetic integrity of the population due to both hatchery influence and small wild population size; and the potential effects of long-term climate change. Each of these potential threats is discussed in the following sections.

3.3.2.1 FEATHER RIVER HATCHERY ARTIFICIAL PROPAGATION PROGRAM

The FRFH is the only hatchery in the Central Valley that currently produces spring-run Chinook salmon. The FRFH was constructed in 1967 to compensate for anadromous salmonid spawning habitat lost with construction of the Oroville Dam. The FRFH has a goal of releasing 2,000,000 spring-run Chinook salmon smolts annually (DWR 2004a). Adverse effects of artificial propagation programs are described in Section 2.3.2.1 for winter-run Chinook salmon produced at the Livingston Stone National Hatchery and many of these potential adverse effects would also apply to the FRFH's production of spring-run. Other effects unique to the FRFH and spring-run Chinook salmon are described below.

Prior to 2004, FRFH hatchery staff differentiated spring-run Chinook salmon from fall-run Chinook salmon by opening the ladder to the hatchery on September 1. Those fish ascending the ladder from September 1 through September 15 were assumed to be spring-run Chinook salmon while those ascending the ladder after September 15 were assumed to be fall-run (Kastner 2003). This practice led to considerable hybridization between spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon (DWR 2004a). Since 2004, the FRFH fish ladder remains open during the spring months and those fish ascending the ladder are marked with an external floy tag and returned to the river. This practice allows FRFH staff to identify those previously marked fish as spring-run when they re-enter the ladder in September (DWR 2004a). Only floy-tagged fish are spawned with floy-tagged fish in the month of September. No other fish are spawned

during this time as part of an effort to prevent hybridization with fall-run, and introduce a temporal separation between stocks in the hatchery. During the FRFH spring-run spawning season, all heads from adipose fin-clipped fish will be taken and sent to CDFG's laboratory in Santa Rosa for tag extraction and decoding. The tag information will be used to test the hypothesis that early spring-run spawners will produce progeny that maintain that run fidelity.

The FRFH also releases a significant portion of its spring-run production into San Pablo Bay. This practice increases the chances that these fish will stray into other Central Valley streams when they return as adults to spawn. This straying has the potential to transfer genetic material from hatchery fish to wild naturally spawning fish and is generally viewed as an adverse hatchery impact. Of particular concern would be the straying of hatchery fish into Deer, Mill or Butte creeks, affecting the genetic integrity of the only significantly distinct spring-run Chinook salmon populations in the Central Valley (DWR 2004a).

3.3.2.2 SMALL POPULATION SIZE COMPOSED OF ONLY THREE EXTANT NATURAL POPULATIONS

Streams that currently support wild, persistent populations of spring-run Chinook salmon in the Central Valley include Mill, Deer and Butte creeks (CDFG 1998). Population counts for these three creeks for the 1995 to 2001 time period are shown in **Table 3-1**.

Table 3-1. Adult Spring-run Chinook Salmon Population Counts for Mill, Deer and Butte Creeks (1995-2001)

Tributary	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996	1995
Mill Creek	1,104	544	560	424	200	252	320
Deer Creek	1,622	637	1,591	1,879	466	614	1,295
Butte Creek	9,605	4,118	3,529	20,259	635	1,413	7,500
Source: (CDFG 2002)							

Each of these three populations is small and isolated. Additionally, these populations are genetically distinct from other populations classified as spring-run Chinook salmon in the Central Valley (e.g., Feather River) (DWR 2004a). Banks *et al.* (2000) suggest that the spring-run phenotype in the Central Valley is actually shown by two genetically distinct subpopulations - Butte Creek and Deer and Mill creeks spring-run Chinook salmon. Lindley *et al.* (2007) report that the current distribution of viable populations makes the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU vulnerable to catastrophic disturbance. All three extant independent populations are in basins whose headwaters lie within the debris and pyroclastic flow radii of Mt. Lassen, an active volcano that USGS views as highly dangerous. Additionally, a fire with a maximum diameter of 30 km, big enough to burn the headwaters of Mill, Deer and Butte creeks simultaneously, has roughly a 10 percent chance of occurring somewhere in the Central Valley each year.

CDFG (1998) reports that there may be other streams supporting spring-run Chinook salmon but documentation is weak (Battle Creek), their populations are not persistent (Antelope, Cottonwood, and Big Chico creeks), populations may be hybridized to some degree with fall-run due to the lack of spatial separation of spawning habitat (Sacramento, Yuba, and Feather rivers), or is a hybrid hatchery population derived from the FRFH. Other potential problems associated with a small population are similar to those associated with the winter-run Chinook salmon population and are further described in Section 2.3.2.2.

3.3.2.3 GENETIC INTEGRITY

Issues concerning the genetic integrity of spring-run Chinook salmon are similar to those described for winter-run Chinook salmon in Section 2.3.2.3 above. Other issues that may be unique to spring-run Chinook salmon in the Central Valley are described below.

Historically, spring-run Chinook salmon acquired and maintained genetic integrity through spatiotemporal isolation with other Central Valley Chinook salmon runs. Spring-run Chinook salmon were temporally isolated from winter-run, and largely isolated in both time and space from the fall-run. With the construction of dams presenting impassable barriers to upstream tributaries of the Sacramento River much of this historical spatiotemporal integrity has been eliminated.

Several sources suggest that putative spawning by spring-run Chinook salmon in the mainstem Sacramento River may actually be by spring-run/fall-run hybrids or early fall-run. For example, in the NMFS OCAP BO, reports that due to the overlap of ESUs and resultant hybridization since the construction of Shasta Dam, Chinook salmon that spawn in the mainstem Sacramento River during September are more likely to be early fall-run rather than spring-run. In the CVP and SWP OCAP BA (Reclamation 2003), it is reported that the increasing overlap in spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon spawning periods is evidence that genetic introgression is occurring.

3.3.2.4 LONG-TERM CLIMATE CHANGE

The potential effects of long-term climate change on Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon would be similar to those described above in Section 2.3.2.4 for winter-run Chinook salmon. However, because spring-run Chinook salmon normally spend a longer time in freshwater as juveniles than other Chinook salmon races, and pre-spawning adults typically hold in the river during the warmest summer months, any negative effects of climate change may be more profound on this race of Chinook salmon.

3.3.3 SAN FRANCISCO, SAN PABLO, AND SUISUN BAYS

3.3.3.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

Adult spring-run Chinook salmon immigration and holding in California's Central Valley Basin occurs from mid-February through July, and peaks during April and May (CDFG 1998; DWR and Reclamation 1999; Lindley *et al.* 2004). Threats to spring-run Chinook salmon adult immigration and holding that potentially occur in the Bays are similar to those described above in Section 2.3.3.1 for winter-run Chinook salmon.

3.3.3.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Threats to spring-run Chinook salmon juvenile rearing and outmigration that potentially occur in San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun Bay are similar to those described above in Section 2.3.3.2 for winter-run Chinook salmon.

3.3.4 SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA

3.3.4.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

Threats to spring-run Chinook salmon adult immigration and holding that potentially occur in the Delta are similar to those described above in Section 2.3.4.1 for winter-run Chinook salmon. Because water temperatures in the Delta are normally too warm for this life stage during June and July, it is likely that most spring-run have passed through the Delta into the mainstem Sacramento River and beyond by this time. Water temperatures in the Delta would not be suitable for holding after the end of May.

3.3.4.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Factors creating threats to the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage of spring-run Chinook salmon would be similar to those described above in Section 2.3.4.2 for winter-run Chinook salmon. Water temperatures in the Delta begin rising in April and are likely unsuitable after May. Recent recoveries of CWT Butte Creek spring-run Chinook salmon in Delta salvage and trawl data indicate that these fish are present during March, April, and May.

3.3.5 LOWER SACRAMENTO RIVER (PRINCETON [RM 163] TO THE DELTA)

3.3.5.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

Adult spring-run Chinook salmon immigration into the Delta and the lower Sacramento River occurs from mid-February through July, and peaks during April-May (Moyle 2002). See Section 3.2.1 for a more complete description of the biological requirements and description of this life stage. Factors that may adversely affect spring-run Chinook salmon adult immigration and holding in the lower Sacramento River include passage impediments, adverse flow conditions, harvest in the sportfishery, poaching, and potential water quality problems, particularly adverse water temperatures.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

In the lower portions of the Sacramento River, flows are diverted into the SDWSC. Adult salmon have been caught close to the locks at the upstream end of the channel and have also been observed to be blocked from migrating upstream by the locks (NMFS 1997).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

There is no commercial fishery for salmon in the Sacramento River and the in-river sportfishery only allows the taking of salmon from the beginning of August through December 31. Therefore, based on the run timing of spring-run Chinook salmon there is likely no legal harvest in this section of the river.

The extent of poaching of spring-run Chinook salmon in this reach of the river is unknown. There are no man-made structures that would unnaturally increase densities allowing for easy poaching however, some level of poaching likely occurs due to snagging by anglers or inadvertent misidentification of caught fish.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Suitable water temperatures for adult spring-run Chinook salmon migrating upstream to spawning grounds range from 57°F to 67°F (NMFS 1997). However, spring-run Chinook salmon are immature when upstream migration begins and need to hold in suitable habitat for several months prior to spawning. The maximum suitable water temperature for holding is 59°F to 60°F (NMFS 1997). Because water temperatures in this reach of the lower Sacramento River generally begin exceeding 60°F in April, it is likely that little if any suitable holding habitat exists in this reach and that it is only used by adults as a migratory corridor.

NMFS (1997) reports that recent research has indicated that water temperatures in the lower Sacramento River may have risen by as much as 4 to 7°F since the late 1970s. Potentially the cumulative losses of shade along the river may have influenced water temperatures in this reach. The loss of shaded habitat and potential effects are described below in Section 3.3.5.2.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Sacramento River is not likely to adversely affect adult immigrating spring-run Chinook salmon.

FLOW CONDITIONS

During high flow or flood events, water is diverted into the Sutter and Yolo bypasses upstream of the City of Sacramento. Adult spring-run Chinook salmon migrating upstream may enter these bypasses, where their migration may be delayed or blocked by control structures, particularly during early spring months. To date, there have not been any measures implemented to protect adult spring-run Chinook salmon from entrainment into the flood control bypasses (NMFS 1997).

3.3.5.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

The timing of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon emigration from the spawning and rearing grounds varies among the tributaries of origin, and can occur during the period extending from October through April (Vogel and Marine 1991).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Optimal water temperatures for juvenile Chinook salmon range from 53.6°F to 57.2°F (NMFS 1997). A daily average water temperature of 60°F is considered the upper temperature limit for juvenile Chinook salmon growth and rearing (NMFS 1997). Spring-run Chinook salmon juveniles are most abundant in the lower Sacramento River during winter months when average water temperatures are normally less than 60°F. However, because some spring-run Chinook salmon juveniles may be in this reach of the river at any time during the year it is possible that juveniles are exposed to water temperatures above 60°F. Additionally, outmigrating spring-run Chinook salmon may be exposed to warmwater releases from the Colusa Drain at Knights Landing. Warm water is released from the drain to the river mainly from April through June. Releases from the drain can exceed 2,000 cfs and 80°F.

WATER QUALITY

The major point source threat of pollution in the Sacramento River is the Iron Mountain Mine as described for winter-run Chinook salmon above. However, because the Iron Mountain Mine is so far north of the lower Sacramento River, most heavy metal contaminants from the mine have likely either settled out or have been diluted to acceptable EPA standards by the time water reaches this reach of the river. Within the lower Sacramento River and Bay-Delta there are three large municipal water treatment plants which can be an important point source of pollution: the West Sacramento Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), the Sacramento Regional WWTP, and the Stockton Sewage Treatment Plant. Pre-treatment, primary treatment and secondary treatments in place since the 1950s have all reduced pollutant loading to the system however, heavy metal loadings and toxic organic pollutants remain a major concern (NMFS 1997).

The main non-point sources of pollution in the lower Sacramento River are urban runoff and agricultural drainage. Stormwater runoff from the city of Sacramento has been shown to be acutely toxic to aquatic invertebrates (NMFS 1997). Significant urban runoff also occurs during the dry season and is created from domestic/commercial landscape irrigation, groundwater infiltration, pumped groundwater discharges and construction projects (NMFS 1997). The Colusa Basin Drain is the largest source of agricultural return flow in the Sacramento River. It drains agricultural areas serviced by the Tehama-Colusa and Glenn-Colusa Irrigation districts and discharges to the Sacramento River below Knights Landing. The drain has been identified as a major source of warm water, pesticides, turbidity, suspended sediments, dissolved solids, nutrients and trace metals (NMFS 1997).

Because the lower Sacramento River is used only as a migratory corridor for spring-run Chinook salmon immigration, water quality is not likely to adversely affect this life stage.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flood control structures in the lower Sacramento River are designed to divert water from the river during a major flood event into the Butte Creek Basin and the Sutter and Yolo bypasses. The diversions can be significant. For example, the flood control system can divert as much as four to five times more flow down the bypasses than remains in the river (NMFS 1997). Juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon migrating down the river may enter the diversions during storm events. Studies conducted on the Sutter Bypass show that the highest proportion of flows are diverted from December through March with a peak occurring in February (NMFS 1997). Juveniles diverted into the bypasses may experience migration delays, potential stranding as flood flows recede and increased rates of predation. However, the Sutter and Yolo bypasses also provide important rearing habitat to juvenile salmonids. Therefore, stranding likely occurs only during very high flow events followed by a rapid cessation of flow.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Stream bank stabilization in the lower Sacramento River has primarily involved riprapping. Riprapping the river bank involves removing vegetation along the bank and upper levees which removes most instream and overhead cover in nearshore areas. Overhanging vegetation is referred to as SRA habitat. Woody debris and overhanging vegetation within SRA habitat provide escape cover for juvenile salmonids from predators. Aquatic and terrestrial insects are an important component of juvenile salmon diet. These insects are dependent on a healthy riparian habitat. SRA habitat also can provide some degree of local temperature modification and refugia during summer months due to the shading it provides to nearshore habitats (USFWS 1980). The importance of SRA habitat to Chinook salmon was demonstrated in studies conducted by the USFWS (DeHaven 1989). In early summer, juvenile Chinook salmon were found exclusively in areas of SRA habitat, and none were found in nearby riprapped areas (DeHaven 1989).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Flood control measures, regulated flow regimes and river bank protection measures have all had a profound effect on riparian and instream habitat in the lower Sacramento River. Levees constructed in this reach are built close to the river in order to increase streamflow, channelize the river to prevent natural meandering, and maximize the sediment carrying capacity of the river (NMFS 1997). Channelization of the river requires bank protection measures such as riprapping to reduce the effects of streambank erosion. Additionally, nearshore aquatic areas are deepened and sloped to a uniform gradient, such that variations in water depth, velocity and direction of flow are replaced by consistent moderate to high velocities.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The process of channelizing the lower Sacramento River and the construction of levees for flood control have resulted in a loss of connectivity with the floodplain which serves as an important source of woody debris and gravels that aid in establishing a diverse riverine habitat.

ENTRAINMENT

Entrainment is defined as the redirection of fish from their natural migratory pathway into areas or pathways not normally used. Entrainment also includes the take, or removal, of juvenile fish from their habitat through the operation of water diversion devices and structures such as siphons, pumps and

gravity diversions (NMFS 1997). A primary source of entrainment is unscreened or inadequately screened diversions. A survey by CDFG identified 350 unscreened diversions along the Sacramento River downstream of Hamilton City.

Entrainment of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon has been identified as one of the most significant causes of mortality in the Sacramento River and Delta (NMFS 1997) and is likely also true for spring-run. In addition, a program to flood rice field stubble during the winter has been implemented extending the period for potential entrainment (NMFS 1997).

Outmigrating juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon may also be diverted into the Yolo or Sutter bypasses during high flow or flood events and stranded as flood waters recede. The entrance to the Yolo Bypass is the Fremont Weir upstream of Sacramento near the confluence with the Feather River. During high flows weir gates are open and because the weir is not screened, juveniles enter the Yolo Bypass, where they may rear and eventually leave through the lower end upstream of Chipps Island in the Delta, or be trapped in isolated ponds as waters recede. Additionally, Sacramento River water is diverted into the SDWSC, and outmigrating juvenile Chinook salmon may enter the channel where water quality, flow levels and rearing conditions are extremely poor (NMFS 1997).

PREDATION

Only limited information on predation of spring-run Chinook salmon juveniles is available. Native species that are known to prey on juvenile salmon include Sacramento Pikeminnow and steelhead. Predation by pikeminnow can be significant when juvenile salmon occur in high densities such as below dams or near diversions. Although Sacramento pikeminnow are a native species and predation on juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon is a natural phenomenon, loss of SRA habitat and artificial instream structures tend to favor predators and may change the natural predator-prey dynamics in the system favoring predatory species (CALFED 2000c). Hatchery reared steelhead may also prey on juvenile salmon. Non-native striped bass may also be a significant predator on juvenile salmon. Although no recent studies of striped bass predation on juvenile salmon have been completed, Thomas (1967 *in* NMFS 1997) found that in the lower Sacramento River, salmon accounted for 22 percent of striped bass diet.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

In the lower Sacramento River, hatchery steelhead from the FRFH are planted in the Feather River below Yuba City at a large enough size and at a time when they could intercept outmigrating spring-run Chinook salmon juveniles (NMFS 1997).

3.3.6 MIDDLE SACRAMENTO RIVER (RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM [RM 243] TO PRINCETON [RM 163])

3.3.6.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

In this reach of the river, the potential threats to the adult immigration and holding life stage of spring-run Chinook salmon arise from a potential passage impediment at the GCID HCPP, potential water quality problems, particularly adverse water temperatures, harvest in the sportfishery and poaching.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Although the GCID HCPP (~RM 205) and associated water diversions present problems for emigrating juvenile salmonids, adults are likely not affected.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Current sportfishing regulations in the Sacramento River allow for the taking of salmon after August 1. It is possible that some spring-run Chinook salmon could be holding in the mainstem river below the RBDD prior to spawning in mid-August to October. The magnitude of the harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon is not known.

The extent of poaching of spring-run Chinook salmon in this reach of the river is unknown. Some level of poaching likely occurs due to snagging by anglers or inadvertent misidentification of caught fish. Additionally, when passage at the RBDD is hindered there may be unusually high densities of salmon downstream of the dam that present poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water Temperatures in this reach of the river are similar to those occurring in the lower Sacramento River. However, some holding of adult spring-run Chinook salmon may occur downstream of the RBDD in deep coldwater pools. With the installation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997, water temperatures have cooled slightly and suitable water temperatures for adult holding likely extend downstream of the RBDD for a short distance.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Sacramento River is not likely to adversely affect adult immigrating spring-run Chinook salmon.

3.3.6.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Factors that may adversely affect juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon in the middle Sacramento River are similar to those that occur in the lower river as described above. However, in addition to those factors there is a potential downstream passage impediment at the GCID HCPP at RM 205.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS

Historically, the GCID HCPP at RM 205 created downstream migration problems for spring-run juvenile Chinook salmon. The GCID pumping plant may divert up to 20 percent of the Sacramento River flow. Rotary drum fish screens were installed in 1972 to help protect juvenile salmon but they were largely ineffective and never met NMFS or CDFG screen design criteria. Flat plate screens were installed in front of the rotary screens in 1993 to help alleviate the problem until a more permanent solution could be found. Juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon are exposed to the GCID pumping plant facilities as early as mid-July extending into late-November when the diversion season ends.

The interim flat-plate screens were an improvement over the rotary drum screens but were still likely to subject juvenile salmon to impingement due to high approach velocities along the screens, inadequate sweeping to approach velocities, and long exposure time at the screen (USFWS 1995 *in* NMFS 1997). Construction of a new screening facility was completed in 2001 and the testing and monitoring program for the facility are now underway (Reclamation 2007). The testing and monitoring of the new facility is scheduled to be completed in 2007 (Reclamation 2007).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures normally exceed 60°F from July through September and in dry years can often exceed 66°F (NMFS 1997). Therefore, the middle Sacramento River likely provides little habitat suitable for juvenile Chinook salmon rearing.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality issues in the middle Sacramento River are similar to those described above in the lower Sacramento River. The only point source pollution that has been identified and may potentially affect this reach of the river is the Iron Mountain Mine described for winter-run Chinook salmon above. Non-point source pollution sources include both urban and agricultural runoff similar to that described above for the lower Sacramento River. Urban runoff is likely not as great in this reach of the river as that occurring in the lower Sacramento River but agricultural runoff is likely similar or greater.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions, under current regulated flow regimes, in the middle Sacramento River likely have little effect on outmigrating juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Loss of riparian habitat that has occurred in the middle Sacramento River is similar to that described above for the lower Sacramento River.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Physical habitat alteration that has occurred in the middle Sacramento River is similar to that described above for the lower Sacramento River. The river is not quite as confined in this reach as levees are constructed further from the channel than those occurring in the lower river.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Although the river is not quite as confined in this reach as levees are constructed further from the channel than those occurring in the lower river, the river is disconnected from its historic floodplain by flood control measures including regulated flows and levees.

ENTRAINMENT

Entrainment is defined for winter-run Chinook salmon above. The exact number of unscreened diversions in this reach of the river is not known. A study by the California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout completed in 1987 reported that over 300 unscreened irrigation, industrial, and municipal water supply diversions occur on the Sacramento River between Redding and Sacramento (NMFS 1997). Although most of these diversions are small, cumulatively they likely entrain a large number of outmigrating juvenile salmonids.

Studies are currently underway to determine the effectiveness of new fish screens at the GCID HCPP to determine the effectiveness of new fish screen installed in 2001 (Reclamation 2007). However, juvenile emigration data suggest that peak spring-run movement past the GCID facility occurs in fall and winter months, when pumping volume is low or has ceased for the season (CUWA and SWC 2004).

PREDATION

Predation on juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon in the middle Sacramento River is likely occurring from native Sacramento pikeminnow, native and hatchery-reared steelhead and striped bass. Although the extent of predation is unknown, predation from Sacramento pikeminnow and striped bass is likely similar to that occurring in the lower Sacramento River as described above. Predation from hatchery steelhead is likely somewhat less than that occurring in the lower Sacramento River because the Feather River

hatchery fish enter the Sacramento River downstream of this reach. Additionally, steelhead released from the CNFH are likely more evenly distributed throughout the river by the time they reach this section.

Opportunities for high predation rates also may be present at the GCID HCPP. The plant is described below as a passage impediment. Studies have indicated that Sacramento pikeminnow are the primary predator at the pumping plant, although striped bass were also found with Chinook salmon in their stomachs (CALFED 2000c). Vogel and Marine (1995) report that predation is likely in the vicinity of the fish screens associated with the diversion.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Direct adverse effects of hatchery operations are likely minimal in the middle reach of the Sacramento River primarily because steelhead released from the Feather River Hatchery enter the river downstream and steelhead released by the CNFH are likely more evenly distributed throughout the system by the time they reach the middle reach.

3.3.7 UPPER SACRAMENTO RIVER (KESWICK DAM TO RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM)

3.3.7.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

In this reach of the river, the potential threats to the adult immigration and holding life stage of spring-run Chinook salmon arise from potential passage impediments at the RBDD and the ACID Dam, harvest in the sportfishery and poaching. Keswick Dam, at the upstream terminus of this reach of the river, presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Keswick Dam (~RM 302) presents an impassable barrier to all upstream migration of spring-run Chinook salmon and represents the upstream extent of anadromous salmonid habitat in the mainstem Sacramento River. The ACID Dam (RM 298.5) was constructed in 1917 about three river miles downstream of the current Keswick Dam site. Originally the dam was a barrier to upstream fish migration until 1927, when a poorly designed fish ladder was installed (NMFS 1997). The dam is a 450-foot long flashboard structure which has the capability of raising the backwater level 10 feet. The dam is only installed during the irrigation season which typically runs from early April to October or early November. As mentioned above, the fish ladder that provides passage around the dam was poorly designed and although spring-run Chinook salmon were able to negotiate the ladder, it did present a partial impediment to upstream migration. In 2001 a new fish ladder was installed. Post-project monitoring indicates that the new fish ladder is operating effectively (CDFG 2004c). Another potential problem associated with the facility is that high volume releases from the ACID's canal downstream of the dam may create false attraction flows for migrating adult salmon and encourage them to enter the canal where they could be stranded (NMFS 1997).

Regardless of potential problems associated with the ACID Dam, the facility likely affects only a small portion of the run. The reach from the ACID to Keswick Dam is three miles; representing only a small portion of the potential spawning area. Aerial spawning escapement surveys indicate that only about two percent of the winter-run spawns above the ACID Dam (CUWA and SWC 2004) and the same is likely true for spring-run.

The RBDD at RM 243 is a concrete structure 52 feet high and 740 feet long. The dam has 11 gates which are raised or lowered to control the level of Lake Red Bluff enabling gravity diversion into the TCC. Permanent fish ladders are located on each abutment of the dam. The fish ladders are inefficient in allowing upstream migration of adult salmonids (NMFS 1997). In several radio tagging studies of adult

winter-run Chinook salmon, 43-44 percent of tagged fish were blocked by the dam (Vogel *et al.* 1988, Hallock *et al.* 1982 *in* NMFS 1997). Tagged winter-run Chinook salmon that eventually passed the dam were delayed by an average of 125 hours in one study (Vogel *et al.* 1988 *in* NMFS 1997) and 437 hours in a previous study (Hallock *et al.* 1982 *in* NMFS 1997). At present, the dam gates are kept in the raised position from September 15 through May 14. Spring-run Chinook salmon arriving at the RBDD before September 15 or after May 14 may experience delays in passing the dam.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in this reach of the river is likely similar to that in the middle reach. Unusually high densities of salmon at the ACID Dam, or near Keswick Dam could create poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Following the installation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997, water temperatures in this reach of the river seldom exceed 60°F and are suitable for spring-run Chinook salmon adult immigration and holding.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in this reach of the Sacramento River is not at a level to cause adverse effects on immigrating adult salmonids.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Large flow fluctuations are the main concern regarding adverse flow conditions in the middle and upper Sacramento River. Historically, the largest and most frequent flow reductions have occurred in the late summer and early fall when flashboards at the ACID required adjustment. In years of full water deliveries by the CVP, flows had been reduced from levels of 10,000 to 14,000 cfs to a level of 5,000 cfs (NMFS 1997). Currently, under the CVP/SWP BO, flow reduction rates are divided into several intervals to prevent rapid reductions potentially stranding adults. Although these flow reductions may adversely affect other life stages, adult immigration is likely not affected.

3.3.7.2 SPAWNING

The amount of spawning of spring-run Chinook salmon in the mainstem Sacramento River is not certain. CDFG (2004b) reports that they cannot make reliable carcass survey estimates of returning adult spring-run Chinook salmon in the mainstem Sacramento River because of the overlap in spawn timing with fall-run Chinook salmon. In 2002, an estimated 608 salmon displaying spring-run characteristics passed RBDD. Of these, 125 were estimated to have entered Beegum Creek, a tributary to Cottonwood Creek. The remaining fish (485) may have spawned in the mainstem Sacramento River or entered other upstream tributaries such as Clear Creek or Battle Creek. Aerial redd surveys showed no redds downstream from RBDD. In 2003, an estimated 145 salmon displaying spring-run characteristics passed RBDD. However, because a greater number than this were estimated to enter Beegum Creek, Clear Creek and Battle Creek, no spring-run Chinook salmon were estimated to have spawned in the mainstem Sacramento River in 2003.

Similarly, Reclamation (2003) reports that redd counts conducted in the Sacramento River during the typical spring-run spawning period (late August and September) have shown low numbers of new redds relative to new redds counted during winter-run spawning timing and fall-run spawning timing. Peaks in redd count numbers are evident during winter-run spawning and fall-run spawning but not during spring-run spawning. During redd surveys the number of new redds has diminished through July and then

increased at the end of September before large increase that typically occurs after October 1 when they become classified as fall-run. This suggests that the number of spring-run Chinook salmon spawning in the Sacramento River is low (average of 26 redds counted) relative to the average spring-run escapement estimate of 908 between 1990 and 2001 in the mainstem Sacramento River. The additional fish have not been accounted for in tributaries upstream of the RBDD.

Any spawning of spring-run Chinook salmon that may occur in this reach of the river may be adversely affected by poor water quality (water temperature), adverse flow conditions, physical habitat alteration, hybridization with hatchery stock, and recreational sportfishing and poaching. Each of these potential effects is described below.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Keswick Dam marks the upstream extent of potential anadromous salmonid habitat in the Sacramento River. If any spawning of spring-run Chinook salmon occurs in the upper Sacramento River it would likely be upstream of the RBDD. The only barrier to migration upstream of the RBDD and downstream of Keswick is the ACID which is described above under adult upstream immigration and holding.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Sportfishing regulations in the Sacramento River allow for the taking of salmon after August 1 to the end of December. During August, late spawning winter-run and Chinook salmon exhibiting spring-run behavior are likely the only adult salmon in this reach of the river. Therefore, some take is likely. Beginning in September, early spawning fall-run Chinook salmon begin to arrive and they likely make up the majority of the harvest from mid-September through the end of the year.

The affect of poaching on spring-run Chinook salmon in this reach of the river is not known but deliberate poaching activity likely is not heavy until later in the year when fall-run have arrived. However, this section of the river is a popular year-round sportfishery and some spring-run may be misidentified by anglers and taken prior to August 1.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Generally, successful spawning for Chinook salmon occurs at water temperatures below 60°F (NMFS 1997). Since 1993 managing water temperatures for winter-run Chinook salmon from May through August have exhausted the cold water pool by September. Therefore, water temperatures routinely exceed the 60°F criteria for spawning required for spring-run Chinook salmon in September and October.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in this reach of the Sacramento River is generally not at a level to cause direct adverse effects on spawning adult salmonids.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Large flow fluctuations are the main concern regarding adverse flow conditions in the middle and upper Sacramento River. Historically, the largest and most frequent flow reductions have occurred in the late summer and early fall when flashboards at the ACID Dam required adjustment. In years of full water deliveries by the CVP, flows had been reduced from levels of 10,000 to 14,000 cfs to a level of 5,000 cfs (NMFS 1997). Currently, under the CVP/SWP BO, flow reductions are conducted in intervals to prevent the stranding of juveniles and spawning adults likely are not affected by changes in flow. However, eggs in redds and developing embryos may be affected as described below under embryo incubation.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Spring-run Chinook salmon are the earliest spawning of anadromous salmonids in the Sacramento River Basin, therefore the few spring-run that may spawn in the mainstem Sacramento River would have first access to available habitat. However, later spawning fall-run Chinook salmon are quite numerous in the upper Sacramento River and may superimpose their redds on existing spring-run redds thus eliminating any advantage to spring-run early spawning.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Chinook salmon require clean loose gravel from 0.75 to 4.0 inches in diameter for successful spawning (NMFS 1997). The construction of dams in the upper Sacramento River has eliminated the major source of suitable gravel recruitment to reaches of the river below Keswick Dam. Gravel sources from the banks of the river and floodplain have also been substantially reduced by levee and bank protection measures. Levee and bank protection measures restrict the meandering of the river which would normally release gravel into the river through natural erosion and deposition processes. However, because very little spawning occurs in this portion of the river and salmon exhibiting spring-run behavior typically spawn before fall and winter runs, it is not likely that a lack of suitable spawning gravel in this reach of the river has a significant negative effect on spring-run Chinook salmon spawning.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The FRFH is the only hatchery in the Central Valley producing spring-run Chinook salmon. Prior to 2004, FRFH hatchery staff differentiated spring-run from fall-run by applying a cut-off date to fish entering the hatchery. Those fish ascending the ladder from September 1 through September 15 were assumed to be spring-run Chinook salmon while those ascending the ladder after September 15 were assumed to be fall-run (Kastner 2003). This practice led to considerable hybridization between spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon (DWR 2004a). Since 2004, the fish ladder remains open during the spring months and those fish ascending the ladder are marked with an external tag and returned to the river. This practice allows FRFH staff to identify those previously marked fish as spring-run when they re-enter the ladder in September, reducing potential hybridization with the fall-run (DWR 2004a). There are no observable genetic differences between the FRFH spring and fall runs, however the spring run enters the river in April, May and June as bright (green) fish.

In order to reduce mortality associated with downstream migration subsequent to hatchery releases, fish are often trucked to and released in San Pablo Bay. These practices likely increase straying rates increasing the potential for Feather River Hatchery produced spring-run Chinook salmon to hybridize with naturally spawning Chinook salmon throughout the Central Valley (Williams 2006).

3.3.7.3 EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The Sacramento River supports a popular year-round recreational fishery. It is possible that anglers could disturb developing embryos in redds while wading.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The embryo incubation life stage of Chinook salmon is the most sensitive to elevated water temperatures. Preferred water temperatures for Chinook salmon egg incubation and embryo development range from 46°F to 56°F (NMFS 1997). A significant reduction in egg viability occurs at water temperatures above 57.5°F and total mortality may occur at 62°F (NMFS 1997).

Historically, water temperatures in the middle Sacramento River typically exceeded 60°F from July through September and in drier years may have exceeded 66°F (NMFS 1997). It is likely that spring-run Chinook salmon that spawned downstream of the RBDD did not produce viable offspring because of lethal water temperatures (Hallock and Fisher 1985). However, with implementation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997, suitable water temperatures for embryo incubation may extend downstream of the RBDD. Currently, river temperatures just below the RBDD only marginally exceed the incipient lethal level for incubating eggs during June through September, by reaching 57°F to 58°F. These water temperatures are in the range that would typically cause mortality to 10 to 20 percent of eggs (Cramer *et al.* 2003).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality issues that may produce adverse effects on spring-run Chinook salmon include both point source and non-point source pollution. The inactive Iron Mountain Mine in the Spring Creek watershed near Keswick Dam creates the largest discharge of toxic material into the Sacramento River. There are three metals of particular concern: copper, cadmium and zinc. The early life stages of salmon are the most sensitive to these metals (NMFS 1997). The acid mine drainage from Iron Mountain Mine is among the most acidic and metal laden anywhere in the world (NMFS 1997). Historically, discharge from the mine has produced massive fish kills.

In 1983 the Iron Mountain Mine site was declared a superfund site by the EPA. Since that time various mitigation measures have been implemented including a neutralization plant that has improved the ability to control metal loadings to the river. NMFS (1997) reported that although significant improvements have been made, basin plan objectives had not yet been achieved in 1997. Since that time, other mitigation measures have been implemented resulting in a 95 percent reduction in historic copper, cadmium and zinc discharges (EPA 2006). At present, acid mine waste still escapes untreated from waste pile and seepage on the north side of Iron Mountain and flows into Boulder Creek, which eventually flows into the Sacramento River (EPA 2006). However, there were no significant exceedances of dissolved metal concentrations in the Sacramento River in 2002 and 2003 (CDFG 2004c). Another point source of pollution in the upper Sacramento River identified in NMFS (1997) is the Simpson Mill near Redding which discharges PCBs into the river.

Non-point source pollution consists of sediments from storm events, stormwater runoff in urban and developing areas and agricultural runoff. Sediments constitute nearly half of the material introduced to the river from non-point sources (NMFS 1997). Excess silt and other suspended solids are mobilized during storm events from plowed fields, construction and logging sites and mines. High sediment loading can interfere with eggs developing in redds by reducing the ability of oxygenated water to percolate down to eggs in the gravel. Stormwater runoff in urban areas can transport oil, trash, heavy metals and toxic organics all of which are potentially harmful to incubating eggs. Agricultural runoff can contain excess nutrients, pesticides and trace metals.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow fluctuations are the primary concern related to potential adverse effects on the embryo incubation life stage of spring-run Chinook salmon. For example, if spawning salmon construct redds during periods of high flow, those redds could become dewatered during subsequent periods of low flow. Historically, the largest and most rapid flow reductions have occurred during the irrigation season (normally, early April through October) when adjustments are required at the ACID Dam. To accommodate these adjustments, Sacramento River flows at times have been decreased by one-half or greater, over the course of a few hours (NMFS 1997). Currently, under the CVP/SWP BO, flow reductions are divided into several intervals to prevent the stranding of juveniles. However, reducing the rates of flow reduction does not protect existing redds from becoming dewatered.

3.3.7.4 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS

Keswick Dam at RM 302 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migrating adult Chinook salmon hence it represents the upstream extent of spring-run Chinook salmon habitat on the mainstem Sacramento River. The ACID Dam, located about three miles below Keswick Dam, represents the furthest upstream impediment to juvenile outmigration. The dam is only in place during the irrigation season which typically extends from April through November. During the rest of the year neither upstream adult migration nor downstream juvenile outmigration is hindered. Juveniles migrate past the dam by either dropping as much as ten feet over the dam to the river below or moving through the bypass facility.

The RBDD, at the downstream extent of the upper Sacramento River, creates the final passage impediment to downstream outmigration in this reach of the river. When the dam gates are lowered, Lake Red Bluff is formed slowing flows and delaying juvenile outmigration allowing more opportunities for predation. Historically there was both direct and indirect mortality associated with fish using an ineffective juvenile fish bypass facility at the dam. A "Downstream Migrant Fish Facility" was installed in 1992 which appears to have reduced mortality associated with use of the bypass facility.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Following the installation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997 water temperatures in this reach of the river seldom exceed 60°F and are suitable for juvenile salmon rearing year-round.

WATER QUALITY

Point source pollution may occur from both the Iron Mountain Mine and the Simpson Mill as described above. Because the juvenile life stage of Chinook salmon is the most susceptible to adverse effects from pollution and the proximity of these two potential sources of pollution, potential adverse effects are likely more profound in the upper Sacramento River compared to the lower reaches. Effects of non-point source pollution from urban runoff and agricultural drainage are similar to those described above for the middle Sacramento River. However, pollution associated with urban runoff is likely higher due to the proximity of the cities of Redding and Red Bluff.

FLOW CONDITIONS

There is likely very little rearing of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon that occurs in the upper Sacramento River. Additionally, any spring-run juvenile Chinook salmon juveniles in this reach are likely only there during winter months when flows are not affected by agricultural diversions.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Levee building, bank protection measures and the disconnection of the river from its historic floodplain have all had negative effects on riparian habitat. Woody debris and SRA habitat provide important escape cover for juvenile salmon. Aquatic and terrestrial insects, a major component of juvenile salmon diet, are dependent on riparian habitat. Aquatic invertebrates are dependent on the organic material provided be a healthy riparian habitat and many terrestrial invertebrates also depend on this habitat. Studies by the CDFG as reported in NMFS (NMFS 1997) demonstrated that a significant portion of juvenile Chinook salmon diet is composed of terrestrial insects, particularly aphids which are dependent on riparian habitat.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Controlled flow regimes and channelization of the upper Sacramento River have resulted in a loss of natural river morphology and function.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The construction of levees and streambank protection measures have resulted in a disconnection of the river with its historic floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

Adverse effects due to entrainment of outmigrating juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon at unscreened diversions are similar to those described above for the middle Sacramento River. Although there is a fish bypass facility at the ACID Dam, the screening does not operate consistently particularly under high flow or debris load conditions and some entrainment may occur. The new downstream migrant fish facility at the RBDD appears to have alleviated entrainment problems at the RBDD.

PREDATION

Significant predators of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon in the upper Sacramento River include Sacramento pikeminnow and both hatchery and wild steelhead. Striped bass, a significant predator in lower reaches of the river, typically do not utilize the upper Sacramento River; however, they are present immediately below the RBDD.

The most serious adverse effect due to predation occurs in the vicinity of the RBDD. Passage through Lake Red Bluff can delay outmigrating juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon and increases the opportunities for predation by both fish and birds (Vogel and Smith 1986 as citied *in* NMFS 1997). Chinook salmon juveniles passing under the gates at the RBDD are heavily preyed upon by both striped bass and Sacramento pikeminnow (NMFS 1997). Large concentrations of Sacramento pikeminnow have been observed accumulating immediately below the RBDD when juvenile Chinook salmon are present (Garcia 1989 *in* NMFS 1997).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The extent of predation on juvenile Chinook salmon by hatchery-reared steelhead is not known. However, steelhead releases by the CNFH may have a high potential for inducing high levels of predation on naturally produced Chinook salmon (CALFED 2000c). The CNFH has a current production target of releasing approximately 600,000 steelhead in January and February at sizes of 125 to 275 mm (CALFED 2000c).

3.3.8 NORTHERN SIERRA NEVADA DIVERSITY GROUP

The northern Sierra Nevada spring-run Chinook salmon Diversity Group historically was comprised of populations in the Mokelumne, American, Yuba, and Feather rivers and Butte, Big Chico, Deer, Mill, and Antelope creeks (**Figure 3-6**). Currently, spawning populations of Chinook salmon exhibiting spring-run characteristics occur in each of these rivers/creeks except for the Mokelumne and American rivers.



Figure 3-6. Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group

3.3.8.1 FEATHER RIVER

The Feather River watershed is located at the north end of the Sierra Nevada. The watershed is bounded by the volcanic Cascade Range to the north, the Great Basin on the east, the Sacramento Valley on the west, and higher elevation portions of the Sierra Nevada on the south. The Feather River watershed upstream of Oroville Dam is approximately 3,600 square miles and comprises approximately 68 percent of the Feather River Basin. Downstream of Oroville Dam, the basin extends south and includes the drainage of the Yuba and Bear Rivers. The Yuba River joins the Feather River near the City of Marysville, 39 river miles downstream of the City of Oroville, and the confluence of the Bear River and the Feather River is 55 river miles downstream of the City of Oroville. Approximately 67 miles downstream of the City of Oroville, the Feather River flows into the Sacramento River, near the town of Verona, about 21 river miles upstream of Sacramento. The Feather River watershed, upstream of the confluence of the Sacramento and Feather rivers, has an area of about 5,900 square miles.

The Feather River supports runs of both spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon. Historically, spring-run Chinook salmon immigrated to the upper tributaries of the Feather River in the spring and early summer where they would hold and eventually spawn in late summer or early fall. Fall-run Chinook salmon would immigrate to the lower Feather River in the fall and spawn immediately upon arrival. The construction of Oroville Dam presented an impassable migration barrier to upstream migration and today spawning is confined to the lower Feather River, primarily in the eight-mile reach extending from the Fish Barrier Dam downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet. Currently, the genetic distinctness of the two runs is not clear. DWR (2004a) reports that the FRFH-produced spring-run Chinook salmon as well as naturally spawning spring-run Chinook salmon in the Feather River were more closely related to fall-run than the documented spring-run populations in Butte, Mill and Deer creeks. Given that both spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon spawn in the same reach of the Feather River and at about the same time, in high densities, it is likely that the population is hybridized. Nevertheless, fish exhibiting the typical life history of the spring-run are found holding at the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet and the Fish Barrier Dam as early as March (DWR 2004a). Annually, 30,000 to 170,000 Chinook salmon spawn in the lower Feather River, however, the proportion of putative spring-run to fall-run is unknown.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The construction of Oroville Dam presented an impassable migration barrier to upstream migration and today spawning is confined to the lower Feather River, primarily in the eight-mile reach extending from the Fish Barrier Dam downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet. There are no known passage impediments to upstream migrating adult Chinook salmon below the Fish Barrier Dam.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The sportfishery in the lower Feather River currently allows the taking of salmon from January 1 through September 30. The proportion of putative spring-run taken during this time is unknown however, other than from about mid-August through September; only Chinook salmon exhibiting spring-run timing would likely be in the river. Additionally, unusually high densities of fish in the lower Feather River likely create favorable poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Suitable water temperatures for adult spring-run Chinook salmon migrating upstream to spawning grounds reportedly range from 57°F to 67°F (NMFS 1997). However, spring-run Chinook salmon are immature when upstream migration begins and need to hold in suitable habitat for several months prior to spawning. The maximum suitable water temperature for holding is reported to be about 59°F to 60°F

(NMFS 1997). Under a 1983 agreement between CDFG and DWR, water temperatures are generally maintained below 60°F year-round above the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet (DWR 1983), but can exceed 65°F downstream during the summer months.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Feather River is not likely to adversely affect immigrating adult anadromous salmonids. However, water quality may affect more sensitive life stages as discussed below under embryo incubation.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Except during flood events, flows in the reach of the lower Feather River extending downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet (Low Flow Channel) are maintained at a constant 600 cfs. Under the new Settlement Agreement, as part of the FERC relicensing for the Oroville Facilities, flows in the Low Flow Channel will be increased to a constant 800 cfs (FERC 2007). The instream flow requirements below the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet are 1,700 cfs from October through March and 1,000 cfs from April through September. It is likely that flow conditions in the lower Feather River seldom affect this life stage.

SPAWNING

The Feather River supports one of the largest runs of Chinook salmon in the Central Valley (Sommer *et al.* 2001b). Approximately 75 percent of the natural spawning for Chinook salmon occurs between the Fish Barrier Dam at RM 67 and the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet at RM 59, with the remainder occurring in the reach downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet to Honcut Creek at RM 44 (Sommer *et al.* 2001b).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The construction of Oroville Dam and subsequent blocking of upstream migration has eliminated the spatial separation between spawning fall-run and spring-run Chinook salmon. Reportedly, spring-run Chinook salmon migrated to the upper Feather River and its tributaries from mid-March through the end of July (CDFG 1998). Fall-run Chinook salmon reportedly migrated later and spawned in lower reaches of the Feather River than spring-run Chinook salmon (Yoshiyama *et al.* 2001). Restricted access to historic spawning grounds currently causes spring-run Chinook salmon to spawn in the same lowland reaches that fall-run Chinook salmon use as spawning habitat. The overlap in spawning site locations, combined with an overlap in spawning timing (Moyle 2002) with temporally adjacent runs, may be responsible for inbreeding between spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon in the lower Feather River (Hedgecock *et al.* 2001).

In the Feather River, spring-run Chinook salmon spawning may occur a few weeks earlier than fall-run spawning, but currently there is no clear distinction between the two, because of the disruption of spatial segregation by Oroville Dam. Thus spawning of spring-run Chinook salmon occurs during the same months as fall-run. This presents difficulties from a management perspective in determining the proportional contribution of total spawning escapement by the spring- and fall-runs. Because of unnaturally high densities of spawning in the Low Flow Channel, spawning habitat is likely a limiting factor. Intuitively it could be inferred that the slightly earlier spawning Chinook salmon displaying spring-run behavior would have better access to the limited spawning habitat, however, early spawning likely leads to a higher rate of redd superimposition. Redd superimposition occurs when spawning Chinook salmon dig redds on top of existing redds dug by other Chinook salmon. The rate of superimposition is a function of spawning densities and typically occurs in systems where spawning habitat is limited (Fukushima *et al.* 1998). Redd superimposition may disproportionately affect early spawners, and therefore potentially affect Chinook salmon exhibiting spring-run life history

characteristics. As part of the Settlement Agreement for FERC relicensing of the Oroville Facilities, one or more weirs will be installed in the upper section of the river to aid in spatially segregating the spring- and fall runs (FERC 2007).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Regulations allow taking of salmon from January 1 through September 30. The proportion of putative spring-run taken during this time is unknown however, during this time period, Chinook salmon displaying spring-run behavior likely make up the majority of the spawning population. Unusually high densities of Chinook salmon in the lower Feather River likely create favorable poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Releases are made from the coldwater pool in Lake Oroville Reservoir and this cold water generally provides suitable water temperatures in the Low Flow Channel (i.e., reach of the river extending from the Fish Barrier Dam downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet) (DWR 2001). However, downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet, water temperatures can reach 74°F in the summer (DWR 2001).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Feather River is not likely to adversely affect spawning adult salmon. However, water quality may affect more sensitive life stages as discussed below under embryo incubation.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the Low Flow Channel are regulated to 600 cfs, except during flood events when flows have reached as high as 150,000 cfs (DWR 1983). The instream flow requirements below the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet are 1,700 cfs from October through March and 1,000 cfs from April through September. PHABSIM indicates that at flows of 600 cfs in the Low Flow Channel, approximately 91 percent of potential spawning habitat is available. High Flow Channel approximately 86 percent of the potential spawning habitat is available at 1,000 cfs (DWR 2004e).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Spawning habitat for Chinook salmon below Oroville Dam has been affected by changes to the geomorphic processes caused by several factors, including hydraulic mining, land use practices, construction of flood management levees, regulated flow regimes, and operation of Oroville Dam. The dam blocks sediment recruitment from the upstream areas of the watershed. In the lower reaches of the river, levees and bank armoring prevent gravel recruitment. Periodic flows of sufficient magnitude to mobilize smaller sized gravel from spawning riffles result in armoring of the remaining substrate. DWR (DWR 1996) evaluated the quality of spawning gravels in the lower Feather River based on bulk gravel samples and Wolman surface samples obtained during spring 1996. The study concluded that the worst scoured areas had an armored surface layer too coarse for spawning salmonids. Additionally, much of the streambed substrate in the reach from the Fish Barrier Dam to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet is composed of large gravel and cobble, which is too large for construction of spawning redds for Chinook salmon. This reach of the lower Feather River is by far the most intensively used spawning habitat of the river for salmon. The settlement agreement as part of the Oroville FERC relicensing process provides provisions for a gravel supplementation and monitoring program (FERC 2007).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Regulation of the lower Feather River by the Oroville facilities has changed both streamflow and sediment discharge. Attenuation of peak flows, decreased winter flows, increased summer flows, and

changes to flow frequencies have led to a general decrease in channel complexity downstream of Oroville Dam. Because several species and races of fish occur in the lower Feather River, a diversity of habitat types is required. Decreases in channel diversity lead to a decrease in habitat diversity and quality.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The FRFH is the only hatchery in the Central Valley producing spring-run Chinook salmon. Prior to 2004, FRFH staff differentiated spring-run from fall-run by applying a cut-off date to fish ascending the fish ladder. Those fish ascending the ladder from September 1 through September 15 were assumed to be spring-run Chinook salmon while those ascending the ladder after September 15 were assumed to be fall-run (Kastner 2003). This practice led to considerable hybridization between spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon (DWR 2004a). Since 2004, the fish ladder remains open during the spring months and those fish ascending the ladder are marked with an external tag and returned to the river. This practice allows FRFH staff to identify those previously marked fish as spring-run when they re-enter the ladder in September (DWR 2004a). While this practice reduces the potential for hybridization with the fall-run in the hatchery, it is likely that many hatchery produced spring-run hybridize with the fall-run because of the lack of temporal and spatial isolation in the Feather River Low Flow Channel as mentioned above.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

Redd superimposition is likely the most serious factor affecting embryo incubation of spring-run Chinook salmon in the Feather River. Chinook salmon spawning escapements to the lower Feather River are much higher than available spawning habitat can support leading to high rates of redd superimposition. Spring-run Chinook salmon redds would be more affected than fall-run because spring-run spawn earlier in the year. The Settlement Agreement under the FERC relicensing for the Oroville Facilities calls for the installation of one or more weirs in the Low Flow Channel of the Feather River to aid in the spatial segregation of fall and spring-run Chinook salmon which should reduce the adverse effects of redd superimposition on spring-run Chinook salmon redds (FERC 2007).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The lower Feather River supports a popular year-round fishery. It is possible that redds could be disturbed by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Spring-run Chinook salmon embryos incubating in the Low Flow Channel are likely not adversely affected by high water temperatures as water temperatures seldom exceed 60°F. However, embryos from early spawning spring-run Chinook salmon that may have constructed redds downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet may experience water temperatures lethal to embryos. However, under the Settlement Agreement as part of the FERC relicensing process for the Oroville Facilities, increases in flow through the Low Flow Channel will likely lead to a slight reduction in water temperatures downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet.

WATER QUALITY

As part of the FERC relicensing process for the Oroville Facilities, six of the relicensing studies specifically address metals contamination in the lower Feather River. As part of these studies, water quality samples were collected at 17 locations within the lower Feather River. Samples exceeding aquatic life water quality criteria occurred for four constituents: total aluminum, iron, copper, and lead. In the reach of the Feather River extending from the Fish Barrier Dam downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet, 19 percent of the water quality samples exceeded aquatic life water quality criteria. Samples taken from the reach of the Feather River extending from the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet downstream to the

confluence with the Sacramento River were variable, but all were higher than the upstream reach and 3 exceeded aquatic life water quality criteria 100 percent of the time. Copper exceeded aquatic life water quality criteria in 5 of 276 samples; two of these occurrences were in the reach of the Feather River extending from the Fish Barrier Dam downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet. Iron only exceeded aquatic life water quality criteria at three sampling locations; all locations were downstream of the lower Feather River confluence with Honcut Creek. Lead exceeded aquatic life water criteria only once at several stations, but three or four times at the two most downstream stations on the Feather River. Heavy metal contamination could affect embryo survival.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Adverse effects on developing embryos could occur if a flow fluctuation caused redds to become dewatered while eggs were incubating.

Oroville Facilities releases are regulated and subject to regulatory flow criteria. Under an agreement with CDFG, flows in the Low Flow Channel are regulated to 600 cfs, except during flood events when flows have reached as high as 150,000 cfs (DWR 1983). The instream flow requirements below the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet are 1,700 cfs from October through March and 1,000 cfs from April through September.

Results from the PHABSIM indicate that at flows of 600 cfs in the Low Flow Channel, approximately 91 percent of potential spawning habitat is available, and in the reach extending downstream from the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet approximately 86 percent of the potential spawning habitat is available at 1,000 cfs (DWR 2004e).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Juvenile Chinook salmon in the lower Feather River have been reported to emigrate from approximately mid-November through June, with peak emigration occurring from January through March (Cavallo Unpublished Work; DWR 2002a; Painter *et al.* 1977). From 1999 to 2003 DWR conducted snorkel, seine and electrofishing surveys in the lower Feather River. Age-0 Chinook salmon were very abundant in the spring but were nearly absent from summer surveys, suggesting behavior consistent with fall-run (DWR 2004b).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Low Flow Channel normally remain below 62°F year-round and are suitable for juvenile Chinook salmon rearing. During the January through March time period, when approximately 96 percent of juvenile Chinook salmon emigrate (DWR 2002a), water temperatures generally remain suitable for emigration throughout the lower Feather River (DWR 2003).

WATER QUALITY

At times, heavy metal concentrations in the lower Feather river are known to exceed EPA guidelines as discussed above under embryo incubation. Exposure of juveniles for extended periods of time could lead to decreased survival.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the Low Flow Channel of the Feather River, where most juvenile rearing of salmonids occurs, is maintained at a constant 600 cfs year-round except during flood events. Some flow fluctuations may occur downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet that have the potential to strand juvenile rearing or outmigrating salmonids. Since 2001, DWR has been conducting a juvenile stranding study on Chinook salmon and steelhead in the lower Feather River. Empirical observations and aerial surveys identified over 30 areas that have the potential to strand juveniles with flow decreases. However, sampling of

isolated areas indicated relatively little juvenile salmonid standing. Furthermore the proportion of stranded salmonids represented a very small percentage (<<1 percent) of the estimated number of emigrants (DWR 2004c).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Fixed flows in the lower Feather River have resulted in fewer channel forming or re-shaping events leading to a lack of habitat diversity. This lack of diversity results in unnatural riparian conditions and a lack of recruitment of riparian vegetation.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Channel complexity refers to the diversity of geomorphic features in a particular river reach. Features such as undercut banks, meanders, point bars side channels and backwaters all provide habitat for juvenile salmonids. Regulation of the lower Feather River by the Oroville facilities has changed both streamflow and sediment discharge. Attenuation of peak flows, decreased winter flows, increased summer flows, and changes to flow frequencies have led to a general decrease in channel complexity downstream of Oroville Dam. Because several species and races of fish occur in the lower Feather River, a diversity of habitat types is required. Decreases in channel diversity lead to a decrease in habitat diversity and quality.

The high concentration of spawning salmonids in the Low Flow Channel results in a high concentration of juveniles in the Low Flow Channel. Seesholtz *et al.* (2003) found that most out-migration of juvenile Chinook salmon occurs between January and April and that these fish are relatively small. Based on historic accounts of juvenile salmonid emigration, the current peak in the emigration period is somewhat earlier than pre-dam conditions (Painter *et al.* 1977; Warner 1954). Seesholtz *et al.* (2003) further report that substantial numbers of juveniles remain in the Low Flow Channel through the end of June. Seesholtz *et al.* (2003) speculate that this early emigration may be caused by competition with other juvenile salmonids, including Chinook salmon and steelhead, for rearing habitat.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Regular intermediate flood flushing flows to maintain geomorphic function of the river and replenish fish and riparian habitats are generally rare in the lower Feather River because of flow regulation by the Oroville Facilities. Lack of frequent high flow/flood events has led to a lack of floodplain renewal and connectivity to the channel.

ENTRAINMENT

The main diversion on the lower Feather River downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay occurs at Sunset Pumps at RM 38.6. The pumps divert 65,500 acre-feet of water annually. Although the diversion is screened, some entrainment of juvenile salmonids likely occurs.

PREDATION

Counts of known predators on juvenile anadromous salmonids are reported to be very low in the Low Flow Channel (Seesholtz *et al.* 2003). Naturally spawned steelhead are an exception because little is known about their relative abundance. Because water temperatures are relatively low in the Low Flow Channel, it is doubtful that significant predation occurs in this reach by non-salmonid species.

Significant numbers of predators do reportedly exist in the High Flow Channel below the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet. Analysis of CWT recovery data indicates that predation on hatchery-reared Feather River Chinook salmon released in the Feather River is high, however further analysis reveals that most of this predation takes place in the Sacramento River downstream of the Feather River confluence (DWR 2004d).

One aspect of the Oroville Project operations and facilities that may enhance predation in the High Flow Channel is that the high density of juveniles in the Low Flow Channel may cause early emigration of juvenile salmonids. Because juvenile rearing habitat in the Low Flow Channel is limited, juveniles may be forced to emigrate from the area due to competition for resources. Relatively small juvenile salmonids may be less capable of avoiding predators than those that rear to a larger size in the Low Flow Channel prior to beginning their seaward migration.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The FRFH raises and releases both spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon. It is likely that these hatchery-reared fish compete for limited resources with naturally spawned fish in the lower Feather River. There is speculation that the early outmigration of Chinook salmon observed in the Feather River is because of competition for limited resources. Additionally, the FRFH produces and releases yearling steelhead into the lower Feather River. These fish are large enough to prey on juvenile Chinook salmon.

3.3.8.2 YUBA RIVER

The lower Yuba River consists of the approximately 24-mile stretch of river extending from Englebright Dam, the first impassible fish barrier along the river, downstream to the confluence with the Feather River near Marysville.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

Adult spring-run Chinook salmon immigration and holding has previously been reported to primarily occur in the Yuba River from March through October (Vogel and Marine 1991), with upstream migration generally peaking in May (SWRI 2002).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Englebright Dam presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration for anadromous salmonids and marks the upstream extent of potential Chinook salmon habitat. Daguerre Point Dam may also provide a partial barrier to upstream migration. The design of Daguerre Point Dam fish ladders, as currently operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), are suboptimal. For example, during high flows across the spillway, the fish ladder is obscured making it difficult for salmonids migrating upstream to find the entrances to the fish ladders. Fall-run Chinook salmon have been observed attempting to leap over the dam, indicating that these fish were unable to navigate the fish ladders (CALFED and YCWA 2005). Both ladders also tend to become loaded with organic material and sediment, which can directly inhibit passage and/or reduce attraction flows at the ladder entrances. The fish ladder exits are close to the spillway, which can result in fish being swept back over the dam while attempting to exit the ladder.

Daguerre Point Dam can delay or prevent upstream migration of adult spring-run Chinook salmon in the lower Yuba River (NMFS 2007c). Daguerre Point Dam includes suboptimal fish ladder design and sheet flow across the dam spillway that reportedly may interfere with attraction to ladder entrances, particularly during high flow periods (January through March) (NMFS 2007c). The location of the ladder entrances also makes it difficult for immigrating adults to find the entrances (NMFS 2007c). Since 2001, wooden flash boards have been periodically affixed to the crest of the dam during low flow periods to aid in directing the flows towards the fish ladder entrances. Fish passage monitoring data from 2006 indicates that the installation of the flash boards resulted in an immediate and dramatic increase in the passage of salmon up the ladders, and is thought to have improved the ability of salmon to locate and enter the ladders (NMFS 2007c). Both ladders, particularly the north ladder, reportedly tend to clog with woody debris during high flow events, however, a log boom was installed at the north ladder in 2003 to reduce woody debris accumulation and an updated inspection and maintenance plan has allowed for more frequent inspection and cleaning of the ladders. Additionally, gravel buildup at the top of both ladders

reportedly can block passage or reduce attraction flows at ladders, however, since 2003 the Corps has implemented a program to reduce gravel accumulation in front of the ladders (NMFS 2007c). Options to improve fish passage at Daguerre Point Dam where identified by the USFWS' Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP). The Project Modification Report recently completed by the USACE included engineering surveys, hydraulic evaluation, and a preliminary environmental assessment. There is no anticipated date for the implementation or completion of improvements to Daguerre Point Dam.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Poaching of adult Chinook salmon at the Daguerre Point Dam fish ladders has been well documented by CDFG, and is considered a chronic problem. Poaching is exacerbated when fish congregate below Daguerre Point Dam during low and high flows when the ladders are not open. In addition, poachers also have tampered with the fish ladders to prevent adult salmon passage and thus increasing the concentration of individual fish below the dam.

Fishing for Chinook salmon on the lower Yuba River is regulated by CDFG. CDFG angling regulations permit fishing for Chinook salmon from the mouth of the Yuba River to Daguerre Point Dam year-round. Harvest of Chinook salmon downstream of Daguerre Point Dam is permitted from January 1 through February 28 and from August 1 through October 15. It is illegal to harvest salmon upstream of Daguerre Point Dam at any time.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Yuba River remain fairly cool year-round due to cool water releases from Engle bright Dam. Additionally, deep coldwater pools are available providing summer holding habitat downstream of the Narrows I and Narrows II powerhouses, or further downstream in the Narrows Reach (YCWA *et al.* 2007), where water depths can exceed 40 feet.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Yuba River is adequate to support Chinook salmon adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The natural hydrograph of the Yuba River is generally characterized by rapid increases and decreases in flows in the late-fall through winter (i.e., November through March) associated with seasonal precipitation events. During the spring months (i.e., April through June) flows exhibit more gradual, sustained increases and decreases. During the summer (i.e., July through October) flows remain relatively stable). Therefore, flow conditions during the spring-run Chinook salmon immigration period are generally relatively stable.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

From Daguerre Point Dam upstream to Englebright Dam there are no barriers to upstream adult immigration.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Angling impacts on spawning spring-run Chinook salmon are likely minimal because harvest is prohibited above Daguerre Point Dam where most spawning occurs.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Average daily water temperatures recorded at Daguerre Point Dam from 1997 to 2001 ranged from 57.7ºF in September to 56.0ºF in October.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Yuba River is adequate to support Chinook salmon adult spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows during the time that spring-run Chinook salmon would be spawning are relatively stable.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Most spawning habitat in the lower Yuba River is upstream of Daguerre Point Dam. Although water temperatures below the dam are likely suitable for Chinook salmon spawning, gravel downstream of the dam is embedded with silt (YCWA 2000). Spawning habitat above Daguerre Point Dam is considered marginal as Englebright Dam blocks recruitment of spawning gravel to the lower Yuba River.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The most extensive habitat alterations in the lower Yuba River have occurred as a result of gold mining operations. The Yuba Goldfields are located along the lower Yuba River near Daguerre Point Dam, approximately 10 miles north of Marysville. The area of the Goldfields is approximately 8,000 acres. The Goldfields have been used for gold mining for about 100 years. As a result thousands of acres of continuous mounds of cobble and rock terrain have been left behind. As a result of the permeability of the substrates composing the Goldfields, several interconnected channels and ponds have formed throughout the area. Surface water in the ponds and canals of the Goldfields are hydraulically connected to the Yuba River. A proportion of flow entering the Goldfields is eventually returned to the Yuba River downstream of Daguerre Point Dam via an outlet canal. Prior to 2003, a fraction of the lower Yuba River Chinook salmon population (e.g., spring-run, fall-run, and late-fall-run) and, presumably, steelhead routinely migrated from the mainstem of the Yuba River into the Yuba Goldfields via the outlet canal. In 2003, a fish barrier was constructed at the outlet canal to prevent fish from entering the Yuba Goldfields. However, fish were still observed passing the barrier during flood or high flow events.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Hatchery reared spring-run Chinook salmon were planted in the Yuba River during the 1970s. Additionally, adipose fin-clipped Chinook salmon have been observed in the Yuba River during recent carcass surveys indicating that some level of straying into the Yuba watershed is occurring. Monitoring efforts in the Yuba River have confirmed FRFH spring-run occur there (M. Tucker, NMFS, pers. comm.). Hybridization of the FRFH spring-run with the native spring-run population would result in compromising the genetic integrity and lowering the fitness of the latter. The hatchery stock would compete with native spring-run over available holding and spawning habitat, and possibly transfer the Feather River strain of IHNV to the local population.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because the lower Yuba River supports a year-round recreational fishery, it is possible that some level of redd disturbance by wading anglers occurs.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Spring-run Chinook embryo incubation primarily occurs in the lower Yuba River from September through March (YCWA *et al.* 2007). The intragravel residence times of incubating eggs and alevins (yolk-sac fry) are highly dependent upon water temperatures. Maximum Chinook salmon embryo survival reportedly occurs in water temperatures ranging from 41°F to 56°F (USFWS 1995c). The average water temperature in the Yuba River at Daguerre Point Dam ranges from approximately 47ºF in January and February to approximately 57ºF in September.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Yuba River is generally good. There is a concern that a substantial amount of mercury may be in the Yuba Goldfields that could be mobilized by flood events but this would likely be downstream of developing embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow reductions from normal maintenance and emergency operations of the Narrows I and II powerhouses below Englebright dam has been associated with cases of redd dewatering. Since 1991, maintenance activities have been scheduled at such times that potential redd dewatering would be minimized. Currently, flows are kept fairly constant during the time period when spring-run Chinook salmon embryos would be developing.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

The average daily mean water temperature downstream of Daguerre Point Dam from May through September ranges between 57.9ºF in May to 61.6ºF in September at Marysville (SWRI 2002). These temperatures are within the suitable range for juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon rearing and outmigration.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Yuba River is generally good. There is a concern that a substantial amount of mercury may be in the Yuba Goldfields that could be mobilized by flood events.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Field observations on the lower Yuba River indicate that both natural and controlled flow reductions can cause some degree of fish stranding (YCWA 1998; YCWA 1999). The magnitude of stranding is site-specific and associated with the specific developmental stage of the fry prior to the onset of flow reductions, channel morphology, and aquatic habitat characteristics.

There are two types of stranding that are associated with flow reductions:

- Stranding associated with the rate of flow reductions (i.e., ramping rates), which determines if the juvenile fish can react quickly enough to avoid being stranded from exposed substrates in side channels and channel margins as flows decrease.
- Stranding associated with the magnitude of flow reductions, regardless of ramping rate, which determines the extent of stranding within off channel habitats as flows decrease.

The SWRCB requires that YCWA, in consultation with the CDFG, NMFS, and USFWS verify that salmon fry are being protected from dewatering events during controlled flow reductions on the lower Yuba River. However, some level of mortality associated with controlled flow reductions is unavoidable,

and therefore should be considered as a factor when assessing threats to juvenile salmonids in the lower Yuba River (YCWA 1999).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The reduction of peak flows in the late winter and spring have resulted in a reduction of riparian vegetation. There is a wide variation throughout the growing season of willow regeneration because each species of willow requires flows at specific periods for reproduction and growth. Cottonwood regeneration is also more prominent under natural flow regimes (YCWA 2000).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Attenuated peak flows and controlled flow regimes have altered the area's geomorphology and have affected the natural meandering of the river downstream of Englebright Dam.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Controlled flows and decreases in peak flows has reduced the frequency of floodplain inundation resulting in a separation of the river channel from its natural floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

As juvenile steelhead pass Daguerre Point Dam, physical injury may occur as they pass over the dam or through its fish ladders (SWRI 2002). Water diversions in the lower Yuba River generally begin in the early spring and extend through the fall. As a result, potential threats to juvenile steelhead occur at the Hallwood-Cordua and South Yuba Brophy diversions.

Fish screens recently installed at the Hallwood-Cordua diversion are considered to be an improvement over those previously present but, the current pipe design may not allow sufficient flow to completely eliminate juvenile salmonid losses at the diversion.

The South Yuba-Brophy system diverts water through an excavated channel from the south bank of the lower Yuba River to Daguerre Point Dam. The water is then subsequently diverted through a porous rock dike that is intended to exclude fish. The current design of this rock structure does not meet NMFS or CDFG juvenile fish screen criteria (SWRI 2002).

There are also three major unscreened diversions on the lower Yuba River located upstream of Daguerre Point Dam: (1) the Browns Valley Pumpline Diversion Facility; (2) the South-Yuba/Brophy Water District Canal; and (3) the Hallwood-Cordua Canal. In addition, there are 16 unscreened water diversion facilities downstream of Daguerre Point Dam (SWRI 2002) which could potentially entrain juvenile salmonids in the lower Yuba River.

PREDATION

The extent of predation on juvenile Chinook salmon in the Yuba River is not well documented, however, several non-native introduced known predators of juvenile salmonids are found in the Yuba River including striped bass, American shad and black bass species. Sacramento pikeminnow, a native predatory species is also found in the lower Yuba River. Manmade alterations to the lower Yuba River channel (i.e., Daguerre Point Dam) may provide more predation opportunities for pikeminnow than would occur under natural conditions.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The extent of potential hatchery effects on juvenile Chinook salmon in the lower Yuba River is unknown. It is possible that some hatchery-reared Chinook salmon from the FRFH may move into the lower Yuba

River in search of rearing habitat. Some competition for resources with naturally spawned Chinook salmon could occur as a result. Additionally, hatchery-reared steelhead from the FRFH could likewise move into the Yuba River in search of rearing habitat and may prey on juvenile Chinook salmon.

3.3.8.3 BUTTE CREEK

Butte Creek originates in the Jonesville Basin, Lassen National Forest, on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and drains about 150 square miles in the northeast portion of Butte County. Butte Creek enters the Sacramento Valley southeast of Chico and meanders in a southwesterly direction to the initial point of entry into the Sacramento River at Butte Slough. A second point of entry into the Sacramento River is through the Sutter Bypass and Sacramento Slough.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Butte Creek is a highly developed watershed system with multiple diversions as well as water imports from foreign sources. Fish passage through Butte Creek is affected by about 22 major structures and an estimated 60 to 80 minor structures (e.g., pump diversions). Currently, it is estimated that salmonids have access to approximately 53 miles of Butte Creek (DWR 2005a).

There are several fish passage impediments and barriers on Butte Creek upstream of Highway 99, including the Quartz Bowl Falls (natural impediment) and the Centerville Diversion Dam (manmade barrier). CDFG reported that salmon and steelhead are unable to migrate upstream of the Quartz Bowl Falls on an annual basis (DWR 2005a). CDFG biologist report observing salmon in the reach between Quartz Bowl Falls and the Centerville Head Dam on only three occasions in the past 25 years when spring flows were in excess of 2,000 cfs (e.g., 1998 and 2003).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational fishing in Butte Creek is limited to catch-and-release of trout and salmon from November 15 through February 15 with gear restrictions (i.e., artificial lures and barbless hooks only). These restrictions apply to the reach of Butte Creek extending from the Oro-Chico Road Bridge upstream to the Centerville Head Dam. Downstream of this point, recreational fishing is allowed year-round for species other than trout and salmon.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures were monitored from June through October from Cable Bridge (downstream) to Quartz Bowl (upstream) within the spring-run Chinook salmon holding and spawning reach of Butte Creek in 2002. **Table 3-2** depicts water temperature exceedances of critical values as measured at different locations in Butte Creek during 2002 from June through October.

Table 3-2. Water Temperature Exceedances in Butte Creek in 2002

Location	Number of Days Equal to or Exceeding		
	15.0ºC (59°F)	17.5ºC (63.5°F)	20.0ºC (68°F)
Quartz Bowl Pool	105	57	8
Chimney Rock	113	68	18
Pool 4	121	81	41
Centerville Estates	122	81	44
Cable Bridge	127	99	54

Pre-spawning mortality surveys were conducted in 2002 from the Parrot-Phelan Diversion to the Centerville Head Dam. There were 1,699 pre-spawning mortalities observed from June 26, 2002 to September 19, 2002. Higher than normal water temperatures in conjunction with a large number of adult returns resulted in an outbreak of Columnaris (*Flavobacterium columnare*). Pre-spawning mortalities in Butte Creek prior to this had been reported, however, they have been sporadically recorded, but have never been systematically assessed (CDFG 2000).

There were approximately 17,294 adult spring-run Chinook salmon that migrated to Butte Creek during 2003, of those an estimated 11,231 pre-spawning mortalities occurred. According to CDFG pathologists, the primary cause of these mortalities was an outbreak of two diseases, *Flovobacterium columnare* (Columnaris) and the protozoan *Ichthyophthirius multiphilis* (Ich).

WATER QUALITY

Currently, water quality conditions in Butte Creek meet all EPA water quality constituent requirements.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The present PG&E hydropower facilities divert water from the West Branch of the Feather River at the Hendricks Head Dam near Stirling City, which is then combined with Butte Creek water diverted at the Butte Head Dam. Power is generated at two sites - the DeSabla Powerhouse located above spring-run Chinook salmon holding and spawning areas, and the Centerville Powerhouse located in the middle of the approximately 11-mile holding and spawning reach. Annual diversion from the West Branch of the Feather River average approximately 47,000 acre-feet, and provides approximately 40 percent of the flows in Butte Creek during the months of July through September.

Diversions at the PG&E Centerville Head Dam supply water to the Centerville Powerhouse and reduce flows in Butte Creek to a minimum of 40 cfs from June 1 through September 14. The reach of Butte Creek between the Centerville Head Dam and the Centerville Powerhouse is approximately 5.5 miles long and is considered to be the highest quality and quantity of summer holding habitat in Butte Creek.

Diversions at the Centerville Head Dam which supply water to the Centerville Powerhouse, significantly reduce water temperatures in the reach immediately below the powerhouse due to reduced transit time and shading along the diversion canal. This reduction in water temperatures provides additional summer holding habitat that would potentially not exist.

PG&E determined that maintaining flows through the DeSabla Forebay above 80 cfs to 100 cfs helped to maintain cool water temperatures. While the existing operation of PG&E project facilities seems to provide an overall benefit to salmon holding and spawning, several potential future modifications to PG&E operations which may further improve water temperature conditions are as follows:

- Provide a flow bypass around DeSabla Forebay.
- Develop a water temperature model for flows entering Butte Creek from the West Branch of the Feather River.
- Avoid flow fluctuations during holding and spawning periods.
- Provide potential alternate conveyance and discharge points along the Centerville Canal which supplies water to the Centerville Powerhouse.

SPAWNING

Spring-run Chinook salmon in Butte Creek primarily spawn in stream reaches between the Parrot-Phelan Diversion Dam and the Centerville Head Dam (USFWS 2003a).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Historically, dams, inefficient fish ladders, and the dewatering of portions of Butte Creek as a result of water diversions created impediments to upstream passage for spawning adult spring-run Chinook salmon. Since the early 1990s, restoration actions in Butte Creek have focused on improving instream flow during the spring critical immigration period, thereby increasing the likelihood that fish will succeed in reaching the upstream holding and spawning areas, even in dry years. Currently, the minimum flow for allowing upstream passage is estimated at 80 cfs (CALFED 2006).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Butte Creek, from the confluence with the Sacramento River upstream to the Oro-Chico Road Bridge crossing south of Chico, is closed to trout and salmon fishing year-round. From the Oro-Chico Road Bridge crossing upstream to the Centerville Head Dam, catch and release fishing for trout and salmon is allowed from November 15 through February 15. However, Butte Creek is open to fishing for other species all year and some inadvertent catch of spring-run Chinook salmon may occur.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures between Parrot-Phelan Diversion Dam and the Centerville Head Dam in Butte Creek frequently exceed the reported optimums for spring-run Chinook spawning. Water temperatures frequently exceed 59ºF from July through September. In recent years, as escapement in Butte Creek has increased, mortality of pre-spawning adults has also increased due to a combination of high water temperatures and the bacterial disease Columnaris, leading to speculation that the adult carrying capacity of Butte Creek has been reached (Stillwater Sciences Website 2007). An estimated 17,294 adult spring-run Chinook salmon migrated to Butte Creek during 2003, of which an estimated 11,231 died prior to spawning (Ward *et al.* 2003b). Pre-spawn mortalities were primarily due to high water temperatures, overcrowding of fish in limited holding pools, and disease (e.g., Columnaris and Ich) (Ward *et al.* 2003b).

Subsequent to the 1991 FERC requirement that PG&E maintain a minimum release of 40 cfs from June through September below the Centerville Head Dam, Ward *et al*. (2003b) report that the flow and temperature regime appears to have maximized survival and spawning success.

WATER QUALITY

Available data indicate that overall water quality in Butte Creek ranges from good to excellent in the upper watershed and degrades in quality lower in the system (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004). Both pH and dissolved oxygen concentrations appear to be below Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) criteria all of the time. Turbidity, mineral concentrations, nutrient loads and heavy metal concentrations (e.g., lead) have at times exceeded Central Valley RWQCB criteria for short periods of time (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

FLOW CONDITIONS

PG&E's minimum instream flow requirement at the Lower Centerville Diversion Dam is 40 cfs from June 1 to September 14. Average monthly flows from June through September (1998-2002) were between 49 cfs and 46 cfs. During the onset of the spawning period in mid-September of 2004, PG&E in consultation with CDFG and NMFS, increased flows to 60 cfs (PG&E 2005).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Based upon estimates of spawning habitat, the reach of Butte Creek upstream of the Centerville Powerhouse could support 152 to 1,316 spawners at 40 cfs and 270 to 2,352 spawners at 130 cfs. The reach downstream of the powerhouse could support 1,262 to 10,976 spawners at 130 cfs.

Within the 11-mile spring-run Chinook salmon holding and spawning reach, the area with the most deep holding pools is within the upper three miles of the reach while the majority of suitable spawning gravel substrate is within the lower five miles of the reach (Ward *et al.* 2003b).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Hydropower generation has altered flows in Butte Creek since about 1908. During the key June to September holding period, diversions from the West Branch of the Feather River have increased natural flows in the creek and have generally provided cooler temperatures (Ward *et al.* 2003b).

The reach of Butte Creek from the Centerville Powerhouse downstream to the Parrott-Phelan Dam has undergone and continues to undergo residential development. Channel modification projects designed to repair or prevent flood-related damage to roads and houses have degraded natural processes which serve to recruit gravel, provide instream cover and forage, and provide summer holding pools (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The trucking of FRFH spring-run, and their release into San Pablo Bay, facilitates the straying of adult spring-run hatchery returns and threatens the Butte Creek spring-run population. Genetic integrity of the Butte Creek spring-run may be compromised, and their fitness and productivity lowered. The hatchery stock would compete with native spring-run over available holding and spawning habitat, and possibly transfer the Feather River strain of IHNV to the local population. The BRT considers the FRFH spring-run Chinook salmon program to be a major threat to the genetic integrity of wild spring-run Chinook salmon populations in the Central Valley (NMFS 2003).

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because Butte Creek is open to angling year-round, there may be some inadvertent negative impacts to embryo incubation from anglers wading through redds or otherwise disturbing substrates containing redds.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The thermal criteria used to evaluate the suitability of spring-run Chinook salmon water temperatures suggests that water temperatures between 57.2ºF and 60.8ºF for a duration of approximately 20 days could potentially result embryo mortality rates of up to 25 percent from September 15 to September 30 (Armour 1991; CDFG 1998). However, it has been suggested that given that Butte Creek spring-run Chinook salmon are genetically distinct from the Mill Creek and Deer Creek populations (Lindley *et al.* 2004), it is likely that they have adapted to the warmer environs of the Butte Creek watershed. It could be possible that Butte Creek spring -run Chinook salmon can tolerate water temperatures exceeding 60ºF which can occur during the first month of embryo incubation. However, there also may be higher embryo mortality rate for eggs deposited during first month (September) of the spawning period, relative to those deposited later during October when water temperatures decrease below approximately 55ºF (**Figure 3-7**).



Figure 3-7. Water Temperatures Recorded in Butte Creek Near Chico During the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Embryo Incubation Period (September through January)
(USGS Gage: 39.7260°N 121.7090°W)

WATER QUALITY

Available data indicate that overall water quality in Butte Creek ranges from good to excellent in the upper watershed and degrades in quality lower in the system (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004). Both pH and dissolved oxygen concentrations appear to be below Central Valley RWQCB criteria all of the time. Turbidity, mineral concentrations, nutrient loads and heavy metal concentrations (e.g., lead) have at times exceeded Central Valley RWQCB criteria for short periods of time (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

The upper reaches of Butte Creek reportedly have relatively high dissolved oxygen concentrations. Monitoring conducted by DWR between December 1990 and October 1992, recorded dissolved oxygen levels ranging from 9.1 mg/l to 13.1 mg/l. These levels exceed minimum EPA requirements (PG&E 2005).

FLOW CONDITIONS

PG&E's minimum instream flow requirement at the Lower Centerville Diversion Dam is 40 cfs from June 1 to September 14. Average monthly flows from June through September (1998-2002) were between 49 cfs and 46 cfs. During the onset of the spawning period in mid-September of 2004, PG&E in consultation with CDFG and NMFS, increased flows to 60 cfs (PG&E 2005).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the period when flows are managed and when juvenile Chinook salmon are present (e.g., October 15 through January), are likely near optimal ranges. However, water temperatures could be a concern during the late spring especially in the lower reaches of Butte Creek. During the 2002-2003 juvenile migration study period in Butte Creek, the majority of Butte Creek juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon emigrated as fry from December through January. As observed during previous study years, some young-of-the-year remained in Butte Creek above the Parrot-Phelan Diversion Dam prior to emigrating in the spring (Ward *et al.* 2004).

WATER QUALITY

Available data indicate that overall water quality in Butte Creek ranges from good to excellent in the upper watershed and degrades in quality lower in the system (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004). Both pH and dissolved oxygen concentrations appear to be below Central Valley RWQCB criteria all of the time. Turbidity, mineral concentrations, nutrient loads and heavy metal concentrations (e.g., lead) have at times exceeded Central Valley RWQCB criteria for short periods of time (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Butte Creek is primarily a free-flowing stream lacking large dams to control or buffer flows (CDFG 1999a). Flows are highly variable with the majority of out migration of juveniles occurring during high flow events (CDFG 1999a).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The distribution of riparian habitat, particularly in the lower reaches of Butte Creek, has been reduced by anthropogenic changes for flood control, agriculture and urbanization (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

The reach of Butte Creek from the Centerville Powerhouse downstream to the Parrott-Phelan Dam has undergone, and continues to undergo, residential development. Channel modification projects designed to repair or prevent flood-related damage to roads and houses have degraded natural processes which serve to recruit gravel, provide instream cover and forage, and provide summer holding pools (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Although Butte Creek is bordered by levees in some areas, it also passes through Butte Slough and the Sutter Bypass where connectivity to the floodplain still exists to some extent (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

ENTRAINMENT

In Butte Creek most water diversion facilities have been screened or modified to prevent juvenile fish entrainment (PG&E 2005). In addition, as part of PG&E's FERC relicensing project, PG&E has proposed to undertake a project assessing potential juvenile entrainment at its project facilities including the Hendricks Canal, Toadtown Canal and Powerhouse, Butte Canal, DeSabla Forebay and Powerhouse, Lower Centerville Canal, and Centerville Powerhouse (PG&E 2005).

PREDATION

Introduced fish species that are known predators in the Butte Creek system include largemouth and smallmouth bass, black and white crappie, channel catfish and potentially, striped bass and American shad. The native Sacramento pikeminnow is also a major predator on juvenile salmonids particularly near manmade structures (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Juvenile Chinook salmon in Butte Creek are not likely directly affected by hatchery operations. There is some potential for outmigrating juveniles to be preyed upon by hatchery steelhead as they enter either the Sacramento or Feather rivers.

3.3.8.4 BIG CHICO CREEK

Big Chico Creek originates on Colby Mountain, located in Tehama County, California. The creek flows 45 miles to its confluence with the Sacramento River in Butte County. The creek's elevation ranges from 120 feet at the Sacramento River to 6000 feet at Colby Mountain. A portion of Big Chico Creek flows through the city of Chico, California's Bidwell Park and California State University, Chico. Big Chico Creek currently supports a remnant, non-sustaining population of spring-run Chinook salmon.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Big Chico Creek has no major reservoirs, but has five small dams and three natural barriers that could impede anadromous fish migration.

Five Mile Dam was built by the USACE for the purpose of flood control in 1963. The dam effectively spilt the Big Chico Creek flows into three separate channels - Big Chico Creek, Sycamore Channel, and Lindo Channel. The design of the flood control structure creates a ponding effect upstream during flood events. This causes gravels to drop out of suspended load upstream of the diversion which creates a gravel bar that blocks the flow to Lindo Channel unless it the gravel bar is mechanically removed. As a result, Lindo Channel frequently lacks sufficient flows to allow upstream migrants to pass, and has the potential to trap adults within the channel during immigration to spawning areas upstream (DWR 2005b).

The Iron Canyon fish ladder was built in the late 1950s to facilitate fish passage through Bidwell Park. This structure has been damaged, and frequently impedes adult salmonid upstream migration. Currently, a project is underway to repair the fish ladder to allow fish passage to an additional 9 miles of spawning habitat over a wider range of flows (CDFG Website 2005). In addition, fish passage through the narrow canyon walls of Bear Hole, located downstream of the Iron Canyon fish ladder, impedes fish passage during low flows. Under high flow conditions, fish have been observed passing major barriers (Iron Canyon). However, under normal and low-flow conditions fish passage is more problematic (DWR 2005b).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational catch-and-release fishing in Big Chico Creek is permitted: (1) one mile downstream of Bidwell Park, is limited to June 16 through October 15 with gear restrictions (i.e., artificial lures and barbless hooks only); and (2) from Bear Hole to the Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve from November 1 through April 30. Fishing upstream of Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve is prohibited year-round.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During low flows in the summer, water flows continuously through Big Chico Creek, however, in Lindo Channel, flows become intermittent. It has been suggested that water temperatures from Iron Canyon to Higgins, which may contain holding adult spring-run Chinook salmon, can potentially reach critical levels during the late summer, particularly during dry water years (DWR 2005b).

Higgins Hole is the upstream limit to spring-run Chinook salmon immigration and is reportedly the best summer holding habitat available in Big Chico Creek. However, mean daily water temperatures during the summer months reportedly generally range from 64ºF to 68ºF (**Figure 3-8**).



Figure 3-8. Average Daily Water Temperatures in Big Chico Creek Near Chico During the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Adult Immigration and Holding Period March through September (2000-2005)
Source: CDEC

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Big Chico Creek and Lindo Channel has been degraded by cadmium, mercury, and other metals associated with gold mining in the upper watershed. The California State University, Chico reported significant concentrations of fecal coliform bacteria during the summer months due to Sycamore pool, which is heavily used as a swimming hole. However, Big Chico Creek currently meets EPA water quality constituent standards. There is also potential for increased suspended sediment loads during the cleaning of Sycamore Pool which is formed by One-Mile Dam. However, a project was completed in 1997 which constructed a bypass waterway that isolates the cleaning area from the flowing creek. The bypass channel consists of a concrete box culvert installed below the surface of the pool bottom. The channel extends the entire length of the pool exiting beyond the fish ladder. A flash board dam will be installed at the entrance to the pool to provide for the diversion of clean water from the channel during cleaning operations.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Mean monthly flows in Big Chico Creek from 1930 to 1986 during the spring-run Chinook salmon immigration and holding period (i.e., February through August) range from approximately 400 cfs to approximately 40 cfs.

Big Chico Creek flows through the Chico alluvial fan at the Five-Mile Recreation Area. Flows at Five-Mile are regulated for flood control by diversion of high flows from a single stilling basin in Big Chico Creek and two flood bypass channels (Lindo Channel and Sycamore Channel). The invert elevations of Big Chico Creek and the Lindo Channel diversion are similar, thus flows are sustained in both channels during the summer low flow period. However, due to a gravel bar formation below the stilling basin, flows in Lindo Channel become intermittent from May through November each year.

SPAWNING

Spring-run Chinook salmon in Big Chico Creek primarily spawn in stream reaches between the Higgins Hole and Iron Canyon (CDFG 2004a).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The first barrier to upstream migration on Big Chico Creek occurs in Iron Canyon where a jumble of boulders has accumulated in the Creek. These boulders present an impassable barrier at normal flows but allow passage at high flows (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007). The Iron Canyon fish ladder was built in the late 1950s to facilitate fish passage. This structure has been damaged, and frequently impedes adult salmonid upstream migration. Currently, a project is underway to repair the fish ladder to allow fish passage to an additional nine miles of spawning habitat over a wider range of flows (CDFG Website 2005). The waterfall at Higgins Hole is currently thought to be the uppermost barrier to anadromous fish migrations (CDFG 2001a).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Currently, Big Chico Creek is open to catch and release fishing from the confluence with the Sacramento River to Bear Hole located approximately one mile downstream of Bidwell Park during the June 16 to February 15 time period, however, from October 15 through February 15 only barbless artificial lures may be used. Big Chico Creek, from Bear Hole to the upper boundary of the Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve is open to catch and release fishing, with barbless artificial lures, from November 1 through April 30. From the upper boundary of the ecological reserve to Higgins Hole Falls, Big Chico Creek is closed to fishing at all times of the year.

WATER TEMPERATURES

Summer water temperatures in Big Chico Creek are marginal for holding spring-run Chinook salmon and are seldom suitable for spawning until mid-October (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007). **Figure 3-9** depicts stream water temperatures recorded in Big Chico Creek near Chico during the normal spring-run Chinook salmon spawning period of September through October.



Figure 3-9. Average Daily Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek Near Chico During Adult Spring-run Chinook Salmon Spawning Period September through October (2000-2004)

WATER QUALITY

A number of issues and concerns have been raised regarding the water quality in the Big Chico Creek watershed, primarily, increased sediment loads and turbidity, fecal coliform contamination, urban stormwater runoff, groundwater contamination, agricultural runoff, siltation-, pollutant-, and garbage-related contamination from the Minnehaha Mine, sediment-, erosion-, and septic-related contamination from the Boy Scout Camp at Chico Meadows, and the potential threat of petroleum contamination from Highway 32 (CDFG 2001a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Adult spring-run Chinook salmon enter Big Chico Creek between March and June, although, late arriving individuals often have difficulty in upstream migrations because of low-flow conditions. Early arriving individuals are normally blocked by waterfalls. Spring-run Chinook salmon normally spend summer months in deep pools from Iron Canyon to Higgins Hole and spawn in adjacent riffles when water temperatures become suitable in the fall (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

A survey of spawning gravels was conducted by DWR in 1997 to determine the gravel size distribution at various spawning sites in Big Chico Creek. The sites were located along Big Chico Creek at Highway 32; below the Five-Mile Area flood control structure; and at Rose Avenue. The gravel sizes ranged from 20 mm to 100 mm (approximately 1 to 4 inches) in mean diameter. Gravels within these ranges are considered to be suitable for salmonid spawning (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

Gravel recruitment downstream of the Five-Mile Flood Diversion Complex is reduced and gravel also becomes trapped in the One-Mile Pond from which it is customarily removed rather than transported downstream (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007). Additionally, the practice of removing large woody debris from urban and floodway stream reaches has reduced habitat and increased streambed scouring (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The presence of dams on Big Chico Creek limits the composition and volume of sediments transported which reduces the supply of spawning gravels downstream of the dams. Large volumes of suspended sediment in the bedload are deposited within the stilling pond above the Five-Mile area. As a result, coarse sediments are not transported downstream below the Five-Mile area. At Chico's One-Mile Recreation Area, the flow is again reduced and additional volumes of sediment are deposited on the upstream side of the dam. Low-flow silt transport in the Big Chico Creek has been increased by swimming pool clean out and summer water activities by humans, dogs and horses. Unlike high-flow conditions in which silt only deposits where flow velocity is reduced in backwater and overflow sites, silt carried during low flows settle out in riffles and pools where it degrades habitat for spawning (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The trucking of FRFH spring-run, and their release into San Pablo Bay, facilitates the straying of adult spring-run hatchery returns and threatens the Big Chico Creek spring-run population. Genetic integrity of the Big Chico Creek spring-run may be compromised, and their fitness and productivity lowered. The hatchery stock would compete with native spring-run over available holding and spawning habitat, and possibly transfer the Feather River strain of IHNV to the local population.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because Big Chico Creek is open to angling during the spring-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation period, there may be some inadvertent negative impacts to embryo incubation from anglers wading through redds or otherwise disturbing substrates containing redds.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The thermal criteria used to evaluate the suitability of spring-run Chinook salmon water temperatures suggests that water temperatures between 57.2ºF and 60.8ºF for approximately 20 days could potentially result in embryo mortality rates of up to 25 percent from September 15 to September 30 (USFWS 1996; Armour 1991; and CDFG 1998). However, it is hypothesized that Big Chico Creek spring-run Chinook salmon may be more tolerant of high water temperatures then those in nearby streams (e.g., Mill, Deer and Butte creeks) (Lindley *et al.* 2004). There would likely be higher embryo mortality rate for eggs deposited during the first month (September) of the spawning period, relative to those deposited later during October of some water years when temperatures decrease below approximately 55ºF (**Figure 3-10)**.



Figure 3-10. Water Temperatures Recorded in Big Chico Creek Near Chico During the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Embryo Incubation Period (September through January)
(39.7680°N 121.7770°W)

WATER QUALITY

A number of issues and concerns have been raised regarding the water quality in the Big Chico Creek watershed, primarily, increased sediment loads and turbidity, fecal coliform contamination, urban stormwater runoff, groundwater contamination, agricultural runoff, siltation-, pollutant-, and garbage-related contamination from the Minnehaha Mine, sediment-, erosion-, and septic-related contamination from the Boy Scout Camp at Chico Meadows, and the potential threat of petroleum contamination from Highway 32 (CDFG 2001a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Due to flood control management structures (e.g., Lindo Channel and the Sycamore Creek Bypass Channel) Big Chico Creek lacks the flows necessary to maintain the optimal substrate size distributions for the successful incubation of spring-run Chinook salmon embryos. Substrates are often dominated by small gravel, sand, and fine sediments which reduce the interstitial spaces between substrates. Such reductions can result in decreased water flow through redds, leading to low dissolved oxygen concentrations, and poor removal of metabolic wastes. These conditions could reduce embryo growth rates, fitness, and survival.

Fluctuation in flows during the embryo incubation period that could potentially cause redd dewatering events in Big Chico Creek have not been reported to date.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Big Chico Creek, downstream of Iron Canyon, are not suitable for salmonids during the summer months. Most juvenile rearing of spring-run Chinook salmon occurs in the foothill reaches (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

WATER QUALITY

A number of issues and concerns have been raised regarding the water quality in the Big Chico Creek watershed, primarily, increased sediment loads and turbidity, fecal coliform contamination, urban stormwater runoff, groundwater contamination, agricultural runoff, siltation-, pollutant-, and garbage-related contamination from the Minnehaha Mine, sediment-, erosion-, and septic-related contamination from the Boy Scout Camp at Chico Meadows, and the potential threat of petroleum contamination from Highway 32 (CDFG 2001a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Big Chico creek begin to decline in the late-spring and are continuous only in the main channel by summer. The Lindo Channel and Mud Creek channels have only intermittent flow during most years during the summer months (DWR 2005a). As a result of these receding flows there is a potential that juvenile fish emigrating later in the spring may be exposed to sub-optimal water temperatures and stranding due to receding flows in Big Chico Creek and its flood control channels (CDFG 2001a).

Lindo Channel often ceases to flow, sometimes trapping downstream migrants several times during a single season (Ward *et al.* 2004). However, a habitat evaluation of Big Chico Creek, Lindo Channel, and Mud Creek conducted by CDFG in 2001 determined that these waterways provided juvenile Chinook salmon with a variety of habitats with suitable cover, substrates, and water temperatures during the winter and early spring (CDFG 2001a).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Anthropogenic changes in the Big Chico Creek watershed have reduced or degraded riparian habitat. However, some programs are underway to improve riparian habitat by various groups in the area. For example, there has been marked improvement in riparian habitat in Lindo Channel between Manzanita Avenue and Mangrove Avenue (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Some of the valley reaches in Lindo Channel, Mud and Rock creeks that are maintained for flood control, lack sufficient vegetation to maintain stream structure (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Flows in Big Chico Creek, as it emerges onto the Chico Fan at the Five-Mile Recreation Area are regulated for flood control by diversion of flows into two bypass channels: Lindo Channel and the Sycamore Creek Bypass Channel. This has resulted in a disconnection of the river to its normal floodplain and likely results in less habitat diversity in the lower reaches of Big Chico Creek (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

ENTRAINMENT

Currently, juvenile salmonids have a potential for being entrained at the Parrot-Phelan Pumping Station. There are currently plans to develop a "fish-friendly" alternative for the M&T Ranches' Parrot-Phelan Pumping Station by relocating the pumping station and providing fish screens on the diversion structures. In addition to providing water supply to agricultural operations in the area, CDFG and USFWS also hold rights to use water to flood wetlands in the Llano Seco Ranch they own and operate. CDFG and USFWS do not use their water rights because of potential impacts to salmon. Relocation of the pumping station would allow them to exercise their legal rights and also reduce fish entrainment along Big Chico Creek.

Entrainment and/or impingement of juvenile fish at the various flood control structures and diversions in Big Chico Creek could potentially cause physical harm to rearing and emigrating juveniles during high flows in the winter and early spring. As a result these structures constitute a chronic threat to spring-run Chinook juvenile rearing and emigration life stage.

PREDATION

Smallmouth bass are abundant in the valley zone of Big Chico Creek. Smallmouth bass are particularly abundant in dry years while in wet years, high flows typically scour the fish from streams. Therefore, during dry years, smallmouth bass likely present a predation problem for juvenile salmonids in Big Chico Creek (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007). Big Chico Creek also supports a population of brown trout which are a known piscivorous species (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

From 1987 to 1992, spring-run Chinook salmon fry were planted in Big Chico Creek during the spring. The plants did not appear to be successful in that very few, if any, of the planted fish returned to spawn (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

3.3.8.5 DEER CREEK

Deer Creek is part of the lower Cascade Mountain Range and drains an area of approximately 229 square miles. Deer Creek meets the Sacramento River near the town of Vina at RM 230. Deer Creek currently supports a small self-sustaining population of spring-run Chinook salmon. The viability of the population in Deer Creek is dependent on the maintenance and protection of what is currently considered to be excellent habitat. Unlike many Central Valley watersheds, headwater stream habitat in the drainages adjacent to Mount Lassen remains relatively undisturbed. Deer Creek has approximately 25 miles of accessible anadromous fish habitat within the Lassen National Forest.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The first natural barrier in Deer Creek is a fall about nine miles upstream of Polk Springs and approximately 40 miles from the mouth. This fall is about 16 feet high, and salmon had never been known to pass beyond it until a fish ladder was constructed in 1943. There is a second fall on Deer Creek about ten miles upstream of the falls near Polk Springs. This fall contains a sheer drop of about 20 feet. A fish ladder also was constructed at this barrier in early 1950s, but is not operated to allow spring-run Chinook salmon to move upstream because the upstream areas are thought to lack holding habitat (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007).

Deer Creek has five potential manmade physical impediments to fish passage in the lower watershed; (1) Stanford-Vina Ranch Diversion Dam, which is equipped with functioning fish ladders; (2) Cone-Kimball Diversion Dam; (3) North Main Diversion Canal; (4) Deer Creek Irrigation Company Dam (a collapsible structure that is not a permanent impediment to fish passage); and (5) an unnamed canal. Historically, these water diversions caused instream flows to decrease to levels which blocked access for late-summer upstream fish migration (DWR 2005a). However, the Stanford Vina Ranch Irrigation Company (SVRIC) has responded to CDFG requests for voluntary system shut downs to provide "transport windows" for migrating anadromous salmonids (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007).

The SVRIC also has constructed a holding pool downstream of its dam for upstream migrating adult salmonids and has made fish ladder improvements. The negative impacts of water diversions from Deer Creek may be mitigated by a proposed water exchange project, which would provide replacement water in lieu of water from water diversions during biologically critical periods. Replacement water may be from groundwater wells or other sources. Development of this replacement water requires some funding. All of the diversion structures would contain CDFG-designed and operated fish ladders and screens (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The entire Deer Creek fishery is limited to catch and release of spring-run Chinook salmon, which occurs from below upper Deer Creek Falls and fishway downstream to the USGS gaging station from the last Saturday in April to November 15 with gear restrictions (i.e., artificial lures and barbless hooks only), and from the USGS gaging station to the mouth of Deer Creek from June 16 through September 30.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The following water temperature information was obtained from the Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007).

DWR maintains a water temperature data logger at the Highway 99 Bridge. Data records exist in a computerized database for the period of July 1993 to present. This station is part of the DWR Water Quantity and Quality Measurement Program for collecting long-term basic data at various stations. Since May of 1997, DWR also has maintained continuous water temperature recorders at eight stations in Deer Creek (i.e., at the mouth, Highway 99, upper diversion dam, Ponderosa Way, A Line Road, the Meadows, Upper Falls, and Apperson Camp).

A review of the data from July 1993 to the present for the Highway 99 Bridge station indicates that, during the period of mid-May through mid-September, water temperatures exceeded 80°F on numerous occasions.

The CDFG previously monitored water temperatures via data loggers on Deer Creek at Stanford-Vina Dam, A Line Road Crossing, and Ponderosa Way. Data exist for portions of the years from 1992 to 1996. These units were displaced in the floods of January 1997. The purpose for temperature monitoring was to

evaluate spring-run salmon life history patterns (e.g., adult/juvenile migration patterns). CDFG has particular concerns about temperatures greater than 80°F below Stanford-Vina Dam.

Reviews of the CDFG data indicate that maximum water temperatures observed at Stanford-Vina Dam for April, May, and June of 1994 were 77.2°F, 81.1°F, and 86.0°F, respectively. There is only one year of record for this station. At the next station upstream (Ponderosa Way), the maximum 1992 water temperature occurred on July 17 (76.1°F). Records for Ponderosa Way during 1993, 1994, and 1996 are incomplete. The maximum water temperature for 1995 was 67.6°F on July 18. The uppermost station at A Line Road Crossing had an observed maximum water temperature in 1992 of 69.6°F (July 17). In 1993, the maximum water temperature at this station was 66°F, which occurred on August 2. The maximum observed water temperatures during 1994 and 1995 were 69.8°F (July 20) and 62.2°F (August 5), respectively. No records exist for the summer and fall during 1996 at A Line Road Crossing.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Deer Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Deer Creek currently meets EPA water quality standards.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Water diversions reduce streamflow in Deer Creek which may impede migration of adult spring-run Chinook salmon. There is a proposed water exchange project that may allow adequate flows during periods of fish migration. However, an instream flow assessment is necessary to determine appropriate flow levels in Deer Creek (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007).

SPAWNING

The Upper Canyon Reach of Deer Creek extends from the lowermost Highway 32 Bridge crossing downstream approximately 14 miles. The known range for adult spring-run Chinook salmon spawning extends from the Upper Falls downstream to the mouth of the canyon (DWR 2005a). Deer Creek is reported to have excellent spawning and holding habitat throughout the Lower Canyon Reach upstream to the Upper Deer Creek Falls near Highway 32.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Deer Creek has five potential manmade physical impediments to fish passage in the lower watershed; (1) Stanford-Vina Ranch Diversion Dam, which is equipped with functioning fish ladders; (2) Cone-Kimball Diversion Dam; (3) North Main Diversion Canal; (4) Deer Creek Irrigation Company Dam (a collapsible structure that is not a permanent impediment to fish passage); and (5) an unnamed canal. Historically, these water diversions caused instream flows to decrease to levels which blocked access for late-summer upstream fish migration (DWR 2005a). However, the SVRIC has responded to CDFG requests for voluntary system shut downs to provide "transport windows" for migrating anadromous salmonids (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Regulations in Deer Creek permit catch and release fishing only. From Deer Creek falls, downstream for 31 miles, catch and release fishing with artificial lures and barbless hooks is permitted from the last Saturday in April through November 15. From the USGS gaging station cable crossing downstream to the mouth of Deer Creek, catch and release fishing is permitted from June 16 through September 30.

WATER TEMPERATURES

Maximum daily water temperatures from the Upper Falls to Ponderosa Way from June through October (1995 through 1998) range between 65.5ºF and 72.5ºF (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007). It is likely that suitable water temperatures for spawning spring-run Chinook salmon do not occur until mid- to late-October.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Deer Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

There has been no salmonid flow habitat relationships developed for salmonids in Deer Creek. Because there are no major storage facilities on Deer Creek, late fall and winter flow patterns in the area where spring-run Chinook salmon spawning occurs, mimic natural patterns.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Spring-run Chinook salmon habitat in the upper watershed is considered to be excellent, with numerous holding areas and an abundance of spawning gravel (DWR 2005a; USFWS 1999). Flood protection, cattle grazing and water diversions have had a negative effect on habitat in the lower watershed. Stream channelization has reduced the opportunities for gravel deposition. Gravels that might have been deposited are likely to be washed downstream during high flow events because of the increased shear stress produced in these straightened reaches (DWR 2005a; USFWS 1999).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

While habitat in the upper watershed is relatively pristine, channelization has occurred in the lower watershed reducing opportunities for natural deposition of spawning gravel. Additionally, water diversions have led to low-flow conditions which can effect habitat availability (DWR 2005a; USFWS 1999).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The trucking of FRFH spring-run, and their release into San Pablo Bay, facilitates the straying of adult spring-run hatchery returns and threatens the Deer Creek spring-run population. Genetic integrity of the Deer Creek spring-run may be compromised, and their fitness and productivity lowered. The hatchery stock would compete with native spring-run over available holding and spawning habitat, and possibly transfer the Feather River strain of IHNV to the local population.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

Embryo incubation in Deer Creek reportedly occurs from mid-August through mid-March (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because Deer Creek is open to angling during most of the spring-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation period, there may be some inadvertent negative impacts to embryo incubation from anglers wading through redds or otherwise disturbing substrates containing redds.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature monitoring efforts on Deer Creek include data collected from 1993 to the present at the Highway 99 Bridge as part of the DWR Water Quantity and Quality Measurement Program. In addition, since May of 1997, DWR also has maintained continuous water temperature recorders at eight stations in Deer Creek (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007): (1) at the mouth of Deer Creek; (2) Highway 99; (3) upper diversion dam; (4) Ponderosa Way; (5) A Line Road; (6) the Meadows; (7) Upper Falls; (8) and Apperson Camp. However, data collected at these locations is not representative of conditions within primary spring-run Chinook salmon spawning areas located farther upstream (i.e., the Highway 32 Bridge upstream to the Upper Falls).

Based on recent relatively high natural production estimates for Deer Creek, it is likely that water temperatures in the upstream reaches of Deer Creek are suitable for all juvenile spring-run life stages, including embryo incubation.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Deer Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

There are no significant water diversions in the upstream reaches (i.e., primary spawning habitat) of Deer Creek that could result in unnatural flow fluctuations that could cause redd dewatering events.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Deer Creek reportedly provides relatively good habitat for juvenile salmonids (DWR 2005a). Water temperatures recorded in Deer Creek during the 1997-98 brood year (CDFG 1999b) were within the reported optimal ranges for the juvenile rearing and emigration period (January through March).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Deer Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Deer Creek flow average about 320 cfs over the course of a year, however, the stream experiences a high snowmelt flow almost every year and high flows resulting from rain on snow events. These high flows have been known to reach over 21,000 cfs breaching the levee system (MacWilliams *et al.* 2004). The downstream migration of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon occurs concurrently with peak flows from January through March. The extent to which flow fluctuations from water diversions in Deer Creek may cause juvenile stranding is currently unknown.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Recent studies have concluded that aquatic habitat in Deer Creek is limited by the current flood control project. Effects of the flood control project include lack of habitat diversity and riparian vegetation due to channel maintenance and clearing (MacWilliams *et al.* 2004)

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Flood control activities such as stream channelization and clearing have led to a lack of habitat diversity by constraining high flow and flood events between the levees (MacWilliams *et al.* 2004).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The Deer Creek Flood Control Project was completed by the USACE in 1953. About 16 km of levees were built along lower Deer Creek to control flooding and the channel was straightened and cleared. As a result of this work, natural geomorphic processes were disrupted and the riparian zone was limited to a small band within the constructed levees effectively severing the connection between Deer Creek and the floodplain (MacWilliams *et al.* 2004).

ENTRAINMENT

In Deer Creek, fish screens have been in place at all diversions, although some mortality is still reported to occur (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

PREDATION

Green sunfish, largemouth and smallmouth bass, striped bass and American shad are all piscivorous species that have been introduced to the Sacramento watershed. It is likely that sunfish and bass species both occur in Deer Creek and the loss of natural stream function associated with flood control measures likely enhances predation opportunities.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Juvenile Chinook salmon in Deer Creek are not likely directly affected by hatchery operations. There is some potential for outmigrating juveniles to be preyed upon by hatchery steelhead as they enter either the Sacramento River.

3.3.8.6 MILL CREEK

Mill Creek is an eastside tributary to the Sacramento River that flows in a southwesterly direction for approximately 60 miles and drains 134 square miles. The creek originates near a thermal spring area in Lassen Volcanic National Park at an elevation of approximately 8,200 feet. It initially flows through meadows and dense forests and then descends rapidly through a steep rock canyon into the Sacramento Valley. Upon emerging from the canyon, the creek flows 8 miles across the Sacramento Valley floor, entering the Sacramento River about 1 mile north of the town of Tehama, near Los Molinos, at an elevation of approximately 200 feet.

The Revised Draft AFRP identifies Mill Creek as one of the high priority tributaries to the upper Sacramento River, particularly for its populations of spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no major reservoirs on Mill Creek. However, two diversions, Ward Dam and Upper Diversion Dam, have historically diverted most of the natural flow during the summer months. Clough Dam, a private diversion serving the properties of two local land owners, was partially washed out in the 1997 flood. The remnants of the dam were removed in 2002.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Mill Creek. For proposes of fishing regulations, the creek is divided into two reaches. From the Lassen National Park boundary downstream to the USGS gaging station at the mouth of Mill Creek Canyon, fishing with barbless hooks and artificial lures is allowed from the last Saturday in April through November 15. From that point downstream to the mouth, fishing is allowed from June 16 through September 30.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Average daily mean water temperatures from May through September (i.e., during the adult spring-run Chinook salmon holding period) in upper Mill Creek during 1997 ranged from approximately 50ºF to approximately 70ºF. During this period average daily water temperatures generally remained between 60ºF and 65ºF (Harvey-Arrison 1999).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Mill Creek is adequate to support spring-run Chinook salmon adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Mill Creek supports three water diversions. During the irrigation season, instream flows may drop low enough to prevent late migrating adults from moving upstream (DWR 2005a). In dry years when natural flows are low and diversions are operating, increased water temperatures occurring from May through June in the lower reaches of Mill Creek can create a thermal barrier, preventing or delaying adult spring-run Chinook salmon upstream migration (DWR 2005a).

SPAWNING

In Mill Creek, spring-run Chinook salmon hold and spawn from approximately the Lassen National Park boundary downstream to the Little Mill Creek confluence (CDFG 1999b).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Prior to 1997, Clough Dam created a partial barrier to upstream migration in Mill Creek and was utilized as a counting station. In 1997, a flood breached Clough Dam allowing unimpaired access to lower Mill Creek (CDFG 1999b).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Mill Creek. For proposes of fishing regulations, the creek is divided into two reaches. From the Lassen National Park boundary downstream to the USGS gaging station at the mouth of Mill Creek Canyon, fishing with barbless hooks and artificial lures is allowed from the last Saturday in April through November 15. From that point downstream to the mouth, fishing is allowed from June 16 through September 30.

WATER TEMPERATURES

Maximum daily water temperatures in Mill Creek at various locations recorded from April through November ranged from 62.7ºF to 73.0ºF. In most locations in Mill Creek, water temperatures suitable for spawning occur generally in about the beginning of September. Water temperatures near Little Mill Creek are generally not suitable for spawning until about the beginning of October (CDFG 1999b).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Mill Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum and copper have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Erosion from recent volcanic deposits in and near Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the headwaters of Mill Creek, contributes turbidity to the stream nearly year-round (CDFG 1999b). These water quality conditions likely have no adverse effects on immigrating Chinook salmon.

FLOW CONDITIONS

There have been no flow habitat relationships developed for Mill Creek. There are no major water storage facilities on Mill Creek and water diversions are not occurring during the time and in the area where spring-run Chinook salmon are spawning. Therefore, flows during the spring-run Chinook salmon spawning period tend to mimic historic conditions that occurred under natural flow regimes.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

The upper reaches of Mill Creek located above diversion dams reportedly provide excellent spring-run spawning habitat (DWR 2005a). Approximately 48 miles of potential spawning habitat exists from the confluence of Little Mill Creek upstream to Morgan Hot Springs (Klamath Resources Information Website 2007). Spawning habitat availability in the upper reaches of Mill Creek is reportedly not easily identifiable due to the variable size range of available substrates. However, individuals appear to be capable of accessing suitable size gravels located beneath the armored surfaces of the river bed (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

SPAWNING SUBSTRATE AVAILABILITY

High gravel embeddedness has been reported in some spawning areas (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The Mill Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow, with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as barriers to activity and land use allocations have protected these areas such that the mainstem of the stream is essentially undisturbed (CDFG 1999b).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The trucking of FRFH spring-run, and their release into San Pablo Bay, facilitates the straying of adult spring-run hatchery returns and threatens the Mill Creek spring-run population. Genetic integrity of the Mill Creek spring-run may be compromised, and their fitness and productivity lowered. The hatchery stock would compete with native spring-run over available holding and spawning habitat, and possibly transfer the Feather River strain of IHNV to the local population.

SHORT-TERM IN-RIVER CONSTRUCTION

Potential adverse effects due to construction activities are described in Section 3.3.5.1 above under Adult Holding and Immigration in the Sacramento River. The same regulations and measures to prevent or reduce adverse effects would be utilized in Mill Creek.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Mill Creek during a portion of the embryo incubation period for spring-run Chinook salmon. Therefore, redds may be exposed to inadvertent disturbance by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Spring-run Chinook salmon redds are located in the upstream reaches of Mill Creek which are generally characterized as having favorable water temperatures during the majority of the embryo incubation period (September through January).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Mill Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum and copper have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Erosion from recent volcanic deposits in and near Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the headwaters of Mill Creek, contributes turbidity to the stream nearly year-round (CDFG 1999b). Increased turbidity could adversely affect developing Chinook salmon embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions in the upstream reaches of Mill Creek are not affected by water diversions. As a result, any changes in flow that could potentially result in decreased oxygen flow, or redd dewatering events, would be due to natural fluctuations in streamflow.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Mill Creek reportedly provides relatively good habitat for juvenile salmonids (DWR 2005a). Water temperatures recorded in Deer Creek during the 1997-1998 brood year (CDFG 1999b) were within the reported optimal ranges for the juvenile rearing and emigration period (January through March).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Mill Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum and copper have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Erosion from recent volcanic deposits in and near Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the headwaters of Mill Creek, contributes turbidity to the stream nearly year-round (CDFG 1999b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

The downstream migration of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon occurs concurrently with peak flows from January through March. The extent to which flow fluctuations from water diversions in Mill Creek may affect juvenile salmonid habitat availability and cause juvenile stranding is currently unknown.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The Mill Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow, with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as barriers to activity and land use allocations have protected these areas such that the mainstem of the stream is essentially undisturbed (CDFG 1999b).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

The Mill Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as a barrier to human activity and the environment is essentially undisturbed (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007)

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Because Mill Creek is a relatively narrow watershed with steep slopes, there is little natural connection with the floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

In Mill Creek, fish screens have been in place at all diversions, although some mortality is still reported to occur (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

PREDATION

Smallmouth bass, brown trout and green sunfish are all non-native predators known to exist in Mill Creek. The extent of predation that occurs on juvenile steelhead is unknown.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Juvenile Chinook salmon in Mill Creek are not likely directly affected by hatchery operations. There is some potential for outmigrating juveniles to be preyed upon by hatchery steelhead as they enter either the Sacramento River.

3.3.8.7 ANTELOPE CREEK

Antelope Creek flows southwest from the foothills of the Cascade Range entering the Sacramento River nine miles southeast of the town of Red Bluff. The drainage is approximately 123 square miles and the average stream discharge is 107,200 acre-feet per year.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Though there are diversion structures in the valley sections of Antelope Creek, there are no major impoundments. Anadromous fish (spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead) have been able to maintain passage to the upper watershed (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007). During low-flow conditions, the number of adult spring-run Chinook salmon entering upstream habitat can be reduced due to decreases in water velocities and depths.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Antelope Creek. For proposes of fishing regulations, the creek is divided into two reaches. From the confluence with the north fork downstream to the USGS gaging station at the mouth of Antelope Creek Canyon, fishing with barbless hooks and artificial lures is allowed from the last Saturday in April through November 15. From that point downstream to the mouth, fishing is allowed from June 16 through September 30. Therefore, the recreational fishery is open for most of the spring-run Chinook salmon adult immigration life stage, although harvest is not allowed.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Maximum water temperatures recorded during July and August from 1992 to 1995 ranged from 67ºF to 70ºF. Water temperatures are likely to warm to support Chinook salmon holding unless cool water refugia are found in deep pools.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Antelope Creek likely does not cause any adverse effects to spring-run Chinook salmon immigration and holding.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The degree to which water diversions and structures can impact spring-run Chinook salmon in Antelope Creek varies between years. In some years, some or all of the natural streamflow may be diverted by water-rights holders from mid-spring into the fall (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

SPAWNING

Based on reported observations of spring-run Chinook salmon, the range of their distribution is equal to approximately 9 miles, and extends from approximately 1.6 miles downstream of the Paynes Creek crossing upstream to near McClure Place on the North Fork, and to Bucks Flat on the South Fork (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007). A total of eight spring-run Chinook salmon were counted during the annual spawning snorkel survey in 2001. This was a total reduction from 154 counted during a 1998 survey (CDFG 2002).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Local landowners and CDFG are pursuing a partnership with the Service to implement a fish passage improvement program for Antelope Dam. A fish ladder has been operating at the dam since 1981. Floodwaters damaged the ladder, and a new, more technologically advanced ladder needs to be installed, and improvements need to be made to the face of the dam to promote use of the ladder. If funding is available, the project will be completed in 2007. Other than occasional low-flow conditions and beaver dams, there are no other manmade impediments to salmonid upstream migration in Antelope Creek (NMFS Website 2007).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Antelope Creek. For proposes of fishing regulations, the creek is divided into two reaches. From the confluence with the north fork downstream to the USGS gaging station at the mouth of Antelope Creek Canyon, fishing with barbless hooks and artificial lures is allowed from the last Saturday in April through November 15. From that point downstream to the mouth, fishing is allowed from June 16 through September 30.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Maximum daily water temperatures in Antelope Creek at various locations recorded from April through November (1996, 1997, and 1998) ranged from 60.6ºF to 68.9ºF (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Antelope Creek likely does not cause any adverse effects to spring-run Chinook salmon spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Antelope Creek fish habitat is relatively unaltered above the valley floor but lack of adequate migratory attraction flows into the Sacramento River to this habitat prevents optimum use by anadromous fish (DWR Website 2007b). In wettest years, average flows in winter months range from 200 to 1,200 cfs. In the driest years, flows in winter average 50 cfs. In all but the wettest years, summer and early fall flows average from 20 to 50 cfs. The natural flow pattern is altered by diversions in the lower creek from spring through fall. Flows are typically diverted from April 1 through October 31 (County of Butte Website 2007).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Vanicek (1993) rated spawning habitat as fair to poor in Antelope Creek. There have been no flow habitat relationships developed for Antelope Creek.

SPAWNING SUBSTRATE AVAILABILITY

Vanicek (1993) reported that substrate in Antelope Creek is primarily sand and silt. The effects of fine sediment on spawning areas in Antelope Creek are unknown (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The Antelope Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as a barrier to human activity and the environment is essentially undisturbed (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The trucking of FRFH spring-run, and their release into San Pablo Bay, facilitates the straying of adult spring-run hatchery returns and threatens the Antelope Creek spring-run population. Genetic integrity of the Antelope Creek spring-run may be compromised, and their fitness and productivity lowered. The hatchery stock would compete with native spring-run over available holding and spawning habitat, and possibly transfer the Feather River strain of IHNV to the local population.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Antelope Creek during a portion of the embryo incubation period for spring-run Chinook salmon. Therefore, redds may be exposed to inadvertent disturbance by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures on the Middle Fork, North Fork, and South Fork of Antelope Creek during the warmest water temperature conditions occurring during (e.g., September, October, and November) are listed in **Table 3-3** below. These water temperatures are above the reported optimum for the embryo incubation life stage however, the magnitude to which these water temperatures would decrease by the onset of the embryo incubation period in September is unknown.

Table 3-3. Seven Day Maximum Water Temperature Recorded in the Middle Fork, South Fork, and North Fork of Antelope Creek During the First Portion of the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Embryo Incubation Life Stage in 1996, 1997, and 1998

Location	Date	Seven Day Maximum Water Temperature (ºF)
Middle Fork Antelope Creek	7/21/97	67.8[1]
South Fork Antelope Creek	8/18/96	73.7[2]
North Fork Antelope Creek	7/21/97	62.2[3]

1996: MF Antelope Creek data collected from July 1 through October 15; SF Antelope Creek[2] data collected from April 9 through November 1; NF Antelope Creek data collected from July 1 through October 15

1997: MF Antelope Creek[1] data collected from April 9 through November 1; SF Antelope Creek data collected from April 9 through November 1; NF Antelope Creek[3] data collected from April 9 through November 1

1998: MF Antelope Creek data collected from May 21 through October 2; SF Antelope Creek data collected from May 21 through October 2; NF Antelope Creek data collected from May 21 through October 2.

Source: (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007)

WATER QUALITY

Because Antelope Creek habitat in the upstream watershed is basically undisturbed, water quality in areas where redds are established likely has no adverse effects on developing embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Antelope Creek fish habitat is relatively unaltered above the valley floor, however, flow conditions on Antelope Creek during the spring-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation period are not known at this time.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the spring-run Chinook salmon juvenile rearing and outmigration period have not been reported to the public, although real-time water temperature and flow monitoring data recorders were recently installed at various locations in Antelope Creek as part of an AFRP monitoring project. However, this data has not been made publicly available.

WATER QUALITY

Although little water quality information on Antelope Creek is available, because Antelope Creek habitat in the upstream watershed is basically undisturbed, water quality in the upstream reaches likely have no adverse effects on juvenile salmonids.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The downstream migration of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon occurs concurrently with peak flows from January through March. The extent to which flow fluctuations from water diversions in Antelope Creek may affect juvenile salmonid habitat availability and cause juvenile stranding is currently unknown. However, there are two diversions in Antelope Creek at the canyon mouth. One is operated by the Edwards Ranch, which has water rights of 50 cfs, and the other by the Los Molinos Water Company which has a water right of 70 cfs. Flows are diverted between April 1 and October 31. The stream is usually dewatered when both diversions operate (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The Antelope Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as a barrier to human activity and the environment is essentially undisturbed (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Because Antelope Creek is a relatively narrow watershed with steep slopes, there is little natural connection with the floodplain (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

The Antelope Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as a barrier to human activity and the environment is essentially undisturbed. Therefore, above the valley floor, the creek has essentially retained its natural functions.

ENTRAINMENT

The Antelope Main canal could potentially cause entrainment or impingement of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon. It is unknown how many diversions associated with this canal are equipped with fish screens that meet NMFS and CDFG juvenile fish screen criteria.

PREDATION

Smallmouth bass, brown trout and green sunfish are all non-native predators known to exist in Antelope Creek. The extent of predation that occurs on juvenile Chinook salmon is unknown.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Juvenile Chinook salmon in Antelope Creek are not likely directly affected by hatchery operations. There is some potential for outmigrating juveniles to be preyed upon by hatchery steelhead as they enter either the Sacramento River.

3.3.9 BASALT AND POROUS LAVA DIVERSITY GROUP

The basalt and porous lava spring-run Chinook salmon Diversity Group historically was comprised of populations in Battle Creek, the upper Sacramento River (upstream of where Keswick and Shasta dams now reside), the McCloud River, and the Pit River (**Figure 3-11**). Currently, within this diversity group, spawning populations of Chinook salmon exhibiting spring-run characteristics occur in Battle Creek and the mainstem Sacramento River immediately downstream of Keswick Dam.



Figure 3-11. Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group

3.3.9.1 BATTLE CREEK

Battle Creek enters the Sacramento River approximately five miles southeast of the Shasta County town of Cottonwood. It flows into the Sacramento Valley from the east, draining a watershed of approximately 360 square miles.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The main stem of Battle Creek has four structures that act as potential impediments to adult anadromous fish migration: (1) the CNFH barrier weir that diverts returning hatchery fish into the hatchery for brood stock collection each year from September through early March; (2) the CNFH Intake 3 diversion weir that diverts water for the hatchery; (3) the Orwick seasonal gravel diversion dam; and (4) the tailrace from PG&E's Coleman Powerhouse, which has been known to attract anadromous salmonids into an area with little spawning habitat. Additionally, the CNFH barrier dam, which straddles lower Battle Creek, has been operated over the years, in part, to prevent the migration of salmon and steelhead into the upper watershed, in order to prevent fish borne diseases be from entering the hatcheries water supply.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Battle Creek supports a popular recreational fishery (e.g., fall-run Chinook salmon, steelhead). As a result, some level of poaching likely occurs. Current fishing regulations do not allow any fishing from the mouth of Battle Creek to 250 feet upstream of the weir at the CNFH. Upstream of that point, catch and release fishing with artificial lures and barbless hooks is allowed from the last Saturday in April to November 15.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Battle Creek water temperatures is generally cool because of the many cold springs that feed into it and because it receives significant snowmelt during the spring and summer. However, operation of hydroelectric facilities also influences water temperatures in Battle Creek. Reduced streamflow resulting from diversions may cause the water temperatures in the stream to warm. Shunting water between the power facilities also may cause stream warming if the water flows in open canals for some distance (KRIS Website 2007).

The North Fork Battle Creek contains excellent habitat for spring-run Chinook, even at the lowest (i.e., elevation) reaches because cold springs feed the creek. The South Fork also is influenced by springs and would maintain at least acceptable habitat in its lower reaches under a restored flow regime. The observed water temperatures in Battle Creek also indicate that the mainstem might provide some acceptable habitat for spring Chinook holding in wet years (KRIS Website 2007). Maximum weekly average water temperatures for various locations in the mainstem of Battle Creek are shown below in **Table 3-4**.

Table 3-4. Maximum Weekly Average Water Temperatures (°F) Reported from 1998 Through 2001 in Battle Creek

	Maximum Weekly Average Temperature (ºF)			
Location	**1998**	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**
Battle Creek at Jelly's Ferry Road	66.5	__	__	__
Battle Creek at Mouth	__	68.7	70.7	71.5
Battle C below Confluence of North and South Fork	63.3	65.9	66.0	67.1
End of Coleman Canal	63.7	91.4	64.6	64.6
Battle Creek above Coleman Powerhouse	67.7	70.3	71.9	73.9
Coleman Powerhouse tailrace	__	61.7	66.3	74.3
Source: KRIS Website 2007				

WATER QUALITY

Little information on water quality in Battle Creek is available. However, it is assumed to be quite good as Battle Creek also provides water to the CNFH.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Two studies were conducted to determine the flows necessary to facilitate fish passage within the Battle Creek watershed (Kier Associates 1999). The results of these two studies were used to develop instream flow alternatives for the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project (Reclamation and SWRCB 2005). These new recommended minimum instream flows rage from 35 to 88 cfs.

SPAWNING

Prime quality spawning, holding, and rearing habitat for steelhead, winter-run, and spring-run Chinook occurs upstream of Wildcat and Coleman dams on the north and south forks of Battle Creek, respectively. The habitat and water temperatures in these upper stream reaches are excellent for all life stages of salmonids. Battle Creek has complex channel features that create relatively good habitat for Central Valley salmonids including, an abundance of coldwater springs, high natural flows, and continuous flows during the summer months. High quality spawning habitat for spring-run Chinook salmon is primarily located upstream of Wildcat and Coleman dams on the north and south forks of Battle Creek (DWR 2005a).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The mainstem of Battle Creek has four structures that act as potential impediments to adult anadromous fish migration: (1) the CNFH barrier weir that diverts returning hatchery fish into the hatchery for brood stock collection each year from September through early March; (2) the CNFH Intake 3 diversion weir that diverts water for the hatchery; (3) the Orwick seasonal gravel diversion dam; and (4) the tailrace from PG&E's Coleman Powerhouse, which has been known to attract adult Chinook salmon and steelhead into an area with little spawning habitat (DWR 2005a).

In the mid-1990s, the fish ladders at Eagle Canyon on North Fork Battle Creek and PG&E's Colman Dam on South Fork Battle Creek were intentionally closed primarily to manage populations of spring-run Chinook salmon. Closing the ladders limited the amount of stream available for spring-run Chinook salmon that passed the CNFH weir. It was assumed that this would increase the rate at which fish encounter each other during the spawning season, and would reduce entrainment by unscreened diversions.

The North Fork Battle Creek has three dams: (1) Wildcat Dam; (2) Eagle Canyon Dam; and (3) North Battle Creek Dam. All of these structures are located downstream of natural barriers to upstream fish migration. These structures divert water for hydroelectric power production. The South Fork of Battle Creek also has three hydroelectric diversion dams downstream of natural barriers: (1) South Diversion Dam; (2) Inskip Dam; and (3) Coleman Dam.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Battle Creek supports a popular recreational fishery (e.g., fall-run Chinook salmon, steelhead). As a result, some level of poaching likely occurs. Current fishing regulations do not allow any fishing from the mouth of Battle Creek to 250 feet upstream of the weir at the CNFH. Upstream of that point, catch and release fishing with artificial lures and barbless hooks is allowed from the last Saturday in April to November 15.

WATER TEMPERATURE

DWR has 22 water temperature monitoring locations within the Battle Creek watershed. Field parameters such as dissolved oxygen, electrical conductivity, turbidity, and water temperature have been collected since 1998 (DWR 2005a).

Average daily water temperatures in 1988 and 1989 in Battle Creek above the CNFH approached or exceeded lethal water temperatures for holding and spawning spring-run Chinook salmon during summer months. During the period July 1 to September 14, average water temperature exceeded 66.2°F in all four years, indicating that spring-run Chinook salmon adults holding at the site would be unable to successfully spawn.

Water temperatures in Battle Creek warm at lower elevations due to higher air temperatures. The North Fork above its confluence with the South Fork is the warmest location while those reaches upstream are cooler. Water temperatures generally do not rise significantly between Wildcat Diversion Dam and Eagle Canyon Dam because large amounts of cold spring water enter the creek at Eagle Canyon, located between these two locations. High water temperatures that may occur at these locations are partially a result of low flows related to hydropower operation. Water temperatures become cool enough (i.e., < 66ºF) for adult spring-run Chinook holding at Eagle Canyon Diversion Dam and the North Battle Feeder Dam.

During the period July 1 to September 14, 2001, average water temperatures exceeded 66.2°F below the Wildcat Diversion Dam and the Eagle Canyon Diversion Dam, indicating that spring-run Chinook adults at the site would be unable to successfully spawn. During the period September 15 through 30, average water temperatures did not exceed 62°F, indicating that all sites were suitable for spring-run Chinook salmon spawning (Armour 1991), (USFWS 1995d), and (CDFG 1998).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Battle Creek is suitable for salmonid spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Monthly average flows in Coleman Channel above the Coleman Forebay (USGS Gage 11376450) from August through October were greater than 250 cfs (1979 to 2001); however, there have been no flow habitat relationships developed for spring-run Chinook salmon at this location.

Results of the IFIM study conducted by the Battle Creek Working Group (Kier Associates 1999), determined that flows necessary to provide 95 percent of the maximum weighted usable area (WUA) for the upper reaches of North Fork Battle Creek would be approximately 60 cfs from August through September. The monthly average flow in North Fork Battle Creek below the diversion to Eagle Canyon power canal (USGS Gage 11376150) from August through November (1995 to 2001) was approximately 30 cfs. The average monthly average flow in North Fork Battle Creek below the diversion to the Wildcat Channel (USGS Gage 11376160) from August through November (1995 to 2001) was approximately 35 cfs.

Results of the IFIM study conducted by the Battle Creek Working Group (Kier Associates 1999), determined that flows necessary to provide flows that would provide 95 percent of the maximum WUA for the upper reaches of South Fork Battle Creek would be approximately 65 cfs from August through September. The monthly average flow in South Fork Battle Creek at the South Powerhouse power canal (USGS Gage 11376410) from August through November (1980 to 2001) were greater than approximately 150 cfs (KRIS Website 2007).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Stream channel conditions in Battle Creek are considered suitable for salmonid production (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004). Reclamation (2003) cited *in* Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004, assumed that key stream habitat conditions were of sufficient quality that the abundance of threatened or endangered salmonid populations could be substantially increased by increasing instream flows and constructing fish passage facilities at the Battle Creek Hydroelectric Project diversion dams.

SPAWNING SUBSTRATE AVAILABILITY

Brown and Kimmerer (2004) report that areas suitable for salmonid spawning, based on substrate particle size, are relatively scarce. However, they also report that in-river conditions are likely not a limiting factor due to the current low population numbers of targeted species.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Stream channel conditions in Battle Creek during the late 20th century have been considered suitable for salmonid production. Key stream habitat conditions appear to be of sufficient quality such that the abundance of threatened or endangered salmonid populations could be increased by increasing instream flows and constructing fish passage facilities at the Battle Creek Hydroelectric Project diversion dams. Land management activities currently occurring in the watershed appear to have little impact on the potential to restore anadromous salmonids to this watershed (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004)

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The CNFH is located on lower Battle Creek and operations of the hatchery may have negative effects on habitat in lower Battle Creek. For example: (1) operations of the fish ladder at the CNFH may deny access to upstream habitat for spring-run Chinook salmon; (2) broodstock selection at the CNFH may have led to hybridization of fall- and spring-run stocks; and (3) excess production of fall-run Chinook salmon may be overwhelming the carrying capacity of habitat in lower Battle Creek (Ward and Kier 1999b).

Stakeholders and agencies interested in the restoration of Battle Creek fisheries have been working to modify facilities at the CNFH with the goal of isolating CNFH operations from Battle Creek. For example, an ozone treatment plant was installed to keep pathogens out of the hatchery water supply, preventing the release of diseased fish to the system. Additionally, proposals have been made to modify the CNFH barrier dam to keep hatchery produced fish out of the main portion of the Battle Creek watershed (Ward and Kier 1999b).

A technical review panel determined that the probability of hybridization between spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon is unknown (CALFED Bay-Delta Program 2004). While the probability of hybridization is unknown, the potential loss of genetic information through such occurrences could be extremely counter productive to recovery efforts. The review panel recommended that the potential for hybridization be minimized by abandoning restoration of fall and late-fall-run Chinook salmon in Battle Creek, or to reserve those efforts until spring-run Chinook salmon populations have become fully restored (i.e., removed ESA protection). It was recommended by the review panel that passage of fall and late-fall Chinook salmon above the dam, via ladder or jumping, be prevented or reduced to the lowest possible level during the initial stages of recovery. This could be achieved by closing the fish ladder to block fall and late-fall-run Chinook salmon migration.

In order to protect spring-run Chinook salmon from introgressing with fall-run in upper Battle Creek, CNFH changed the timing for closing the barrier weir from September 1 to August 1, i.e., the barrier is now closed the last day of July. Most, if not all, of the spring-run Chinook salmon are believed to have moved above the weir by this time; any spring-run Chinook holding below the weir at its closing could

potentially spawn below the weir or enter CNFH and possibly be utilized as broodstock for the fall-run program.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Battle Creek supports a popular recreational fishery (e.g., fall-run Chinook salmon, steelhead). As a result, some level of disturbance of redds by wading anglers likely occurs.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature problems may occur during some years due to the diversion of coldwater springs into canals away from adjacent stream channels on the North Fork and South Fork of Battle Creek. However, it is unknown the degree to which these operations currently affect the spring-run Chinook salmon juvenile rearing and emigration life stage (Reclamation et al. 2004).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality factors in Battle Creek are not expected to have adverse effects on developing Chinook salmon embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The operations of the Battle Creek Hydroelectric Project causes water level changes in some reaches of Battle Creek that are more frequent and rapid then those which occur naturally. The effects of these flow changes have not been the direct focus of any study to date. However, the Battle Creek Working Group has identified potential rates of flow fluctuation of less than 0.17 feet per hour based on previous studies conducted in the Pacific Northwest (Ward and Kier 1999a).

As part of the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project, PG&E, in cooperation with the resource agencies, has agreed to adaptively manage instream flows in Battle Creek by adjusting flows at diversion dams to maintain habitat and prevent redd dewatering events (KRIS Website 2007).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature problems may occur during some years due to the diversion of coldwater springs into canals away from adjacent stream channels on the North Fork and South Fork of Battle Creek. However, it is unknown the degree to which these operations currently affect the spring-run Chinook salmon juvenile rearing and emigration life stage (KRIS Website 2007).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality factors in Battle Creek are not likely to adversely affect juvenile Chinook salmon.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Powerhouse operations cause flow fluctuations of up to 200 cfs in some reaches of the Battle Creek watershed which could potentially lead to juvenile stranding events. It has been estimated that powerhouse diversions on the North Fork and South Fork of Battle Creek divert up to 97 percent of the natural unimpaired flow (Reclamation et al. 2004).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Land management activities currently occurring in the watershed appear to have little impact on the potential to restore anadromous salmonids to this watershed (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004). Restoration of riparian corridors in lower Battle Creek are currently underway (Battle Creek Working Group 1999).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Stream channel conditions (e.g., gravel distribution and abundance, sedimentation, channel morphology) in Battle Creek are considered to be suitable for salmonid production (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004). Similarly, land management activities in the watershed are assumed to have little impact on the potential to restore anadromous salmonids to the system (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Flood control measures have resulted in less frequent high flow events and resulted in a loss of connectivity with the river and historic floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

The high volume of surface water diverted from unscreened agricultural and hydroelectric diversions in Battle Creek constitutes a substantial threat to rearing and emigrating juvenile salmonids. However, it is anticipated the installation of positive fish barrier screens in the near future as part of the proposed water management strategy for the Battle Creek watershed will reduce the amount of juvenile entrainment at water diversions (KRIS Website 2007).

PREDATION

The USFWS has identified predation as one of the ways that juvenile salmonids released from the CNFH may affect natural populations of salmonids (Battle Creek Working Group 1999). However, the actual extent of predation on natural populations by steelhead and Chinook salmon on natural populations is not known (Battle Creek Working Group 1999).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The USFWS has expressed concern that predation, disease transmission and competition/displacement are ways in which juvenile salmonids released from the CNFH may affect natural salmonid populations (Battle Creek Working Group 1999). The actual extent of these potential impacts is not known, although there is speculation that these factors are minimal or non-existent (Battle Creek Working Group 1999). However, these conclusions were not based on completed investigations. Furthermore, these conclusions that suggest minimal impact were derived during a period when Chinook salmon and steelhead populations were depressed. As restoration of Battle Creek salmonid populations proceed, increased interactions between hatchery operations and natural fish populations are expected, suggesting that more investigations of possible impacts are required (Battle Creek Working Group 1999).

3.3.9.2 UPPER SACRAMENTO RIVER

See Section 3.3.7 for a discussion of potential spring-run Chinook salmon in the upper Sacramento River.

3.3.10 NORTHWESTERN CALIFORNIA DIVERSITY GROUP

The northwestern California spring-run Chinook salmon Diversity Group historically was comprised of populations in Stony, Thomes, Beegum, and Clear creeks (**Figure 3-12**). Spring-run Chinook salmon have likely been extirpated from Stony Creek and only small populations of spring-run Chinook salmon occur in Thomes, Beegum, and Clear creeks.

3.3.10.1 THOMES CREEK

Thomes Creek enters the Sacramento River four miles north of the town of Corning. It flows into the Sacramento Valley from the west, draining a watershed of approximately 188 square miles.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no significant dams on Thomes Creek other than two seasonal diversion dams, one near Paskenta and the other near Henleyville. Several small pump diversions are seasonally operated in the stream (DWR Website 2007b). These dams would be in place during the time when spring-run Chinook salmon would be immigrating to upstream areas and likely present obstacles to upstream immigration. Additionally, gravel mining downstream of the Tehama-Colusa Canal siphon crossing has reportedly resulted in a partial barrier to salmonids returning to Thomes Creek to spawn (Vestra Resources, Inc. 2006).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Legal harvest of salmonids in Thomes Creek is not permitted. Angling is permitted but restricted to barbless hooks and artificial flies and lures only.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During most years, water temperatures during the summer months are likely too warm to support adult spring-run Chinook salmon holding. Chinook salmon utilizing Thomes Creek for spawning likely hold in the mainstem Sacramento River.

WATER QUALITY

The surface water quality of streams draining eastward from the Coast Range is generally poor. These streams generally have very high suspended sediment loads due to the metavolcanic bedrock and schist formations which produce clays that stay in suspension during turbulent flow conditions. Soil disturbance within these watersheds can accelerate erosion and sedimentation processes and lead to increased metal and nutrient concentrations. High concentrations of metals and nutrients are commonly present during both low flow and storm runoff events. These concentrations frequently exceed water quality criteria established for the protection of beneficial use or the maintenance of aquatic life. However, water quality is not likely to cause direct harm to adult salmonids utilizing Thomes Creek as a migratory corridor.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Thomes Creek is usually dry or intermittent below the USGS stream gage near Paskenta until the first heavy fall rains occur (DWR Website 2007b). Therefore spring-run Chinook salmon utilization of Thomes Creek would likely only occur during wet years.



Figure 3-12. Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no significant dams on Thomes Creek other than two seasonal diversion dams, one near Paskenta and the other near Henleyville. Several small pump diversions are seasonally operated in the stream (DWR Website 2007b). These dams would be in place during the time when spring-run Chinook salmon would be immigrating to upstream areas and likely present obstacles to upstream immigration.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACT

Legal harvest of salmonids in Thomes Creek is not permitted. Angling is permitted but restricted to barbless hooks and artificial flies and lures only.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Thomes Creek are likely too warm to support spring-run Chinook salmon spawning until at least mid-October.

WATER QUALITY

The surface water quality of streams draining eastward from the Coast Range is generally poor. These streams generally have very high suspended sediment loads due to the metavolcanic bedrock and schist formations which produce clays that stay in suspension during turbulent flow conditions. Soil disturbance within these watersheds can accelerate erosion and sedimentation processes and lead to increased metal and nutrient concentrations. High concentrations of metals and nutrients are commonly present during both low flow and storm runoff events. These concentrations frequently exceed water quality criteria established for the protection of beneficial use or the maintenance of aquatic life. Water is generally warm in streams flowing through the proposed reservoir sites. Total phosphorus concentrations are at stimulatory levels for algae (DWR Website 2007b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the Thomes Creek watershed fluctuate seasonally. Summer low flows are frequently measured at less than 4 cfs, while winter flows often exceed 4,500 cfs. Flows recorded at Paskenta range from zero in 1977 to 37,800 cfs during December 1964. The December 1964 runoff event was triggered by a major rain-on-snow storm. Periodic large floods like the 1964 event can result in tremendous bedload movement (DWR Website 2007b).

Thomes Creek is usually dry or intermittent below the USGS stream gage near Paskenta until the first heavy fall rains occur (DWR Website 2007b). Therefore, spring-run Chinook salmon spawning in Thomes Creek would likely only occur during wet years.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Historically, there was about 30 river miles of potential Chinook salmon habitat available in Thomes Creek, of which only the lower 4 miles are currently available (NMFS Website 2005). A small spring-run Chinook salmon run was known to utilize habitat about 8 miles upstream of the town of Paskenta when streamflow was adequate (NMFS Website 2005).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Little data on habitat alteration within the Thomes Creek Watershed is available. However, Gauthier and Hoover (2005) report that Thomes Creek is one of the largest sediment producers in the western United

States. Excessive sediment loading is likely caused by land use practices and road building in the upper watershed.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The FRFH produces spring-run Chinook salmon and the current hatchery practice of releasing juveniles into San Pablo Bay increases potential straying rates. It is possible for strays from the hatchery to enter Thomes Creek and potentially hybridize with naturally spawning spring-run. However, hatchery effects are likely minimal because Thomes Creek does not support a consistent or sustaining population of spring-run Chinook salmon.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because angling is permitted in Thomes Creek, it is possible that anglers could disturb redds by wading through the stream.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in anadromous salmonid accessible reaches of Thomes Creek likely are not suitable for Chinook salmon embryo incubation until at least mid-October.

WATER QUALITY

The surface water quality of streams draining eastward from the Coast Range is generally poor. These streams generally have very high suspended sediment loads due to the metavolcanic bedrock and schist formations which produce clays that stay in suspension during turbulent flow conditions. Soil disturbance within these watersheds can accelerate erosion and sedimentation processes and lead to increased metal and nutrient concentrations. High concentrations of metals and nutrients are commonly present during both low flow and storm runoff events. These concentrations frequently exceed water quality criteria established for the protection of beneficial use or the maintenance of aquatic life. Total phosphorus concentrations are at stimulatory levels for algae (DWR Website 2007b). These water quality factors would likely decrease survival of Chinook salmon embryos incubating in Thomes Creek.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Thomes Creek has an unimpaired natural pattern of flashy winter and spring flows and very low summer and fall flows creating an environment of fairly inconsistent habitat (CALFED 2000d). Inconsistent flows, particularly during the fall and early winter months, promote an increased potential for redd dewatering. For example, if salmon construct a redd and spawn in shallow water during a period of high flows, a subsequent period of lower flows could result in the redd becoming exposed to dry conditions.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Thomes Creek likely become unsuitable for rearing Chinook salmon by late spring.

WATER QUALITY

The surface water quality of streams draining eastward from the Coast Range is generally poor. These streams generally have very high suspended sediment loads due to the metavolcanic bedrock and schist formations which produce clays that stay in suspension during turbulent flow conditions. Soil disturbance

within these watersheds can accelerate erosion and sedimentation processes and lead to increased metal and nutrient concentrations. High concentrations of metals and nutrients are commonly present during both low flow and storm runoff events. These concentrations frequently exceed water quality criteria established for the protection of beneficial use or the maintenance of aquatic life. Total phosphorus concentrations are at stimulatory levels for algae (DWR Website 2007b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Thomes Creek has an unimpaired natural pattern of flashy winter and spring flows and very low summer and fall flows creating an environment of fairly inconsistent habitat (CALFED 2000d). These conditions are not conducive to supporting a persistent population of Chinook salmon. However, during wet years some Chinook salmon spawning may occur and lower Thomes Creek could be utilized for some juvenile rearing or, during wet years, some non-natal juvenile rearing may occur.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The lower reach of Thomes Creek has been significantly altered by the construction of flood control levees and bank protection measures (i.e., riprapping) (CALFED 2000d). These measures have resulted in reduced habitat for juvenile Chinook salmon.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Channel modification projects designed to prevent flood-related damage (e.g., levee construction and bank riprapping) have degraded natural processes which serve to recruit gravel, provide instream cover and forage, and provide habitat diversity in lower Thomes Creek.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The construction of levees and bank riprapping of lower Thomes Creek have disconnected the channel from its historic floodplain, thereby preventing the recruitment of large woody debris and natural processes associated with periodic floodplain inundation.

ENTRAINMENT

Agricultural diversions on Thomes Creek are unscreened and any outmigrating salmonids likely are susceptible to entrainment in the diversions.

PREDATION

Sacramento pikeminnow is likely the most important predator of juvenile salmonids in Thomes Creek. While the pikeminnow is native to these waters, habitat alteration may have changed the predator prey dynamics in the system conferring an advantage to pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The trucking of FRFH spring-run Chinook salmon, and their release into San Pablo Bay, facilitates the straying of adult spring-run hatchery returns and threatens the Butte Creek spring-run population. Genetic integrity of the Thomes Creek spring-run may be compromised, and their fitness and productivity lowered. The hatchery stock would compete with native spring-run over available holding and spawning habitat, with the possibility of transferring the Feather River strain of IHNV to the local population.

3.3.10.2 COTTONWOOD/BEEGUM CREEK

Cottonwood Creek drains the west side of the Central Valley and enters the Sacramento River a short distance downstream from the Redding-Anderson area. Beegum Creek is a tributary to Cottonwood

Creek and supports most spring-run Chinook salmon habitat. Cottonwood Creek is likely used only as a migratory corridor.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are several irrigation diversions but no storage reservoirs on Cottonwood Creek. These diversions likely present passage obstacles to most areas of Cottonwood Creek other than Beegum Creek.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Legal harvest of salmonids in Cottonwood Creek and its tributaries is not permitted. Angling is permitted but restricted to barbless hooks and artificial flies and lures only.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Clark (1929) reported that Cottonwood Creek formerly supported spring-run Chinook salmon. Currently, other than Beegum Creek, spring-run Chinook salmon likely do not utilize Cottonwood Creek except as a migratory corridor to Beegum Creek.

High water temperatures in Cottonwood Creek likely present a thermal barrier to migrating spring-run Chinook salmon beginning in May. This population has been observed to arrive earlier than most spring-run due to high water temperatures at the mouth of Cottonwood Creek (CDFG 2004b).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Cottonwood Creek does not likely adversely affect immigrating adult salmonids. However, more sensitive life stages may be affected as discussed below.

FLOW CONDITIONS

During spring of drier years, low flows in Cottonwood Creek may impede or prevent the upstream migration of spring-run Chinook salmon to over-summer holding areas (CALFED 2000d).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Spawning surveys have confirmed that spring-run Chinook salmon are both spatially and temporally isolated from fall-run in Beegum Creek (CDFG 2004b). Potential spawning of Chinook salmon exhibiting spring-run characteristics in Cottonwood Creek is not known but if it does occur, both spatial and temporal overlap in spawning likely occurs due to upstream passage barriers.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACT

Legal harvest of salmonids in Cottonwood Creek and its tributaries is not permitted. Angling is permitted but restricted to barbless hooks and artificial flies and lures only.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Spawning in Beegum Creek by spring-run Chinook salmon is delayed until mid- to late-October, which is later than timing observed for other Central Valley spring-run populations. This delay in spawning timing is likely due to high water temperatures extending through September in Beegum Creek (CDFG 2004b).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Cottonwood or Beegum Creeks likely has no direct adverse effects on spawning salmonids. However, more sensitive life stages may be affected as discussed below.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Beegum Creek, where most spring-run Chinook salmon spawning occurs likely mimics historic patterns.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Currently, approximately 8 river miles of habitat are available in Beegum Creek for spring-run Chinook salmon (NMFS Website 2005). Recent spawning escapements to Beegum Creek are depicted in **Figure 3-13**.



Figure 3-13. Beegum Creek Spawning Escapement Estimates (1993 – 2006)
Source: (CDFG 2007)

SPAWNING SUBSTRATE AVAILABILITY

Coarse sediment supply in Cottonwood Creek is adversely affected by gravel mining. Mining reduces the natural gravel recruitment to potential spawning areas potentially resulting in channel armoring.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

There are no large water development projects or comprehensive flood control measures in the Cottonwood Creek drainage. Habitat alteration has arisen from timber harvest in the upper watershed, grazing in the middle watershed and extensive gravel mining in the lower watershed.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The trucking of FRFH spring-run, and their release into San Pablo Bay, facilitates the straying of adult spring-run hatchery returns and threatens the Butte Creek spring-run population. Genetic integrity of the Cottonwood/Beegum Creek spring-run may be compromised, and their fitness and productivity lowered. The hatchery stock would compete with native spring-run over available holding and spawning habitat,

with the possibility of transferring the Feather River strain of IHNV to the local population. Embryo Incubation

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because angling is permitted in Cottonwood Creek and its tributaries, it is possible that anglers could disturb redds by wading through the stream.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Spawning in Beegum Creek by spring-run Chinook salmon is delayed until mid- to late-October, which is later than timing observed for other Central Valley spring-run populations. This delay in spawning timing is likely due to high water temperatures extending through September in Beegum Creek (CDFG 2004b). Because spawning is delayed, it is likely that water temperatures for embryo incubation are suitable in Beegum Creek.

WATER QUALITY

The surface water quality of streams draining eastward from the Coast Range is generally poor. These streams generally have very high suspended sediment loads due to the metavolcanic bedrock and schist formations which produce clays that stay in suspension during turbulent flow conditions. Soil disturbance within these watersheds can accelerate erosion and sedimentation processes and lead to increased metal and nutrient concentrations. High concentrations of metals and nutrients are commonly present during both low flow and storm runoff events. These concentrations frequently exceed water quality criteria established for the protection of beneficial use or the maintenance of aquatic life. Water is generally warm in streams flowing through the proposed reservoir sites. Total phosphorus concentrations are at stimulatory levels for algae (DWR Website 2007b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Beegum Creek, where Chinook salmon embryos would be incubating are not controlled and mimic historic conditions.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Beegum Creek are likely cool enough to support Chinook salmon juvenile rearing, however, water temperatures downstream in Cottonwood Creek likely become too warm by early summer such that Cottonwood Creek likely only serves as a migratory corridor.

WATER QUALITY

Two major instream gravel extraction projects operate in Cottonwood Creek below the Interstate 5 bridge (CALFED 2000d) which likely degrade water quality for a short distance downstream.

FLOW CONDITIONS

There are no water development projects on Cottonwood Creek therefore, flows are unregulated. Runoff from the watershed is flashy: high in the rainy season and low in the dry season. The baseflow component of the runoff is small.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Extensive gravel mining occurs in lower Cottonwood Creek, which has resulted in a loss of riparian habitat. The remaining portion of the watershed is primarily rural which has helped avoid adverse impacts to the riparian areas.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

There has been little development in the Cottonwood Creek watershed. This has resulted in Cottonwood Creek maintaining most of its historic characteristics and function.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

No comprehensive flood control measures have occurred in the Cottonwood Creek drainage resulting in the creek retaining its connection to the floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

There are irrigation diversions but no storage reservoirs on the Cottonwood Creek. Outmigrating juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon could potentially be entrained at unscreened diversions.

PREDATION

Sacramento pikeminnow is likely the most important predator of juvenile salmonids in Cottonwood/Beegum Creek system. While the pikeminnow is native to these waters, habitat alteration may have changed the predator prey dynamics in the system conferring an advantage to pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The CNFH on Battle Creek produces and releases both fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead. Current hatchery production targets are the release of 12 million fall Chinook smolts and 500,000 steelhead yearlings annually (DWR 2004a). The fish are released on station. The Chinook release has the potential for creating competition for habitat and food resources for juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon and the steelhead are of sufficient size to be a significant predator on juvenile Chinook salmon.

3.3.10.3 CLEAR CREEK

Clear Creek is a westside tributary of the upper Sacramento River and enters the river at RM 289 just south of Redding.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Whiskeytown Dam at RM 19 is an impassable barrier to adult anadromous salmonids and marks the upstream extent of potential Spring-run Chinook salmon habitat. Prior to 2001, the McCormick-Saeltzer Dam presented a barrier to upstream migration for anadromous salmonids. Following removal of the Dam in 2001, access to approximately 12 miles of coldwater habitat upstream to Whiskeytown Dam was restored.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Legal harvest of salmonids in Clear Creek and its tributaries is not permitted. Angling is permitted but restricted to barbless hooks and artificial flies and lures only.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature targets in Clear Creek are to maintain water temperatures under 60°F during the spring-run Chinook salmon adult immigration and holding life stage period. These water temperatures are maintained by controlling flows from Whiskeytown Dam. However, under the current flow schedule (see below) it may not be possible to maintain water temperatures under 60°F during particularly hot time periods (USFWS 2003b).

WATER QUALITY

The impact of significant accumulations of mercury is an issue in Clear Creek. Mercury contamination is the result of historic gold mining practices in the watershed (CDFG 2004b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Prior to 1999, streamflows below Whiskeytown Dam were reduced annually to approximately 50 cfs during the summer and increased in early October to provide suitable water temperatures for fall-run Chinook salmon spawning. A flow schedule for Clear Creek has been incorporated into the CVPIA AFRP that is designed to maintain flows in Clear Creek that will allow water temperatures conducive to all spring-run Chinook salmon life stages. Currently the release schedule call for maintenance of 200 cfs flows from October 1 to June 1 and 150 cfs, or less, from July through September in order to maintain water temperatures below 60°F (USFWS 2003b). However, a flow experiment in August 1998 demonstrated that during hot periods, flows higher than 150 cfs may be required to meet temperature targets (USFWS 2003b).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Historically, there were approximately 25 river miles of Chinook salmon habitat available for use in Clear Creek of which only 16 are currently accessible (NMFS Website 2005). Presumably this allowed for some spatial segregation between the spring and fall runs. Now there is likely some overlap in spawning habitat creating a potential for hybridization between spring-run and early spawning fall-run Chinook salmon.

In 2003, a temporary picket weir was installed from September 2 to November 3 to spatially segregate spring-run (released upstream) from fall-run (released downstream). Surveys conducted during the weir installation period documented a total of 55 redds upstream of the weir (CDFG 2004b).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACT

Legal harvest of salmonids in Clear Creek and its tributaries is not permitted. Angling is permitted but restricted to barbless hooks and artificial flies and lures only.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature targets in Clear Creek are to maintain water temperatures under 56°F during the spring-run Chinook salmon spawning life stage period. These water temperatures are maintained by controlling flows from Whiskeytown Dam. However, under the current flow schedule (see below) it may not be possible to maintain water temperatures under 56°F during September to allow for early spawning spring-run Chinook salmon (USFWS 2003b). Currently, the 60°F to 56°F transition date is set at September 15 (USFWS 2003b).

WATER QUALITY

The impact of significant accumulations of mercury is an issue in Clear Creek. Mercury contamination is the result of historic gold mining practices in the watershed (CDFG 2004b)

FLOW CONDITIONS

Prior to 1999, streamflows below Whiskeytown Dam were reduced annually to approximately 50 cfs during the summer and increased in early October to provide suitable water temperatures for fall-run Chinook salmon spawning. A flow schedule for Clear Creek has been incorporated into the CVPIA Anadromous Fisheries Restoration Program Plan that is designed to maintain flows in Clear Creek that will allow water temperatures conducive to all spring-run Chinook salmon life stages. Currently the release schedule call for maintenance of 200 cfs flows from October 1 to June 1 and 150 cfs, or less, from July through September in order to maintain water temperatures below 60°F (USFWS 2003b).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Currently, approximately 16 river miles are available for Chinook salmon spawning in Clear Creek (NMFS Website 2005). Recent spring-run Chinook salmon escapement estimates are depicted in **Figure 3-14**.



Figure 3-14. Clear Creek Spawning Escapement Estimates (1993 – 2006).
Source: (CDFG 2007)

SPAWNING SUBSTRATE AVAILABILITY

The construction of Whiskeytown Dam and significant gravel mining in the Clear Creek watershed has diminished suitable spawning gravel substrate. Currently, gravel replacement projects are being conducted in the watershed (CDFG 2004b). Physical Habitat Alteration

The Clear Creek watershed has undergone extensive modification because of Whiskeytown Dam. Currently, Whiskeytown Dam diverts most of the Clear Creek natural streamflow to Spring Creek. However, extensive water shed rehabilitation efforts are currently underway in the watershed.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Currently, half of the FRFH spring-run production (1,000,000 yearling smolts) are trucked to San Pablo Bay in May through July and released. It is thought that salmonid juveniles move out relatively quickly, but there could be opportunity for hatchery spring-run to out-compete small, natural spring-run entering the estuary after the arrival of FRFH spring-run.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because angling is permitted in Clear Creek and its tributaries, it is possible that anglers could disturb redds by wading through the stream.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature targets in Clear Creek are to maintain water temperatures under 56°F during the spring-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation life stage period. These water temperatures are maintained by controlling flows from Whiskeytown Dam. However, under the current flow schedule (see below) it may not be possible to maintain water temperatures under 56°F during the first part of September to accommodate early spawners (USFWS 2003b). Currently, the 60°F to 56°F transition date is set at September 15 (USFWS 2003b).

WATER QUALITY

The impact of significant accumulations of mercury is an issue in Clear Creek. Mercury contamination is the result of historic gold mining practices in the watershed (CDFG 2004b). Mercury is particularly detrimental to developing embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Prior to 1999, streamflows below Whiskeytown Dam were reduced annually to approximately 50 cfs during the summer and increased in early October to provide suitable water temperatures for fall-run Chinook salmon spawning. A flow schedule for Clear Creek has been incorporated into the CVPIA AFRP that is designed to maintain flows in Clear Creek that will allow water temperatures conducive to all spring-run Chinook salmon life stages. Currently the release schedule call for maintenance of 200 cfs flows from October 1 to June 1 and 150 cfs, or less, from July through September in order to maintain water temperatures below 60°F (USFWS 2003b).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature targets in Clear Creek are to maintain water temperatures under 60°F during the spring-run Chinook salmon juvenile rearing and downstream movement life stage period. These water temperatures are maintained by controlling flows from Whiskeytown Dam. However, under the current flow schedule (see below) it may not be possible to maintain water temperatures under 60°F during particularly hot time periods (USFWS 2003b).

WATER QUALITY

The impact of significant accumulations of mercury is an issue in Clear Creek. Mercury contamination is the result of historic gold mining practices in the watershed (CDFG 2004b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Prior to 1999, streamflows below Whiskeytown Dam were reduced annually to approximately 50 cfs during the summer and increased in early October to provide suitable water temperatures for fall-run Chinook salmon spawning. A flow schedule for Clear Creek has been incorporated into the CVPIA Anadromous Fisheries Restoration Program Plan that is designed to maintain flows in Clear Creek that will allow water temperatures conducive to all spring-run Chinook salmon life stages. Currently the release schedule call for maintenance of 200 cfs flows from October 1 to June 1 and 150 cfs, or less, from July through September in order to maintain water temperatures below 60°F (USFWS 2003b).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Over 30 years of gravel mining in Clear Creek has led to a reduction in riparian habitat along the lower sections (CDFG 2004b). Riparian habitat provides cover for rearing juveniles as well as insect habitat that serves as an important food source.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Whiskeytown Dam diverts most of the historic flow from Clear Creek into Spring Creek and also regulates flows in Clear Creek such that natural flow regimes no longer occur.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Because Clear Creek flows are regulated, the channel has become incised and some connection to the historic flood plain has been lost.

ENTRAINMENT

The level of potential entrainment that may occur in Clear Creek has not been investigated.

PREDATION

Sacramento pikeminnow is likely the most important predator of juvenile salmonids in Clear Creek. While the pikeminnow is native to these waters, habitat alteration may have changed the predator prey dynamics in the system conferring an advantage to pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The CNFH on Battle Creek produces and releases both fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead. Current hatchery production targets are the release of 12 million fall-run Chinook salmon smolts and 500,000 steelhead yearlings annually (DWR 2004a). The fish are released on station. The Chinook release has the potential for creating competition for habitat and food resources for juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon and the steelhead are of sufficient size to be a significant predator on juvenile Chinook salmon.

3.3.11 SUB-ADULT AND ADULT OCEAN RESIDENCE

3.3.11.1 HARVEST

The majority of ocean harvest of Central Valley Chinook salmon stocks occur in the recreational and commercial hook-and-line fisheries off the coasts of California and Oregon (Allen and Hassler 1986). Ocean harvest rate of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon is a function of the Central Valley Index, which is defined as the ratio of ocean catch of all Central Valley Chinook salmon south of Point Arena, California to the sum of this catch and the escapement of Chinook salmon to Central Valley streams and hatcheries. The CVI ranged from 0.55 to 0.80 from 1970 to 1995. In the mid 1990s harvest restrictions

designed to protect winter-run Chinook salmon reduced the CVI. For example, in 2001 the CVI was 0.27.

Direct estimates of spring-run Chinook salmon ocean harvest are available due to a life history investigation that has coded-wire tagged wild Butte Creek spring-run Chinook salmon juveniles for roughly a decade. Analysis using these CWT'd cohorts has provided evidence that ocean harvest of Butte Creek spring-run Chinook salmon has ranged from 36 percent to 59 percent (Grover *et al*. 2004; McReynolds *et al*. 2007). It should be noted that these estimates could be over-estimates if CWT'd fish that survive and return to Butte Creek as adults are not detected. It also should be noted that ocean harvest rates of fall-run Chinook salmon from the Klamath River system, which have an ocean distribution similar to that of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, are considerably lower 36 than the Butte Creek spring-run Chinook salmon rate (pcouncil.org).

Another approach to understanding the ocean harvest rate of Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon is to look at the ocean harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon. A biological opinion on the winter-run Chinook salmon ocean harvest suggests that for brood years 1998, 1999, and 2000, the spawner reduction rates associated with winter-run ocean harvest were 0.26, 0.23, and 0.24, respectively. The spawner reduction rate is the observed fishery mortality in terms of adult-equivalents (fish that are expected to survive natural mortality and spawn) divided by the predicted number of spawners that would survive natural mortality in the absence of fishery mortality (NMFS 200b).

Spring-run Chinook salmon ocean harvest is expected be similar to that of winter-run Chinook salmon, if not higher. A spring-run Chinook salmon ocean harvest level of at least approximately 25 percent represents a substantial stressor to the ESU.

3.3.11.2 OCEAN CONDITIONS

The general diets of salmonids in coastal waters are fairly well known for all salmon species in much of the continental shelf region off the West Coast and Alaska. Quantitative studies of the diet of juvenile salmonids in the California Current include those by MacFarlane and Norton (2002) for California, which are most relevant to the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU. This study found intra-specific differences in the type and size of prey consumed, with coho salmon, Chinook salmon, and cutthroat trout tending to be mainly piscivorous. However, ontological shifts to larger more evasive occurring during later life-stages (Brodeur *et al.* 2003). In addition, inter-annual and intra-annual differences in prey availability can lead to major differences in the diet composition of salmonids in the marine environment. The studies conducted to date have found that juvenile salmonids are highly opportunistic in their feeding habits and tend to select the most visually obvious prey within the preferred size range.

Brodeur and Pearcy (1992b) found that juvenile Chinook and coho salmon have the potential to easily exhaust prey resources during years when ocean productivity is low (e.g., El Niño), but during most years they consume less than 1 percent of the total prey production.

In recent years scientific evidence supports hypotheses about the direct and indirect effects of climate change on the ocean production of salmon. Most of this research has focused on the effects of oceanic climate change on the growth and abundance of salmonids (Hollowed *et al.* 2001; Kruse 1998; Myers *et al.* 2000; Pearcy 1997). Two of the most researched phenomena are the ENSO and the PDO. ENSO is a short-term (8 to 15 months) climate change event that occurs at irregular intervals (approximately every 3 to 7 years) and alternates between two phases, the El Niño (warm) and the La Nina (cool).

The PDO is a multi-decadal (20 to 30 year) ENSO-like pattern of North Pacific climate change. The PDO seems to be associated with an inverse relationship between salmon abundance in the Alaska and the U.S. Pacific Coast regions. During a positive PDO phase, the abundance of Alaska salmon is high, and the abundance of U.S. West Coast salmon is low. An abrupt change between positive and negative PDO phases is referred to as a *regime shift.*

ENSO has been shown to produce dramatic effects on marine communities. Alterations in the physical oceanographic properties of the marine environment can be observed as far north as Alaska. Less known is the phenomenon of La Nina, the cool phase of ENSO events that follows El Niño. During the 1982-1983 El Niño event, there were observable alternations in oceanic plankton distributions, fish community structure, and reduced ocean catches off the coastal waters of southern California. Along central California coast, the 1992-1993 El Niño corresponded to delayed phytoplankton blooms, changes in the abundance and distribution of invertebrates, and an increase in the productivity of southern fish species. However, there was a dramatic decline in the northerly rockfish species. More recently, the largest decline in macrozooplankton abundance off central southern California occurred during the 1997-1998 El Niño (Pearcy 1997).

Changes in the physiology and behavior of salmonid populations have been recorded during ENSO events. Reduced condition and growth of sockeye salmon in the Gulf of Alaska during the 1997-1998 El Niño event was related to alterations in the primary prey base. Lower survival rates of juvenile coho salmon upon entering the ocean, higher mortality of adult coho, and reduced size in both coho and Chinook salmon occurred off the coast of Oregon during the 1982-1983 El Niño (Pearcy 1997).

In a study conducted by MacFarlane and Norton (2002) during the 1997-1998 El Niño event on juvenile Chinook salmon in the Gulf of the Farallones, an embayment on the central California coast. The Gulf of the Farallones is a large section of the continental shelf extending from Pt. Reyes, north of San Francisco Bay to the Farallon Islands. It receives freshwater outflow from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. It is the point of ocean entry for an estimated 60 million Chinook salmon smolts spawned from four runs; fall, late-fall, winter, and spring in streams and hatcheries of the Central Valley.

Relative growth rates of juvenile Chinook salmon were estimated from daily otolith increment width of individuals captured via trawl at locations in the Gulf of the Farallones. Plankton samples were also collected at 5 meters and 15 to 25 meters below the surface to estimate secondary productivity and zooplankton composition. The mean otolith increment widths were used as an index of somatic growth during the first 100 days after leaving the Bay-Delta. Growth rate indices for juvenile salmonids caught during the 1998 El Niño period were significantly greater ($P<0.0001$) than for fish collected in 1999. Juvenile salmon in the Gulf of the Farallones not only grew faster and had greater lipid concentrations during the El Niño period, their condition (Fulton's K-factor) was better as well. In 1998, mean K increased to approximately 1.42 for gulf salmon from approximately 1.03 at ocean entry, compared with a change from 1.04 at ocean entry to 1.32 in the gulf during 1999.

Primary productivity, indexed by chlorophyll *a* concentrations, was similar between the two years, however, the distribution of phytoplankton differed. In 1998, phytoplankton were distributed within the gulf on the continental shelf to the west. Greater nutrient freshwater influx coupled with higher sea surface temperatures in 1998 may have accounted for the higher productivity in the gulf during the El Niño event. These data indicate that the 1997-1998 El Niño event was not detrimental to juvenile Chinook salmon growth during the earliest stages their life cycle in the marine environment.

A dramatic increasing trend in the abundance of Alaska salmon that began in the late 1970s has been correlated with relatively warmer sea surface temperatures in the North Pacific. Hare and Matura (2001) hypothesized that a sharp negative shift in the PDO climate index in the fall of 1998 may signify a climate change event that will reverse salmon production trends that began in the 1970s. Since the 1990s Western Alaska has observed extremely low Chinook salmon and chum salmon returns, but returns of salmon in the south-central and southeast of Alaska have at times reached historical highs (ADFG 2002). In general, escapement data indicate that salmon returns in many U.S. Pacific Northwest rivers have improved since the late 1990s.

3.4 STRESSOR PRIORITIZATION

3.4.1 STRESSOR MATRIX DEVELOPMENT

3.4.1.1 STRESSOR MATRIX OVERVIEW

Stressor matrices, in the form of Microsoft Excel spreadsheets, were developed to structure the spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group, population, life stage, and stressor information into hierarchically related tiers so that stressors within each diversity group and population in the ESU could be prioritized. The individual tiers within the matrices, from highest to lowest, are: (1) diversity group; (2) population; (3) life stage; (4) primary stressor category; and (5) specific stressor. These individual tiers were related hierarchically so that each variable within a tier had several associated variables at the next lower tier, except at the lowest tier. The three diversity groups were equally weighted in order to be consistent with the recovery criteria described in this recovery plan, which were, in-part, based on the "representation and redundancy" rule described in Lindley *et al*. (2007). This rule reflects the importance of having multiple diversity groups comprised of multiple independent populations in order to recover the ESU (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

The general steps required to develop and utilize the spring-run stressor matrices are described as follows:

1. Each population within a diversity group was weighted so that all population weights in the diversity group summed to one;
2. Each life stage within the population was weighted so that all life stage weights in the population summed to one;
3. Each primary stressor category within a life stage was weighted so that all primary stressor category weights in a life stage summed to one;
4. Each specific stressor within a primary stressor category was weighted so that all specific stressor weights in a primary stressor category summed to one;
5. A composite weight for each specific stressor was obtained by multiplying the product of the population weight, the life stage weight, the primary stressor weight, and the specific stressor weight by 100;
6. A normalized weight for each specific stressor was obtained by multiplying the composite weight by the number of specific stressors within a particular primary stressor group; and
7. The stressor matrix was sorted by the normalized weight of the specific stressors in descending order.

The completed stressor matrix sorted by normalized weight is a prioritized list of the life stage-specific stressors affecting the ESU. For spring-run Chinook salmon, threats were prioritized within each diversity group as well as within each population. Specific information explaining the individual steps taken to generate these prioritized lists is provided in the following sections.

3.4.1.2 POPULATION IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

The threats assessment for the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU included rivers that both historically supported and currently support spring-run Chinook salmon populations. Lindley *et al.* (2004) , which describes the population structure of threatened and endangered Chinook salmon ESUs in California's Central Valley Basin was used to identify 12 individual rivers that historically supported and currently support spring-run Chinook salmon populations. These 12 spring-run Chinook salmon populations were categorized into three diversity groups as described by Lindley *et al.* (2007) (**Table 3-5**).

Table 3-5. Extant Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon Populations Included in the Threats Assessment Categorized by Diversity Group

Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group	Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group	Northwestern California Diversity Group
Feather River	Battle Creek	Thomes Creek
Yuba River	Upper Sacramento River	Cottonwood/Beegum Creek
Butte Creek		Clear Creek
Big Chico Creek		
Deer Creek		
Mill Creek		
Antelope Creek		

Source: (Lindley *et al.* 2007)

Several steps were taken to obtain a population weight. First, for a given population, each of the weighting characteristics listed below received a whole number score of one through four. For example, a population with high abundance and low genetic integrity received a population abundance score of four and a genetic integrity score of one. After scores were identified for the weighting characteristics for each population, the sum of the weighting characteristic scores for one population was divided by the total sum of the scores for all populations within the diversity group. The resultant quotient is the population weight, thus the population weights within a diversity group sum to one. The weighting characteristic scores and population weights for each spring-run Chinook salmon population in each of the three diversity groups are presented in **Tables 3-6, 3-7, and 3-8**.

Within each of the three diversity groups, populations were weighted relative to one another by scoring the weighting characteristics described below.

- Population abundance
  - A population with relatively low returning adult abundance estimates would receive a low score; highly abundant populations would receive a high score

- Genetic integrity
  - A population supported primarily by hatchery-produced fish would receive a low score, whereas a population with little to no influence of hatchery-produced fish would receive a high score

- Population spatial structure
  - A population that is geographically isolated from other populations in the ESU enhances the ESU's spatial structure and would thus receive a high score; populations in close geographic proximity to one another would receive a low score

- The extent to which the current population is genetically and behaviorally representative of the natural historic population
  - A population that was once extirpated and has been re-established would receive a low score
  - A population supported by hatchery production would receive a low score (i.e., 1 or 2 depending on the degree of hatchery influence)
  - A historically dependent population would receive a low score
  - A population characterized by a consistent and relatively stable returning adult population comprised of naturally-produced fish would receive a high score

Table 3-6. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Population in the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group

Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group	Deer	Mill	Butte	Yuba	Feather	Antelope	Big Chico
Abundance	3	3	4	3	4	1	2
Genetic Integrity	4	4	4	2	1	3	3
Source/Sink	4	4	4	4	4	2	1
Natural Historic Population	4	4	4	4	4	3	1
Habitat Quantity and Quality	4	4	2	4	2	3	2
Restoration Potential	3	3	2	3	2	3	2
Distinct Spring-run Life History	4	4	3	2	2	4	3
Spatial Consideration	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
Sum	28	28	25	25	22	21	16
Population Weight (Sum to 1)	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.10

Table 3-7. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Population in the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group

Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group	Upper Sacramento (Mainstem)	Battle
Abundance	1	4
Genetic Integrity	2	2
Source/Sink	2	4
Natural Historic Population	3	3
Habitat Quantity and Quality	3	2
Restoration Potential	3	4
Distinct Spring-run Life History	2	3
Spatial Consideration	4	4
Sum	20	26
Population Weight (Sum to 1)	0.43	0.57

Table 3-8. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Population in the Spring-run Chinook Salmon Northwestern California Diversity Group

Northwestern California Diversity Group	Cottonwood/ Beegum	Clear	Thomes
Abundance	1	2	1
Genetic Integrity	3	2	2
Source/Sink	1	1	1
Natural Historic Population	2	1	1
Habitat Quantity and Quality	2	3	1
Restoration Potential	1	2	1
Distinct Spring-run Life History	4	3	1
Spatial Consideration	4	4	4
Sum	18	18	12
Population Weight (Sum to 1)	0.38	0.38	0.25

- Whether the population primarily functions as a source or sink
  - A population with consistently high abundance may serve as a source of individuals to other populations and would receive a high score
  - Populations primarily dependent on fish straying from other populations would receive a low score

- The general habitat quantity and quality available in the population's natal stream
  - Several variables were considered when evaluating salmonid habitat availability including, but not limited to flow, water temperature, instream cover, riparian habitat, substrate, and the presence of passage impediments/barriers

- The restoration potential of the population's natal stream
  - Populations on rivers/streams that can be relatively easily restored to increase or improve the amount of habitat available to the fish would receive a high score, whereas populations on rivers with limited habitat and large impassable dams would receive a low score

- Whether the population exhibits a distinctive life history
  - Rivers with habitat conditions amenable to a stream-type life history and/or rivers with fish exhibiting a distinctive stream-type life history would receive a high score; populations exhibiting an ocean-type life history would receive a low score

These eight population characteristics were identified to reflect the VSP framework (McElhany *et al.* 2000) in an attempt to best weight populations according to their relative importance to the viability of the diversity group they belong to. Although some redundancy exists in the specific factors considered among the eight population characteristics, each characteristic uniquely reflects the VSP framework.

3.4.1.3 LIFE STAGE IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

The life stage identification and ranking procedures for spring-run Chinook salmon were identical to that of winter-run Chinook salmon. Please see Section 2.4.1.3 for a description of those procedures. The life stage weightings for each spring-run Chinook salmon population are presented in Attachment B.

3.4.1.4 STRESSOR IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

The stressor identification and ranking procedures for spring-run Chinook salmon were identical to that of winter-run Chinook salmon. Please see Section 2.4.1.4 for a description of those procedures.

3.4.2 STRESSOR MATRIX RESULTS

3.4.2.1 NORTHERN SIERRA NEVADA DIVERSITY GROUP

The northern Sierra Nevada spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group is comprised of the Feather and Yuba rivers, and Butte, Big Chico, Deer, Mill, and Antelope creeks. Stressors of very high importance were identified for all populations and life stages in this diversity group including:

- Passage impediments and/or barriers affecting adult immigration in all of the rivers and creeks;
- High water temperatures during the adult immigration and holding life stage in Butte, Big Chico, Deer, Mill, and Antelope creeks;
- The Fish Barrier Dam and Oroville Dam on the Feather River, and Englebright Dam on the Yuba River as barriers blocking access to historic holding and spawning habitats, a critical factor in the hybridization with fall-run Chinook salmon, and as limiting the instream supply of spawning gravels;
- Entrainment in the Delta, in the lower and middle sections of the Sacramento River, in Antelope Creek, and in the Yuba River;
- Sedimentation impacts on the embryo incubation life stage in Butte, Deer, Mill, and Antelope creeks; and

- Numerous factors affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage in the Delta and lower Sacramento River such as loss of floodplain habitat, loss of natural river morphology and function, loss of riparian habitat and instream cover, and predation.

Many additional stressors were identified as having a very high importance to the northern Sierra Nevada spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group. The complete prioritized list of life-stage specific stressors to this diversity group is displayed in Attachment B.

3.4.2.2 BASALT AND POROUS LAVA DIVERSITY GROUP

The basalt and porous lava spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group is comprised of the Battle Creek and the mainstem Upper Sacramento River. Stressors of very high importance were identified for both populations and life stages in this diversity group including:

- RBDD on the Sacramento River and the dams on the North and South forks of Battle Creek as passage impediments to the adult immigration and holding life stage;
- Keswick Dam as a barrier blocking access to historic holding and spawning habitats, a critical factor in the hybridization with fall-run Chinook salmon, and as limiting the instream supply of spawning gravels;
- Releases of yearling steelhead produced at CNFH competing with, and more importantly, preying on naturally spawned juvenile Chinook salmon in Battle Creek;
- Low-flow conditions in Battle Creek during the adult immigration and holding life stage;
- Entrainment at individual diversions in the Delta, lower and middle Sacramento River, and in Battle Creek;
- Numerous factors affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage in the Delta, and lower, middle, and upper Sacramento River such as loss of floodplain habitat, loss of natural river morphology and function, loss of riparian habitat and instream cover, and predation.

Additional stressors were identified as having a very high importance to the basalt and porous lava spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group. The complete prioritized list of life-stage specific stressors to this diversity group is displayed in Attachment B.

3.4.2.3 NORTHWESTERN CALIFORNIA DIVERSITY GROUP

The northwestern California spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group is comprised of the Thomes, Cottonwood/Beegum, and Clear creeks. Stressors of very high importance were identified for all populations and life stages in this diversity group including:

- High water temperatures in Thomes, Cottonwood/Beegum, and Clear creeks during the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages;
- Agricultural diversion dams and excessive channel braiding impeding adult immigration in Thomes Creek;
- Whiskeytown Dam on Clear Creek as a barrier and as limiting the instream supply of spawning gravels;
- Sedimentation affecting the embryo incubation life stage in Clear and Cottonwood/Beegum creeks;
- Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in Cottonwood/Beegum and Clear creeks;
- Loss of natural river morphology and function in Cottonwood/Beegum and Clear creeks; and
- Numerous factors affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage in the Delta and lower Sacramento River such as loss of floodplain habitat, loss of natural river morphology and function, loss of riparian habitat and instream cover, and predation.

Additional stressors were identified as having a very high importance to the northwestern California spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group. The complete prioritized list of life-stage specific stressors to this diversity group is displayed in Attachment B.

4.0 CENTRAL VALLEY STEELHEAD

4.1 BACKGROUND

4.1.1 LISTING HISTORY

NMFS proposed to list the Central Valley steelhead as endangered on August 9, 1996 (61 FR 41541 (August 1996)). NMFS concluded that the Central Valley steelhead ESU was in danger of extinction because of habitat degradation and destruction, blockage of freshwater habitats, water allocation problems, the pervasive opportunity for genetic introgression resulting from widespread production of hatchery steelhead and the potential ecological interaction between introduced stocks and native stocks. Moreover, NMFS proposed to list steelhead as endangered because steelhead had been extirpated from most of their historical range (61 FR 41541 (August 1996)).

On March 19, 1998, NMFS listed the Central Valley steelhead as a threatened species (63 FR 13347 (March 19, 1998)). NMFS concluded that the risks to Central Valley steelhead had diminished since the completion of the 1996 status review based on a review of existing and recently implemented state conservation efforts and federal management programs (e.g., CVPIA AFRP, CALFED) that address key factors for the decline of this species. In addition, NMFS asserted that additional actions benefiting Central Valley steelhead included efforts to enhance fisheries monitoring and conservation actions to address artificial propagation (63 FR 13347 (March 19, 1998)).

On September 8, 2000, pursuant to a July 10, 2000, rule issued by NMFS under Section 4(d) of the ESA (16 USC § 1533(d)), the take restrictions that apply statutorily to endangered species began to apply to Central Valley steelhead (65 FR 42421 (July 10, 2000)).

On January 5, 2006, NMFS departed from their previous practice of applying the ESU policy to steelhead. NMFS concluded that the within a discrete group of steelhead populations, the resident and anadromous life forms of steelhead remain "markedly separated" as a consequence of physical, ecological and behavioral factors, and may therefore warrant delineation as a separate DPS. In addition, on January 5, 2006, NMFS reaffirmed the threatened status of the Central Valley Steelhead DPS (71 FR 834 (January 5, 2006)). NMFS based its conclusion on conservation and protective efforts that, *"mitigate the immediacy of extinction risk facing the Central Valley steelhead DPS."*

This Central Valley Steelhead ESU includes all naturally spawned populations of steelhead in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and their tributaries, excluding steelhead from San Francisco and San Pablo bays and their tributaries (63 FR 13347 *in* NMFS 2007). This decision also included the CNFH and FRFH steelhead populations (NMFS 2007).

4.1.2 CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATION

NMFS proposed critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead on February 5, 1999, in compliance with Section 4(a)(3)(A) of the ESA, which requires that, to the maximum extent prudent and determinable, NMFS designates critical habitat concurrently with a determination that a species is endangered or threatened (NMFS 1999). On February 16, 2000, NMFS published a final rule designating critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead. Critical habitat was designated to include all river reaches accessible to listed steelhead in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries in California. Also included were river reaches and estuarine areas of the Delta, all waters from Chipps Island westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strait, all waters of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge, and all waters of San Francisco Bay (north of the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge) from San Pablo Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge (NMFS 2000).

In response to litigation brought by NAHB on the grounds that the agency did not adequately consider economic impacts of the critical habitat designations (NAHB v. Evans, 2002 WL 1205743 No. 00–Central Valley–2799 (D.D.C.)), NMFS sought judicial approval of a consent decree withdrawing critical habitat designations for 19 Pacific salmon and *O. mykiss* ESUs. The District Court in Washington DC approved the consent decree and vacated the critical habitat designations by Court order on April 30, 2002 (NAHB v. Evans, 2002 WL 1205743 (D.D.C. 2002)).

NMFS proposed new critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead on December 10, 2004, and published a final rule designating critical habitat for this species on September 2, 2005. The designated critical habitat encompasses 2,308 miles of stream habitat in the Central Valley and an additional 254 square miles of estuary habitat in the San Francisco-San Pablo-Suisun Bay complex. For a list of designated critical habitat units, see the September 2, 2005 Federal Register Notice (70 FR 52488 (September 2, 2005)).

4.1.3 UNIQUE SPECIES CHARACTERISTICS

4.1.3.1 LIFE HISTORY STRATEGY

Steelhead may exhibit anadromous behavior or remain in fresh water for their entire life. Resident forms are usually referred to as ‘‘rainbow’’ or ‘‘redband’’ trout, while anadromous life forms are termed ‘‘steelhead.’’ Anadromous steelhead typically migrate to marine waters after spending 2 years in fresh water. They reside in marine waters for typically 2 or 3 years prior to returning to their natal stream to spawn as 4- or 5-year-olds. Unlike Pacific salmon, steelhead are capable of spawning more than once before they die. However, it is rare for steelhead to spawn more than twice before dying; and most that do so are females (Moyle 2002).

Currently, Central Valley steelhead are considered “ocean-maturing” (also known as winter) steelhead, although summer steelhead may have been present prior to construction of large dams (Moyle 2002). Ocean maturing steelhead enter fresh water with well-developed gonads and spawn shortly after river entry. Central Valley steelhead begin entering fresh water in August, with peak in late September through October. They hold until flows are high enough in tributaries to enter for spawning (Moyle 2002). Steelhead adults typically spawn from December through April with peaks from January though March in small streams and tributaries where cool, well-oxygenated water is available year-round (McEwan and Jackson 1996 and Hallock *et al.* 1961). Depending on water temperature, steelhead eggs may incubate in redds for 1.5 to 4 months before hatching as alevins. Following yolk sac absorption, alevins emerge from the gravel as young juveniles or fry and begin actively feeding (Moyle 2002).

Some populations of steelhead have an additional variant in their life history pattern--the half-pounder. These are immature fish, measuring 25 to 35 centimeters (cm) FL, that over-winter in fresh water after spending a summer in the ocean.

Regardless of life history strategy, for the first year or two, steelhead are found in cool, clear, fast-flowing permanent streams and rivers where riffles predominate over pools, where ample cover from riparian vegetation or undercut banks, and where invertebrate life is diverse and abundant. In streams, strong shifts in habitat occur with size and season. The smallest fish are most often found in riffles; intermediate size fish in runs; and large size fish in pools. Steelhead are found where daytime water temperatures range from nearly 32ºF in winter to 81ºF in the summer (Moyle 2002).

When water temperatures become stressful in streams, juvenile steelhead are faced with the increased energetic costs of living at high water temperatures. Hence, juvenile steelhead will move into fast riffles to feed because of increased abundance of food, even though there are additional costs associated with maintaining position in fast water. At high water temperatures, steelhead also are more vulnerable to

unusual stress, and likely to die as a consequence. When water temperatures are high for steelhead but optimal for a coexisting fish species, interactions may reduce steelhead growth (Moyle 2002).

Predators also have a strong effect on microhabitats selected by steelhead. Small steelhead select places to live based largely on proximity to cover in order to hide from avian predators.

Optimal water temperatures for growth of steelhead have been reported around 59ºF to 64.4ºF (Moyle 2002). Many factors affect choice of water temperatures by steelhead, including the availability of food. As steelhead grow, they establish individual feeding territories; juveniles typically rear for one to two years (and up to four years) in streams before emigration as "smolts" (juvenile fish which can survive the transition from fresh water to salt water) (61 FR 41541 (August 1996)). Some may use tidal marsh areas, non-tidal freshwater marshes, and other shallow water areas in the Delta as rearing areas for short periods prior to their final emigration to the sea. In the Sacramento River, juvenile steelhead migrate to the ocean in spring and early summer at 1 to 3 years of age and 10 to 25 cm FL, with peak migration through the Delta in March and April (Reynolds *et al.* 1993). Hallock *et al.* (1961) found that juvenile steelhead in the Sacramento River basin migrate downstream during most months of the year, but the peak emigration period occurred in the spring, with a much smaller peak in the fall.

Growth of steelhead in fresh water is highly variable, but sizes of 10 to 12 cm FL at the end of year one and 16 to 17 cm at the end of year two are fairly typical. An additional spurt of growth may occur in spring, just prior to smolting, giving smolts age one and above an additional size advantage. Steelhead are primarily drift feeders and may forage in open water of estuarine subtidal and riverine tidal wetland habitats. The diet of juvenile steelhead includes emergent aquatic insects, aquatic insect larvae, snails, amphipods, opossum shrimp, and small fish (Moyle 2002).

Steelhead may remain in the ocean from one to four years, growing rapidly as they feed in the highly productive currents along the continental shelf (Barnhart 1986). The age composition of high seas steelhead is dominated by one-year (61.9 percent) and two-year (31.4 percent) ocean fish, with a maximum of six years at sea (Burgner *et al.* 1992). Steelhead experience most of their marine phase mortality soon after they enter the Pacific Ocean (Pearcy 1992). Ocean mortality is poorly understood. Possible causes of juvenile steelhead mortality are predation, starvation, osmotic stress, disease, and advective losses (Wooster 1983; Hunter 1983, both cited in Pearcy 1992). Marine mortality of adult steelhead may occur from unauthorized high seas driftnet fisheries, predation, competition, and environmental conditions in the ocean (Cooper and Johnson 1992). Competition between steelhead and other species for limited food resources in the Pacific Ocean may be a contributing factor to declines in steelhead populations, particularly during years of low productivity (Cooper and Johnson 1992).

Oceanic and climate conditions such as sea surface temperatures, air temperatures, strength of upwelling, El Niño events, salinity, ocean currents, wind speed, and primary and secondary productivity affect all facets of the physical, biological and chemical processes in the marine environment. Some of the conditions associated with El Niño events include warmer water temperatures, weak upwelling, low primary productivity (which leads to decreased zooplankton biomass), decreased southward transport of sub-arctic water, and increased sea levels (Pearcy 1992). For juvenile steelhead, warmer water and weakened upwellings are possibly the most important of the ocean conditions associated with El Niño. Because of the weakened upwelling during an El Niño year, juvenile California steelhead would need to more actively migrate offshore through possibly stressful warm waters with numerous inshore predators. Strong upwelling is probably beneficial because of the greater transport of smolts offshore, beyond major concentrations of inshore predators (Pearcy 1992).

Steelhead have well-developed homing abilities and usually spawn in the same stream and area in which they had lived as fry. These fish also are capable of spawning in tributaries that dry up during summer, because fry emigrate soon after hatching (Moyle 2002). Steelhead usually do not eat when migrating upstream and often lose body weight.

Central Valley steelhead spawn below dams on every major tributary within the Sacramento and San Joaquin River systems. The female steelhead selects a site with good intergravel flow, digs a redd with her tail, usually in the coarse gravel of the tail of a pool or in a riffle, and deposits eggs while an attendant male fertilizes them. Water velocities over redds are typically 20 to 155 cm/sec, and in depths are 10 to 150 cm. Mating behavior between a pair of large adult fish is similar to that of other salmonids but complicated by the presence of other males, which sneak into spawn along with the mated pair (Moyle 2002). The sneaker males can range from small par that have probably never been to sea, to jacks, to slightly smaller subordinate sea-run males, kept at bay by the aggressive attacks of the dominant male (Moyle 2002).

Eggs in the redd are covered with gravel dislodged just upstream by similar redd building actions. The number of eggs laid per female depends on size and origin but ranges from 200 to 12,000 eggs. The eggs hatch in three to four weeks at 50 to 59ºF, and fry emerge from the gravel four to six weeks later but factors such as redd depth, gravel size, siltation, and water temperature can speed or retard the time to emergence (Shapovalov and Taft 1954). The fry initially live in quiet waters close to shore and exhibit little aggressive behavior for several weeks.

4.1.3.2 HISTORIC SPAWNING HABITAT UTILIZATION

Central Valley steelhead historically were well-distributed throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers prior to dam construction, water development, and watershed perturbations of the 19th and 20th centuries (NMFS 1996, Busby *et al.* 1996 in NMFS 2007). They were found from the upper Sacramento and Pit River systems (now inaccessable due to Shasta and Keswick Dams) south to the Kings and possibly the Kern River systems, and in both east- and west-side Sacramento River tributaries (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1996). Lindley *et al.* (2006) estimated that historically there were at least 81 independant Central Valley steelhead populations distributed primarily throughout the eastern tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. Presently, impassable dams block access to 80 percent of historically available habitat, and block access to all historical spawning habitat for about 38 percent of historical populations (Lindley *et al.* 2006). Existing wild steelhead stocks in the Central Valley are mostly confined to the upper Sacramento River and its tributaries, including Antelope, Deer, and Mill creeks and the Yuba River. Populations may exist in Big Chico and Butte Creeks, and a few wild steelhead are produced in the American and Feather rivers (CDFG 1996b).

4.1.4 STATUS OF CENTRAL VALLEY STEELHEAD

4.1.4.1 HISTORIC POPULATION TRENDS

Historic Central Valley steelhead run sizes are difficult to estimate given the paucity of data, but may have approached one to two million adults annually (McEwan 2001). By the early 1960s, the steelhead run size had declined to about 40,000 adults (McEwan 2001). Over the past 30 years, the naturally-spawned steelhead populations in the upper Sacramento River have declined substantially (**Figure 4-1**) (NMFS 2007).

4.1.4.2 CURRENT STATUS

Until recently, Central Valley steelhead were thought to be extirpated from the San Joaquin River system. Recent monitoring has detected small self-sustaining populations of steelhead in the Stanislaus, Mokelumne, and Calaveras rivers, and other streams previously thought to be devoid of steelhead (McEwan 2001). Incidental catches and observations of steelhead juveniles also have occurred on the Tuolumne and Merced rivers during fall-run Chinook salmon monitoring activities, indicating that steelhead are widespread, throughout accessible streams and rivers in the Central Valley (Good *et al.* 2005).



Figure 4-1. Estimated Natural Steelhead Run Size on the Upper Sacramento River, 1967 Through 1993

4.1.4.3 EXTINCTION RISK ASSESSMENT

The majority of BRT votes were for "in danger of extinction," and the remainder was for "likely to become endangered" Abundance, productivity, and spatial structure were of highest concern (4.2–4.4), although diversity considerations were of significant concern (3.6). All categories received a 5 from at least one BRT member. The BRT was highly concerned that what little new information was available indicated that the monotonic decline in total abundance and in the proportion of wild fish in the Central Valley steelhead ESU was continuing. Other major concerns included the loss of the vast majority of historical spawning areas above impassable dams, the lack of any steelheadspecific status monitoring, and the significant production of out-of-ESU steelhead by the Nimbus and Mokelumne river fish hatcheries. The BRT viewed the anadromous life history form as a critical component of diversity within the ESU and did not place much importance on sparse information suggesting widespread and abundant steelhead populations in areas above impassable dams. Dams both reduce the scope for expression of the anadromous life history form, thereby greatly reducing the abundance of anadromous steelhead and prevent exchange of migrants among resident populations, a process presumably mediated by anadromous fish.

As previously discussed, NMFS determined that Central Valley steelhead should not be listed as "endangered" but as threatened because conservation and protective efforts *"mitigate the immediacy of extinction risk facing the Central Valley steelhead DPS."*

4.2 LIFE HISTORY AND BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

4.2.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

4.2.1.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Steelhead are predominantly winter steelhead; therefore, the following information describes the life history of winter steelhead. Adult steelhead generally immigrate from the ocean to the Sacramento River from August through March (McEwan 2001). The general life stage timing for each individual steelhead population is displayed in **Figures 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5**.

4.2.1.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Adult steelhead immigration into the Delta and the lower Sacramento River occurs from August through March (McEwan 2001; NMFS 2004a), and peaks during January and February (Moyle 2002). Suitable water temperatures for adult steelhead migrating upstream to spawning grounds range from 46°F to 52°F (NMFS 2000; NMFS 2002; SWRCB 2003). Prolonged exposure to water temperatures above 73°F is reported to be lethal to adult steelhead (Moyle 2002).

Adult steelhead hold in deep pools with cool water, normally in the mainstem rivers, until flows are high enough in tributaries to allow entrance for spawning (Moyle 2002). The minimum depth requirement for passage of adults is reported to be 7 inches (Thompson 1972) although the distance fish must travel through shallow water areas is also a critical factor. Additionally, water velocities exceeding 10 to 13 ft/sec likely present barriers to upstream migration (Reiser and Bjornn 1979).

4.2.2 ADULT SPAWNING

4.2.2.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Central Valley adult steelhead generally begin spawning in late December and extend through to March, but also can range from November through April (CDFG 1986). The general life stage timing for each individual steelhead population is displayed in Figures 4-2, 4-3, 4-4 and 4-5.

4.2.2.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Steelhead adults typically spawn from December through April with peaks from January though March in small streams and tributaries where cool, well oxygenated water is available year-round (Hallock *et al.* 1961; McEwan 2001).

A review of the literature suggests optimal conditions for steelhead spawning occur at water temperatures ≤ 52°F (NMFS 2001; NMFS 2002; Reclamation 1997; SWRCB 2003; USFWS 1995c). The literature also reports high survival and normal development (Kamler and Kato 1983; Redding and Schreck 1979; Rombough 1988) at temperatures below 54°F, however, some evidence suggests that symptoms of thermal stress arise at or near 54.0°F (Humpesch 1985; Timoshina 1972).

Steelhead spawn in areas with a gravel substrate and water velocities ranging from 1 to 3.6 ft/sec but prefer velocities of about 2 ft/sec (30–110 cm/sec) at depths of 6 to 28 inches (Bovee 1978). Likewise, the USFWS (1995c) reported a water velocity range for steelhead spawning of 0.5–3.6 ft/sec (15.2–109 cm/sec) at similar depths. The preferred gravel particle size for steelhead spawning ranges from 0.25 to 3.0 inches in diameter, with a sand and silt component of less than 5 percent (USFWS 1995c).



Figure 4-2. Life Stage Timing for Steelhead Populations in the Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group

Sources: American River (Water Forum 2001); Auburn/Coon and Dry creeks (assumed to be same as American River); Feather River (CALFED and YCWA 2005; pers. comm., Cavallo 2004); Bear River (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); Yuba River (CALFED and YCWA 2005; CDFG 1991b; McEwan 2001); Butte Creek (Shapovalov and Taft 1954; USFWS 2000); Big Chico Creek (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007; Interagency Ecological Program Steelhead Project Work Team Website 1998); Deer Creek (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); Mill Creek (Hallock 1989); Antelope Creek (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001)



Figure 4-3. Life Stage Timing for Steelhead Populations in the Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group

Sources: Battle Creek (Ward and Kier 1999a); Cow Creek (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); Upper Sacramento River (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001)



Figure 4-4. Life Stage Timing for Steelhead Populations in the Northwestern California Diversity Group

Sources: Stony Creek (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); Thomes Creek (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); Cottonwood/Beegum Creek (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); Clear Creek (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); Putah Creek (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001)



Figure 4-5. Life Stage Timing for Steelhead Populations in the Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group

Sources: Mokelumne River (EBMUD Website 2007); Calaveras River (Fishery Foundation of California 2004); Stanislaus River (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); Tuolumne River (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001; Reynolds et al. 1993); Merced River (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001); San Joaquin River (Castleberry et al. 1991; CDFG 1986; McEwan 2001)

4.2.3 EMBRYO INCUBATION

4.2.3.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

California Central Valley adult steelhead eggs incubate within the gravel and hatch from approximately 19 to 80 days at water temperatures ranging from 60°F to 40°F, respectively. After hatching, the young fish (alevins) remain in the gravel for an extra two to six weeks before emerging from the gravel and taking up residence in the shallow margins of the stream. Steelhead generally initiate their embryo incubation period from late-December to June (CDFG 1996b). The general life stage timing for each individual steelhead population is displayed in Figures 4-2, 4-3, 4-4 and 4-5.

4.2.3.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Steelhead embryo incubation generally occurs from December through June in the Central Valley. Following deposition of fertilized eggs in the redd, they are covered with loose gravel. Central Valley steelhead eggs can reportedly survive at water temperature ranges of 35.6°F to 59°F (Myrick and Cech 2001). However, steelhead eggs reportedly have the highest survival rates at water temperature ranges of 44.6°F to 50.0°F (Myrick and Cech 2001). The eggs hatch in three to four weeks at 50°F to 59°F, and fry emerge from the gravel four to six weeks later (Shapovalov and Taft 1954).

Steelhead embryo development requires a constant supply of well oxygenated water. This implies a loose gravel substrate allowing high permeability with little silt or sand deposition during the development time period.

4.2.4 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

4.2.4.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Most juvenile steelhead spend one to three years in fresh water before emigrating to the ocean as smolts (Shapovalov and Taft 1954). The primary period of steelhead smolt outmigration from rivers and creeks to the ocean generally occurs from January to June. The general life stage timing for each individual steelhead population is displayed in Figures 4-2, 4-3, 4-4 and 4-5.

BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Regardless of life history strategy, for the first year or two of life rainbow trout and steelhead are found in cool, clear, fast-flowing permanent streams and rivers where riffles predominate over pools, there is ample cover from riparian vegetation or undercut banks, and invertebrate life is diverse and abundant (Moyle 2002). The smallest fish are most often found in riffles; intermediate size fish in runs; and larger fish in pools. Steelhead can be found where daytime water temperatures range from nearly 32°F to 81°F in the summer (Moyle 2002). However, an upper water temperature limit of 65°F is preferred for growth and development of Sacramento River and American River juvenile steelhead (NMFS 2002a).

Studies indicate that the majority of returning adult steelhead in the Central Valley spend two years in freshwater before emigrating to the ocean (McEwan 2001). For juvenile steelhead to survive the winter, they must avoid predation and high flows by finding cover and velocity refuge in the interstitial spaces between cobbles and boulders (Bjornn 1971; Everest *et al.* 1986). Age 0+ steelhead can use shallower habitats and can find interstitial cover in gravel-sized substrates, while age 1+ or 2+ steelhead need a coarser cobble/boulder substrate for cover (Bisson *et al.* 1988).

4.2.5 SMOLT OUTMIGRATION

4.2.5.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

In the Sacramento River, juvenile steelhead migrate to the ocean in spring and early summer at 1 to 3 years of age and 10 to 25 cm FL with peak migration through the Delta in March and April (Reynolds et al. 1993). Hallock et al. (1961) found that juvenile steelhead in the Sacramento River basin migrate downstream during most months of the year, but the peak emigration period occurred in the spring, with a much smaller peak in the fall.

4.2.5.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Steelhead successfully smolt at water temperatures in the 43.7°F to 52.3°F range (Myrick and Cech 2001). Optimum water temperature range for successful smoltification in young steelhead is 44.0°F to 52.3°F (Rich 1987). Wagner (1974) reported smolting ceased rather abruptly when water temperatures increased to 57°F-64°F.

In the Sacramento River, juvenile steelhead migrate to the ocean in spring and early summer at 1 to 3 years of age and 10 to 25 cm FL, with peak migration through the Delta in March and April (Reynolds *et al.* 1993). Hallock *et al.* (1961) found that juvenile steelhead in the Sacramento River basin migrate downstream during most months of the year, but the peak emigration period occurred in the spring, with a much smaller peak in the fall

4.2.6 SUB-ADULT AND ADULT OCEAN RESIDENCE

4.2.6.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND TEMPORAL DISTRIBUTION

Steelhead may remain in the ocean from one to four years, growing rapidly as they feed in the highly productive currents along the continental shelf (Barnhart 1986). Compared to Chinook salmon, relatively little is known about the geographic distribution of steelhead in the ocean.

4.2.6.2 BIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS

Oceanic and climate conditions such as sea surface temperatures, air temperatures, strength of upwelling, El Niño events, salinity, ocean currents, wind speed, and primary and secondary productivity affect all facets of the physical, biological and chemical processes in the marine environment. Some of the conditions associated with El Niño events include warmer water temperatures, weak upwelling, low primary productivity (which leads to decreased zooplankton biomass), decreased southward transport of sub-arctic water, and increased sea levels (Pearcy 1997). For juvenile steelhead, warmer water and weakened upwellings are possibly the most important of the ocean conditions associated with El Niño. Because of the weakened upwelling during an El Niño year, juvenile California steelhead would need to more actively migrate offshore through possibly stressful warm waters with numerous inshore predators. Strong upwelling is probably beneficial because of the greater transport of smolts offshore, beyond major concentrations of inshore predators (Pearcy 1997).

4.3 THREATS AND STRESSORS

4.3.1 SUMMARY OF ESA LISTING FACTORS

Central Valley steelhead have been extirpated from most of their historical range. At the time of listing, NMFS was concerned with widespread degradation, destruction and blockage of freshwater habitats within this region, and the potential results of continuing habitat destruction and water allocation

problems, the pervasive opportunity for genetic introgression resulting from widespread production of hatchery steelhead and the potential ecological interaction between introduced stocks and native stocks.

In 1996, NMFS estimated that Central Valley total run size based on dam counts, hatchery returns, and past spawning surveys was probably less than 10,000 fish. Both natural and hatchery runs have declined since the 1960s. Counts at RBDD averaged 1,400 fish from 1991 to 1996, compared with runs in excess of 10,000 fish in the late 1960s. Run-size estimates for the hatchery produced American River stock averaged less than 1,000 fish, compared to 12,000 to 19,000 in the early 1970s (CDFG 1996b).

Historically, steelhead occurred naturally throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins; however, stocks have been extirpated from large areas of the Sacramento River Basin and possibly from the entire San Joaquin River Basin. The California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead (1988) reported a reduction in Central Valley steelhead habitat from 6,000 miles historically to 300 miles at present. Reynolds *et al.* (1993) reported that 95 percent of salmonid habitat in California's Central Valley has been lost, largely due to mining and water development activities. They also noted that declines in Central Valley steelhead stocks are *"due mostly to water development, inadequate instream flows, rapid flow fluctuations, high summer water temperatures in streams immediately below reservoirs, diversion dams which block access, and entrainment of juveniles into unscreened or poorly screened diversions."* Other problems related to land use practices (agriculture and forestry) and urbanization also have certainly contributed to stock declines.

The major threat to genetic integrity for Central Valley steelhead comes from past and present hatchery practices. Sufficient overlap of spawning hatchery and natural fish within this ESU probably exists for some genetic introgression to occur. Also a substantial problem with straying of hatchery fish exists within this ESU (Hallock 1989). Habitat fragmentation and population declines resulting in small, isolated populations also pose genetic risk from inbreeding, loss of rare alleles, and genetic drift.

In 1998, NMFS continued to identify long-term declines in abundance, small population sizes in the Sacramento River, and the high risk of interbreeding between hatchery and naturally spawned steelhead as major concerns for Central Valley steelhead. The significant loss of historic habitat, degradation of remaining habitat from water diversions, reduction in water quality and other factors, harvest impacts, and the lack of monitoring data on abundance as other important risk factors for this ESU. Nevertheless, NMFS concluded that the risks to Central Valley steelhead had diminished based on a review of existing and recently implemented state conservation efforts and federal management programs (e.g., CVPIA AFRP, CALFED) that address key factors for the decline of this species. NMFS stated that Central Valley steelhead were benefiting from two major conservation initiatives, being simultaneously implemented: (1) the CVPIA, which was passed by Congress in 1992; and (2) the CALFED Program, a joint state/federal effort implemented in 1995.

The CVPIA is specifically intended to remedy habitat and other problems associated with the construction and operation of the CVP. The CVPIA has two key features related to steelhead. First, it directs the Secretary of the Interior to develop and implement a program that makes all reasonable efforts to double natural production of anadromous fish in Central Valley streams (Section 3406(b)(1)) by the year 2002. The AFRP was initially drafted in 1995 and subsequently revised in 1997. Funding has been appropriated since 1995 to implement restoration projects identified in the AFRP planning process. Second, the CVPIA dedicates up to 800,000 acre-feet of water annually for fish, wildlife, and habitat restoration purposes (Section 3406(b)(2)) and provides for the acquisition of additional water to supplement the 800,000 acre-feet (Section 3406(b)(3)). USFWS, in consultation with other federal and state agencies, has directed the use of this dedicated water yield since 1993.

The CALFED Program, which began in June 1995, was charged with the responsibility of developing a long-term Bay-Delta solution. A major element of the CALFED Program is the ERP, which was intended to provide the foundation for long-term ecosystem and water quality restoration and protection throughout the region. Among the non-flow factors for decline that have been targeted by the Program

are unscreened diversions, waste discharges and water pollution prevention, impacts due to poaching, land derived salts, exotic species, fish barriers, channel alterations, loss of riparian wetlands, and other causes of estuarine habitat degradation.

NMFS concluded that the level of risk faced by the Central Valley steelhead ESU has diminished considerably since the 1996 listing proposal as a result of habitat restoration and other measures that have recently been implemented through the CALFED and CVPIA programs. In the San Joaquin River, collaboration between water interests and state and federal resource agencies, including NMFS, has led to the development of a scientifically based, adaptive fisheries management plan known as the Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan (VAMP). Although the VAMP has been developed to provide environmental benefits for fall-run Chinook salmon, NMFS expects that the long-term commitment of all participating parties to fully implement the plan will provide ancillary benefits to Central Valley steelhead through improved flow and passage conditions. Additional actions that benefit Central Valley steelhead include efforts to enhance fisheries monitoring and conservation actions to address artificial propagation.

In 2005 and 2006, NMFS affirmed that risk factors for Central Valley steelhead include extirpation from most of the historical range, a monotonic decline in abundance, declining proportion of wild fish in spawning runs, substantial opportunity for deleterious interactions with hatchery fish (including out-of-basin-origin stocks). According to a CDFG creel census, the great majority (93 percent) of steelhead harvest occurs on the American and Feather rivers.

4.3.1.1 DESTRUCTION, MODIFICATION, OR CURTAILMENT OF HABITAT OR RANGE

The spawning habitat for Central Valley steelhead has been greatly reduced from its historical range. The vast majority of historical spawning habitat for Central Valley steelhead has been eliminated by fish passage impediments associated with water storage, withdrawal, conveyance, and diversions for agriculture, flood control, and domestic and hydropower purposes. Modification of natural flow regimes has resulted in increased water temperatures, changes in fish community structures, depleted flow necessary for migration, spawning, rearing, and flushing of sediments from spawning gravels. These changes in flow regimes may be driving a shift in the frequencies of various life history strategies, especially a decline in the proportion of the population migrating to the ocean. Land use activities, such as those associated with agriculture and urban development, have altered steelhead habitat quantity and quality.

Although many historically harmful practices have been halted, much of the historical damage to habitats limiting steelhead remains to be addressed, and the necessary restoration activities will likely require decades.

4.3.1.2 OVERUTILIZATION FOR COMMERCIAL, RECREATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, OR EDUCATION PURPOSES

Steelhead have been, and continue to be, an important recreational fishery throughout their range. Although there are no commercial fisheries for steelhead in the ocean, inland steelhead fisheries include tribal and recreational fisheries. In the Central Valley, recreational fishing for hatchery-origin steelhead is popular and is restricted to only the visibly marked surplus hatchery-origin fish, which reduces the likelihood of retaining naturally spawned wild fish.

The permits NMFS issues for scientific or educational purposes stipulate specific conditions to minimize take of steelhead individuals during permitted activities. There are currently 11 active permits in the Central Valley that may affect steelhead. These permitted studies provide information about Central Valley steelhead that is useful to the management and conservation of the DPS.

4.3.1.3 DISEASE OR PREDATION

Steelhead are exposed to bacterial, protozoan, viral, and parasitic organisms in spawning and rearing areas, hatcheries, migratory routes, and the marine environment. Very little current or historical information exists to quantify changes in infection levels and mortality rates attributable to these diseases for steelhead. Naturally spawned fish tend to be less susceptible to pathogens than hatchery-reared fish.

Introduction of non-native species and modification of habitat have resulted in increased predatory populations and salmonid predation in river systems. In general, predation rates on steelhead are considered to be an insignificant contribution to the large declines observed in West Coast steelhead populations. In some local populations, however, predation may significantly influence salmonid abundance when other prey species are not present and habitat conditions lead to the concentration of adults and/or juveniles.

4.3.1.4 INADEQUACY OF EXISTING REGULATORY MECHANISMS

FEDERAL EFFORTS

There have been several federal actions attempting to reduce threats to the Central Valley steelhead ESU. The BOs for the CVP and SWP and other federal projects involving irrigation and water diversion and fish passage, for example, have improved or minimized adverse impacts to steelhead in the Central Valley. There have also been several habitat restoration efforts implemented under CVPIA and CALFED programs that have led to several projects involving fish passage improvements, fish screens, floodplain management, habitat restoration, watershed planning, and other projects that have contributed to improvement of steelhead habitat.

However, despite federal actions to reduce threats to the Central Valley steelhead DPS, the existing protective efforts are inadequate to ensure the DPS is no longer in danger of extinction. There remain high risks to the abundance, productivity, and spatial structure of the steelhead DPS.

NON-FEDERAL EFFORTS

Measures to protect steelhead throughout the State of California have been in place since 1998. The state's NCCP involves long-term planning with several stakeholders. A wide range of measures have been implemented, including 100 percent marking of all hatchery steelhead, zero bag limits for unmarked steelhead, gear restrictions, closures, and size limits designed to protect smolts. NMFS and CDFG are working to improve inland fishing regulations to better protect both anadromous and resident forms of O. mykiss populations. A proposal to develop a comprehensive status and trends monitoring plan for Central Valley steelhead was submitted for funding consideration to the CALFED ERP in 2005. The proposal, drafted by CDFG and the interagency Central Valley Steelhead Project Work Team, was selected by the ERP Implementing Agency Managers, and is to receive funding as a directed action. Long-term funding for implementation of the monitoring plan, once it is developed, still needs to be secured. There are many sub-watershed groups, landowners, environmental groups, and non-profit organizations that are conducting habitat restoration and planning efforts that may contribute to the conservation of steelhead.

However, despite federal and non-federal efforts to promote the conservation of the Central Valley steelhead DPS, few efforts address conservation needs at scales sufficient to protect the entire steelhead DPS. The lack of status and trend monitoring and research is one of the critical limiting factors to this DPS.

4.3.1.5 OTHER NATURAL AND MANMADE FACTORS AFFECTING ITS CONTINUED EXISTENCE

NMFS and the BRT is concerned that the proportion of naturally produced fish is declining. Two artificial propagation programs for steelhead in the Central Valley – CNFH and FRFH – may decrease risk to the DPS to some degree by contributing increased abundance to the DPS. The hatcheries' effects on the DPS' productivity, spatial structure, and diversity, however, are either neutral or uncertain. Potential threats to natural steelhead posed by hatchery programs include: (1) mortality of natural steelhead in fisheries targeting hatchery-origin steelhead; (2) competition for prey and habitat; (3) predation by hatchery-origin fish on younger natural fish; (4) genetic introgression by hatchery-origin fish that spawn naturally and interbreed with local natural populations; (5) disease transmission; and (6) impediments to fish passage imposed by hatchery facilities.

Changes in climatic events and global climate, such as El Niño ocean conditions and prolonged drought conditions, can threaten the survival of steelhead populations already reduced to low abundance levels as the result of the loss and degradation of freshwater and estuarine habitats. Floods and persistent drought conditions have reduced already limited spawning, rearing, and migration habitats.

Unscreened water diversions entrain outmigrating juvenile steelhead and fry. Unscreened water diversions (e.g., RBDD, TCC, GCID) and CVP and SWP pumping plants entrain juvenile steelhead, leading to fish mortality.

4.3.2 NON-LIFE STAGE-SPECIFIC THREATS AND STRESSORS FOR THE ESU

Potential threats to the California Central Valley steelhead population that are not specific to a particular life stage include the potential negative impacts of the current artificial propagation program utilizing several hatcheries in the Sacramento-San Joaquin drainage, the small wild population size, the genetic integrity of the population due to both hatchery influence and small population size, and the potential effects of long-term climate change. Each of these potential threats is discussed in the following sections.

4.3.2.1 ARTIFICIAL PROPAGATION PROGRAM

Currently, four hatcheries in the Central Valley produce steelhead to supplement the Central Valley wild steelhead population. The hatcheries and their current production targets are listed in **Table 4-1**.

Table 4-1. Hatcheries Producing Steelhead in the Central Valley

Hatchery	Production Target
Coleman National Fish Hatchery	600,000
Feather River Fish Hatchery	450,000
Nimbus Fish Hatchery	430,000
Mokelumne Fish Hatchery	100,000

Potential adverse effects to wild steelhead populations associated with hatchery production are similar to those described in Section 2.3.2.1 for winter-run Chinook salmon. However, recent research has indicated that approximately 63 to 92 percent of steelhead smolt production is of hatchery-origin (NMFS 2003), which is a higher percentage than winter-run Chinook salmon estimates. More importantly, these data suggest that the relative proportion of wild to hatchery smolt production is decreasing (NMFS 2003). All California hatchery steelhead programs began 100 percent adipose fin-clipping in 1998 to differentiate between hatchery steelhead from natural steelhead.

Propagation of steelhead at the CNFH has been occurring for over 50 years. Hatchery-origin and natural-origin steelhead have been managed as a single stock; mixing of hatchery and natural origin population components occurred through spawning at the hatchery and intermingling of natural spawners in Battle Creek. Niemela *et al*. (2008) used genetic pedigree analysis to evaluate relative reproductive success and fitness among hatchery-origin and natural origin population components based on multilocus DNA microsatellite genotypes. Preliminary results suggest that hatchery origin spawners experienced low relative reproductive success, producing significantly fewer adult offspring in comparison to natural origin spawners. Additionally, repeat spawning was more prevalent in the natural origin component of the population.

4.3.2.2 SMALL POPULATION SIZE

Potential adverse effects of a small population size for steelhead would be similar to those described above in Section 2.3.2.2 for winter-run Chinook salmon. The California Central Valley steelhead ESU mean annual escapement was estimated at 1,952 based on a 5-year period ending in 1993 (Good *et al.* 2005). During that time period a minimum escapement of 1,425 and a maximum escapement of 12,320 were observed (Good *et al.* 2005). A long-term trend analysis indicated that the population was declining (Good *et al.* 2005). In the 2005 Updated Status of Central Valley Steelhead, NMFS suggests that there has been no significant status change since the 1993 data and the population continues to decline (Good *et al.* 2005). The steelhead run in the Feather River has been increasing over the past several years; however, over 99 percent of the run is of direct hatchery-origin (DWR 2002b).

4.3.2.3 GENETIC INTEGRITY

There is still significant local genetic structure to Central Valley steelhead populations, although fish from the San Joaquin and Sacramento basins cannot be distinguished genetically. Hatchery effects appear to be localized – for example, Feather River and Feather River Hatchery steelhead are closely related as are American River and Nimbus Hatchery fish (DWR 2002b). Leary *et al.* (1995) report that hatchery straying has increased gene flow among steelhead populations in the Central Valley and that a smaller amount of genetic divergence is observed among Central Valley populations compared to wild British Columbia populations largely uninfluenced by hatcheries. Currently, natural annual production of steelhead smolts in the Central Valley is estimated at 181,000 and hatchery production is 1,340,000 for a ratio of 0.148 (Good *et al.* 2005). Current monitoring by hydroacoustic tracking has revealed that Mokelumne River/Hatchery steelhead (FRFH source stock) are straying into the American River (J. Smith, EBMUD, pers. comm.).

There has also been significant transfer of genetic material among hatcheries within the Central Valley as well as some transfer from systems outside the Central Valley. For example, eyed eggs from the Nimbus hatchery were transferred to the FRFH several time in the late 1960s and early 1970s (DWR 2002b). Additionally, an Eel River strain of steelhead was used as the founding broodstock for the Nimbus Hatchery (DWR 2002b). There have also been transfers of steelhead from the Feather River Hatchery to the Mokelumne Hatchery. In the late 1970s, a strain of steelhead was brought in from Washington State for the Feather River Hatchery (DWR 2002b).

4.3.2.4 LONG-TERM CLIMATE CHANGE

The potential effects of long-term climate change on Central Valley steelhead would be similar to those described above in Section 2.3.2.4 for winter-run Chinook salmon. However, because steelhead normally spend a longer time in freshwater as juveniles than other anadromous salmonids, any negative effects of climate change may be more profound on steelhead populations.

4.3.3 SAN FRANCISCO, SAN PABLO AND SUISUN BAYS

4.3.3.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

Steelhead adult immigration and holding in California's Central Valley Basin occurs from August through March. Threats to steelhead that potentially may occur in the bays are similar to those described above in Section 2.3.3.1 for winter-run Chinook salmon.

4.3.3.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Threats to steelhead juvenile rearing and outmigration that potentially occurs in the Bays are similar to those described above in Section 2.3.3.2 for winter-run Chinook salmon.

4.3.4 SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA

4.3.4.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

Threats to steelhead adult immigration and holding that potentially occur in the Delta are similar to those described above in Section 2.3.4.1 for winter-run Chinook salmon. Because water temperatures in the Delta are normally too warm for this life stage from August through mid-October, it is likely that most steelhead have passed through the Delta into the mainstem Sacramento River and beyond by this time. Water temperatures in the Delta would not be suitable for this life stage during August and September.

4.3.4.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

In the Sacramento River, juvenile steelhead migrate to the ocean in spring and early summer, with peak migration through the Delta in March and April (Reynolds et al. 1993). According to juvenile steelhead catch data in the Delta from 1995 to 2006, peak juvenile steelhead catch occurred during March and April at Mossdale, and during January through May at Chipps Island (IEP Website 2007).

Factors creating threats to the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage of steelhead would be similar to those described above in Section 2.3.4.2 for winter-run Chinook salmon. Water temperatures in the Delta begin rising in April and are likely unsuitable after May.

As discussed in Section 2.3.4.2 predation is considered a major source of fish loss in the Clifton Court Forebay. Past predation studies and fisheries management at Clifton Court Forebay have focused on loss of entrained fish due to predatory fish. Mayfield (2008) suggests that predatory birds may also play a role in predation losses at the forebay and that double-crested cormorants (*Phalacrocorax auritus*) are a likely predator on entrained juvenile steelhead and even more so on other smaller salmonid juveniles.

4.3.5 LOWER SACRAMENTO RIVER (PRINCETON [RM 163] TO THE DELTA)

4.3.5.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

Adult steelhead immigration into the Delta and the lower Sacramento River occurs from August through March (McEwan 2001; NMFS 2004a), and peaks during January and February (Moyle 2002). See Section 4.2.1 for a more complete description of the biological requirements and description of this life stage. Factors that may adversely affect steelhead adult immigration and holding in the lower Sacramento River include passage impediments, adverse flow conditions, harvest in the sportfishery, poaching, and potential water quality problems, particularly adverse water temperatures.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

In the lower Sacramento River, flows are diverted into the SDWSC. Adult salmon have been caught close to the locks at the upstream end of the channel and have also been observed to be blocked from migrating upstream by the locks (NMFS 1997). It is likely that some steelhead also enter the channel and may be delayed in their upstream migration.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

There is no commercial fishery for steelhead in the Sacramento River. The in-river sportfishery generally allows the taking of hatchery steelhead (identified by adipose fin-clip) during the adult immigration and holding period. The take of wild trout is allowed from April 1 through the end of August. Wild trout are defined as not having an adipose fin-clip and being less than 16 inches in length. It is not likely that adult anadromous wild steelhead are in the river during this time period.

The extent of poaching of steelhead in this reach of the river is unknown. There are no man-made structures that would unnaturally increase densities allowing for easy poaching however, some level of poaching likely occurs due to snagging by anglers or inadvertent misidentification of caught fish

WATER QUALITY

Suitable water temperatures for adult steelhead migrating upstream to spawning grounds range from 46°F to 52°F (CDFG 1991c). Because water temperatures in the lower Sacramento River generally exceed these temperatures, this reach of the river likely serves only as a migratory corridor.

Additionally, NMFS (NMFS 1997) reports that recent research has indicated that water temperatures in the lower Sacramento River may have risen by as much as 4°F to 7°F since the late 1970s. Potentially the cumulative losses of shade along the river may have influenced water temperatures in this reach.

FLOW CONDITIONS

During high flow or flood events, water is diverted into the Sutter and Yolo bypasses upstream of the City of Sacramento. Adult steelhead migrating upstream may enter these bypasses, where their migration may be delayed or blocked by control structures. To date, there have not been any measures implemented to protect adult salmonids from entrainment into the flood control bypasses (NMFS 1997).

4.3.5.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Because of relatively warm waters in the lower Sacramento River, juvenile steelhead likely only use this section of the river for a migratory corridor. The primary period for steelhead smolt emigration occurs from March through June (Castleberry *et al.* 1991).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature in the lower Sacramento River likely does not adversely affect juvenile steelhead as it is used primarily as a migratory corridor. However, outmigrating or rearing juvenile steelhead may also be exposed to warmwater releases from the Colusa Drain at Knights Landing. Warm water is released from the drain to the river mainly from April through June. Releases from the drain can exceed 2,000 cfs and 80°F. Although steelhead would likely show an avoidance reaction to the warmwater, it may present a partial thermal barrier to downstream migration.

WATER QUALITY

The major point source threat of pollution in the Sacramento River is the Iron Mountain Mine as described above for spring-run Chinook salmon. However, because the Iron Mountain Mine is so far

north of the lower Sacramento River, most heavy metal contaminants from the mine have likely either settled out or have been diluted to acceptable EPA standards by the time water reaches this reach of the river. Within the lower Sacramento River and Bay-Delta there are three large municipal water treatment plants which can be an important point source of pollution: the West Sacramento WWTP, the Sacramento Regional WWTP, and the Stockton Sewage Treatment Plant. Pre-treatment, primary treatment and secondary treatments in place since the 1950s have all reduced pollutant loading to the system however, heavy metal loadings and toxic organic pollutants remain a major concern (NMFS 1997).

The main non-point sources of pollution in the lower Sacramento River are urban runoff and agricultural drainage. Stormwater runoff from the city of Sacramento has been shown to be acutely toxic to aquatic invertebrates (NMFS 1997). Significant urban runoff also occurs during the dry season and is created from domestic/commercial landscape irrigation, groundwater infiltration, pumped groundwater discharges and construction projects (NMFS 1997). The Colusa Basin Drain is the largest source of agricultural return flow in the Sacramento River. It drains agricultural areas serviced by the Tehama-Colusa and Glenn-Colusa Irrigation districts and discharges to the Sacramento River below Knights Landing. The drain has been identified as a major source of warm water, pesticides, turbidity, suspended sediments, dissolved solids, nutrients and trace metals (NMFS 1997).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flood control structures in the lower Sacramento River are designed to divert water from the river during a major flood event into the Butte Creek basin and the Sutter and Yolo bypasses. The diversions can be significant. For example, the flood control system can divert as much as four to five times more flow down the bypasses than remains in the river (NMFS 1997). Juvenile steelhead migrating down the river may enter the diversions during storm events. Studies conducted on the Sutter Bypass show that the highest proportion of flows are diverted from December through March with a peak occurring in February (NMFS 1997). Juveniles diverted into the bypasses may experience migration delays, potential stranding as flood flows recede and increased rates of predation.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Bank stabilization for flood control purposes has resulted in extensive areas of streambank riprapping. Rip-rapping the river bank involves removing vegetation along the bank and upper levees which removes most instream and overhead cover in nearshore areas. Overhanging vegetation is referred to as SRA habitat. Woody debris and overhanging vegetation within SRA habitat provide escape cover for juvenile salmonids from predators. Aquatic and terrestrial insects are an important component of juvenile salmonid diet. These insects are dependent on a healthy riparian habitat.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Flood control measures, regulated flow regimes and river bank protection measures have all had a profound effect on riparian and instream habitat in the lower Sacramento River. Levees constructed in this reach are built close to the river in order to increase streamflow, channelize the river to prevent natural meandering, and maximize the sediment carrying capacity of the river (NMFS 1997). Channelization of the river requires bank protection measures such as riprapping to reduce the effects of streambank erosion. Additionally, nearshore aquatic areas are deepened and sloped to a uniform gradient, such that variations in water depth, velocity and direction of flow are replaced by consistent moderate to high velocities. Juvenile steelhead utilize slow and slack water velocities for rearing and the channelization of the river has removed most of this habitat type.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The process of channelizing the lower Sacramento River has resulted in a loss of connectivity with the floodplain which serves as an important source of woody debris and gravels that aid in establishing a diverse riverine habitat.

ENTRAINMENT

Entrainment is defined as the redirection of fish from their natural migratory pathway into areas or pathways not normally used. Entrainment also includes the take, or removal, of juvenile fish from their habitat through the operation of water diversion devices and structures such as siphons, pumps and gravity diversions (NMFS 1997). A primary source of entrainment is unscreened or inadequately screened diversions. A survey by CDFG identified 350 unscreened diversions along the Sacramento River downstream of Hamilton City.

Entrainment of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon has been identified as one of the most significant causes of mortality in the Delta (NMFS 1997) and is likely also true for steelhead. In addition, a program to flood rice field stubble during the winter has been implemented extending the period for potential entrainment (NMFS 1997).

Outmigrating juvenile steelhead may also be diverted into the Yolo or Sutter bypasses during high flow or flood events and stranded as flood waters recede. The entrance to the Yolo Bypass is the Fremont Weir upstream of Sacramento near the confluence with the Feather River. During high flows weir gates are open and because the weir is not screened, juveniles enter the Yolo Bypass, where they may rear and eventually leave through the lower end upstream of Chipps Island in the Delta, or be trapped in isolated ponds as waters recede. Additionally, Sacramento River water is diverted into the SDWSC, and outmigrating juvenile steelhead may enter the channel where water quality, flow levels and rearing conditions are extremely poor (NMFS 1997).

PREDATION

Only limited information on predation of steelhead juveniles is available. Native species that are known to prey on juvenile steelhead include Sacramento pikeminnow and potentially other steelhead. Predation by pikeminnow can be significant when juvenile salmonids occur in high densities such as below dams or near diversions. Although Sacramento pikeminnow are a native species and predation on juvenile steelhead is a natural phenomenon, loss of SRA habitat and artificial instream structures tend to favor predators and may change the natural predator-prey dynamics in the system favoring predatory species (CALFED 2000c). Non-native striped bass may also be a significant predator on juvenile steelhead. Although no recent studies of striped bass predation on juvenile salmonids have been completed, Thomas (1967 *in* NMFS 1997) found that in the lower Sacramento River, salmon accounted for 22 percent of striped bass diet.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Hatchery steelhead may prey on juvenile wild steelhead. In the lower Sacramento River, hatchery steelhead from the FRFH are planted in the Feather River below Yuba City at a large enough size and at a time when they could intercept other rearing wild steelhead.

4.3.6 MIDDLE SACRAMENTO RIVER (RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM [RM 243] TO PRINCETON [RM 163])

4.3.6.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

In this reach of the river, the potential threats to the adult immigration and holding life stage of steelhead arise from a potential passage impediment at the GCID HCPP, potential water quality problems, particularly adverse water temperatures, harvest in the sportfishery and poaching.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Although the GCID HCPP (~RM 205) and associated water diversions present problems for emigrating juvenile salmonids, adults are not likely affected.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Current sportfishing regulations in the Sacramento River allow for the taking of hatchery steelhead during the adult immigration and holding period. The take of wild trout is allowed from April 1 through the end of August. Wild trout are defined as not having an adipose fin-clip and being less than 16 inches in length. Wild trout greater than 16 inches in length are considered steelhead and take is not allowed. It is not likely that adult anadromous wild steelhead are in the river during this time period. It is possible that some steelhead could be holding in the mainstem river below the RBDD prior to spawning in late December to March.

The extent of poaching of steelhead in this reach of the river is unknown. Some level of poaching likely occurs due to snagging by anglers or inadvertent misidentification of caught fish. Additionally, when passage at the RBDD is hindered there may be unusually high densities of salmonids downstream of the dam that present poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water Temperatures in this reach of the river are similar to those occurring in the lower Sacramento River. However, some holding of adult steelhead may occur downstream of the RBDD in deep coldwater pools. With the installation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997, water temperatures have cooled slightly and suitable water temperatures for adult holding likely extend downstream of the RBDD for a short distance during the winter months.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the middle Sacramento River is not likely to adversely affect adult steelhead.

4.3.6.2 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Factors that may adversely affect juvenile steelhead in the middle Sacramento River are similar to those that occur in the lower river as described above. However, in addition to those factors there is a potential downstream passage impediment at the GCID's HCPP at RM 205.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature issues in the middle Sacramento River are similar to those described above in the lower Sacramento River. Water temperatures normally exceed 60°F from July through September and in dry years can often exceed 66°F (NMFS 1997).

WATER QUALITY

The only point source pollution that has been identified and may potentially affect this reach of the river is the Iron Mountain Mine described in Section 3.5.1.2. Non-point source pollution sources include both urban and agricultural runoff similar to that described above for the lower Sacramento River. Urban runoff is likely not as great in this reach of the river as that occurring in the lower Sacramento River but agricultural runoff is likely similar or greater.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions, under current regulated flow regimes, in the middle Sacramento River likely have little effect on outmigrating juvenile steelhead.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Loss of riparian habitat that has occurred in the middle Sacramento River is similar to that described above for the lower Sacramento River.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Physical habitat alteration that has occurred in the middle Sacramento River is similar to that described above for the lower Sacramento River. The river is not quite as confined in this reach as levees are constructed further from the channel than those occurring in the lower river.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Although the river is not quite as confined in this reach as levees are constructed further from the channel than those occurring in the lower river, the river is disconnected from its historic floodplain by flood control measures including regulated flows and levees.

ENTRAINMENT

The exact number of unscreened diversions in this reach of the river is not known. A study by the California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout completed in 1987 reported that over 300 unscreened irrigation, industrial, and municipal water supply diversions occur on the Sacramento River between Redding and Sacramento (NMFS 1997). Although most of these diversions are small, cumulatively they likely entrain a large number of outmigrating juvenile salmonids.

Studies are currently underway to determine the effectiveness of new fish screens at the GCID HCPP to determine the effectiveness of new fish screens installed in 2001 (Reclamation 2007). However, juvenile emigration data suggest that peak steelhead movement past the GCID facility occurs in spring and early summer months, when pumping volume may be high (CUWA and SWC 2004).

Historically, the GCID HCPP at RM 205 has created downstream migration problems for juvenile salmonids. The GCID pumping plant may divert up to 20 percent of the Sacramento River. Rotary drum fish screens were installed in 1972 to help protect juvenile salmon but they were largely ineffective and never met NMFS or CDFG screen design criteria. Flat plate screens were installed in front of the rotary screens in 1993 to help alleviate the problem until a more permanent solution could be found. Juvenile steelhead are exposed to the GCID pumping plant facilities as early as mid-July extending into late November when the diversion season ends.

The interim flat-plate screens were an improvement over the rotary drum screens but were still likely to subject juvenile salmonids to impingement due to high approach velocities along the screens, inadequate sweeping to approach velocities, and long exposure time at the screen (USFWS 1995 *in* NMFS 1997).

Construction of a new screening facility was completed in 2001 and the testing and monitoring program for the facility are now underway (Reclamation 2007). The testing and monitoring of the new facility is scheduled to be completed in 2007 (Reclamation 2007).

PREDATION

Predation on juvenile steelhead in the middle Sacramento River is likely occurring from native Sacramento pikeminnow, native and hatchery-reared steelhead and striped bass. Although the extent of predation is unknown, predation from Sacramento Pikeminnow and striped bass is likely similar to that occurring in the lower Sacramento River as described above. Predation from hatchery steelhead is likely somewhat less than that occurring in the lower Sacramento River because the Feather River hatchery fish enter the Sacramento River downstream of this reach. Additionally, steelhead released from the CNFH are likely more evenly distributed throughout the river by the time they reach this section.

Opportunities for high predation rates also may be present at the GCID HCPP. The plant is described below as a passage impediment. Studies have indicated that Sacramento pikeminnow are the primary predator at the pumping plant, although striped bass were also found with salmonids in their stomachs (CALFED 2000c). Vogel and Marine (1995) report that predation is likely in the vicinity of the fish screens associated with the diversion.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Direct adverse effects of hatchery operations are likely minimal in the middle reach of the Sacramento River primarily because steelhead released from the FRFH enter the river downstream and steelhead released by the CNFH are likely more evenly distributed throughout the system by the time they reach the middle reach.

4.3.7 UPPER SACRAMENTO RIVER (KESWICK DAM TO RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM)

4.3.7.1 ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

In this reach of the river, the potential threats to the adult immigration and holding life stage of steelhead arise from potential passage impediments at the RBDD and the ACID Dam, harvest in the sportfishery and poaching. Keswick Dam, at the upstream terminus of this reach of the river presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Keswick Dam (~RM 302) presents an impassable barrier to all upstream migration of steelhead and represents the upstream extent of anadromous salmonid habitat in the mainstem Sacramento River. The ACID Dam (RM 298.5) was constructed in 1917 about three river miles downstream of the current Keswick Dam. Originally the dam was a barrier to upstream fish migration until 1927 when a poorly designed fish ladder was installed (NMFS 1997). The dam is a 450-foot long flashboard structure which has the capability of raising the backwater level 10 feet. The dam is only installed during the irrigation season which typically runs from early April to October or early November. As mentioned above, the fish ladder providing passage around the dam was poorly designed and although steelhead were able to negotiate the ladder, it did present a partial impediment to upstream migration. In 2001, a new fish ladder was installed. Post-project monitoring indicates that the new fish ladder is operating effectively (CDFG 2004c). Another potential problem associated with the facility is that high volume releases from the ACID's canal downstream of the dam may create false attraction flows for migrating adult salmon or steelhead leading them into the canal where they could be stranded (NMFS 1997).

Regardless of potential problems associated with the ACID Dam, the facility likely affects only a small portion of the run. The reach from the ACID Dam to Keswick Dam is three miles; representing only a small portion of the potential spawning area.

The RBDD at RM 243 is a concrete structure 52 feet high and 740 feet long. The dam has 11 gates which are raised or lowered to control the level of Lake Red Bluff enabling gravity diversion into the TCC. Permanent fish ladders are located on each abutment of the dam. The fish ladders are inefficient in allowing upstream migration of adult salmonids (NMFS 1997). In several radio tagging studies of adult winter-run Chinook salmon, 43-44 percent of tagged fish were blocked by the dam (Vogel *et al.* 1988, Hallock *et al.* 1982 *in* NMFS 1997). Tagged winter-run Chinook salmon that eventually passed the dam were delayed by an average of 125 hours in one study (Vogel *et al.* 1988 *in* NMFS 1997) and 437 hours in a previous study (Hallock *et al.* 1982 *in* NMFS 1997). At present, the dam gates are kept in the raised position from September 15 through May 14, which should allow for the free passage of immigrating steelhead.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Harvest of steelhead in this reach of the river is likely similar to that in the middle reach. Unusually high densities of salmonids at the ACID Dam or near Keswick Dam could create poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the upper Sacramento River during the fall and winter months when adult steelhead would be immigrating are suitable for this life stage.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the upper Sacramento River likely does not adversely affect adult steelhead.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow fluctuations in the upper Sacramento River are not of a magnitude to adversely affect adult steelhead.

4.3.7.2 SPAWNING

Specific information regarding steelhead spawning within the mainstem Sacramento River is limited due to lack of monitoring Currently, the number of steelhead spawning in the Sacramento River is unknown because redds cannot be distinguished from a large resident rainbow trout population that has developed as a result of managing the upper Sacramento River for coldwater species.

Spawning in this reach of the Sacramento River may be affected by adverse flow conditions, physical habitat alteration, recreational sportfishing and poaching, and poor water quality (water temperature). Each of these potential effects is described below.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Keswick Dam presents an impassable barrier to upstream salmonid migration and, therefore, marks the upstream extent of potential spawning habitat in this reach of the Sacramento River. Depending on flow conditions, passage at the ACID may be partially impaired.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Harvest of steelhead in this reach of the river is likely similar to that in the middle reach. Unusually high densities of salmonids at the ACID Dam or near Keswick Dam could create poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Because of suitable water temperatures in this reach of the river and only marginal water temperature conditions downstream of the RBDD, almost all spawning activity likely occurs in the upper Sacramento River.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the upper Sacramento River is similar to that described in the middle reach described above. Because of the proximity of the Iron Mountain Mine, point source pollutants may be more concentrated in this reach of the river but effects on spawning are likely negligible.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Large flow fluctuations are the main concern regarding adverse flow conditions in the middle and upper Sacramento River. The largest and most frequent flow reductions have occurred in the late summer and early fall when flashboards at the ACID Dam require adjustment. However, because the largest flow reductions normally occur before spawning takes place, it is not likely that adverse flow conditions in this reach of the river have a significant negative effect on steelhead.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

As stated above, the level of steelhead spawning in the upper Sacramento River is unknown; however, it is generally thought that available spawning habitat in the upper Sacramento River is sufficient to support the winter-run Chinook salmon population at its currently low level (NMFS 1997). However, as the population recovers, spawning gravel availability could become a limiting factor (NMFS 1997). These same factors likely apply to steelhead.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The construction of dams in the upper Sacramento River has eliminated the major source of suitable gravel recruitment to reaches of the river below Keswick Dam. Gravel sources from the banks of the river and floodplain have also been substantially reduced by levee and bank protection measures. Levee and bank protection measures restrict the meandering of the river which would normally release gravel into the river through natural erosion and deposition processes.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Hatchery influence on spawning steelhead has not been evaluated. However, because a large proportion of steelhead stocks in the Central Valley are of hatchery origin, it is likely that significant inter-breeding between hatchery and wild fish occurs.

4.3.7.3 EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The Sacramento River supports a popular year-round recreational fishery. It is possible that anglers could disturb developing embryos in redds while wading.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The embryo incubation life stage of steelhead is the most sensitive to elevated water temperatures. Because embryo incubation of steelhead in the upper Sacramento River generally would occur from January through June, water temperatures are likely suitable for embryo incubation.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality issues that may produce adverse effects on steelhead include both point source and non-point source pollution. The inactive Iron Mountain Mine in the Spring Creek watershed near Keswick Dam creates the largest discharge of toxic material into the Sacramento River. There are three metals of particular concern: copper, cadmium and zinc. The early life stages of salmon are the most sensitive to these metals (NMFS 1997). The acid mine drainage from Iron Mountain Mine is among the most acidic and metal laden anywhere in the world (NMFS 1997). Historically, discharge from the mine has produced massive fish kills.

In 1983 the Iron Mountain Mine site was declared a superfund site by the EPA. Since that time various mitigation measures have been implemented including a neutralization plant that has improved the ability to control metal loadings to the river. NMFS (1997) reported that although significant improvements have been made, basin plan objectives had not yet been achieved in 1997. Since that time, other mitigation measures have been implemented resulting in a 95 percent reduction in historic copper, cadmium and zinc discharges (EPA 2006). At present, acid mine waste still escapes untreated from waste pile and seepage on the north side of Iron Mountain and flows into Boulder Creek, which eventually flows into the Sacramento River (EPA 2006). However, there were no significant exceedances of dissolved metal concentrations in the Sacramento River in 2002 and 2003 (CDFG 2004c). Another point source of pollution in the upper Sacramento River identified in NMFS (1997) is the Simpson Mill near Redding which discharges PCBs into the river.

Non-point source pollution consists of sediments from storm events, stormwater runoff in urban and developing areas and agricultural runoff. Sediments constitute nearly half of the material introduced to the river from non-point sources (NMFS 1997). Excess silt and other suspended solids are mobilized during storm events from plowed fields, construction and logging sites and mines. High sediment loading can interfere with eggs developing in redds by reducing the ability of oxygenated water to percolate down to eggs in the gravel. Stormwater runoff in urban areas can transport oil, trash, heavy metals and toxic organics all of which are potentially harmful to incubating eggs. Agricultural runoff can contain excess nutrients, pesticides and trace metals.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow fluctuations are the primary concern related to potential adverse effects on the embryo incubation life stage of steelhead. For example, if spawning steelhead construct redds during periods of high flow, those redds could become dewatered during subsequent periods of low flow. Historically, the largest and most rapid flow reductions have occurred during the irrigation season (normally, early April through October) when adjustments are required at the ACID Dam. To accommodate these adjustments, Sacramento River flows at times have been decreased by one-half or greater, over the course of a few hours (NMFS 1997). Currently, under the CVP/SWP BO, flow reductions are divided into several intervals to prevent the stranding of juveniles. However, reducing the rates of flow reduction does not protect existing redds from becoming dewatered.

4.3.7.4 JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Factors that may adversely affect juvenile steelhead in the upper Sacramento River are similar to those described above in the middle Sacramento River and include physical habitat alteration, water quality, predation, passage impediments, and entrainment.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS

Keswick Dam at RM 302 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migrating adult steelhead hence it represents the upstream extent of steelhead habitat on the mainstem Sacramento River. The ACID Dam, located about three miles below Keswick Dam, represents the furthest upstream impediment to juvenile outmigration. The dam is only in place during the irrigation season which typically extends from April through November. During the rest of the year neither upstream adult migration nor downstream juvenile outmigration is hindered. Juveniles migrate past the dam by either dropping as much as ten feet over the dam to the river below or moving through the bypass facility. In either case, juveniles may become disoriented and more susceptible to predation.

The RBDD, at the downstream extent of the upper Sacramento River, creates the final passage impediment to downstream outmigration in this reach of the river. The dam is described in Section 3.3.3.1. When the dam gates are lowered, Lake Red Bluff is formed slowing flows and delaying juvenile outmigration, allowing more opportunities for predation as described above in Section 3.6.5.3. Predation is also facilitated below the dam as described in Section 3.6.5.3. Historically, there was both direct and indirect mortality associated with fish using an ineffective juvenile fish bypass facility at the dam. A Downstream Migrant Fish Facility was installed in 1992, which appears to have reduced mortality associated with use of the bypass facility.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Following the installation of the TCD at Shasta Dam in 1997 water temperatures in this reach of the river seldom exceed 60°F and are suitable for juvenile steelhead rearing year-round.

WATER QUALITY

Point source pollution may occur from both the Iron Mountain Mine and the Simpson Mill as described in Section 3.5.1.2. Because the juvenile life stage of steelhead is the most susceptible to adverse effects from pollution and the proximity of these two potential sources of pollution, potential adverse effects are likely more profound in the upper Sacramento River compared to the lower reaches. Effects of non-point source pollution from urban runoff and agricultural drainage are similar to those described above for the middle Sacramento River. However, pollution associated with urban runoff is likely higher due to the proximity of the cities of Redding and Red Bluff.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Although flow fluctuations do occur in the upper Sacramento River for maintenance activities at the ACID or other water project control measures, flow reductions are governed by ramping rates which likely negate adverse effects due to flow fluctuations on juvenile steelhead.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Levee building, bank protection measures and the disconnection of the river from its historic floodplain have all had negative effects on riparian habitat. Woody debris and SRA habitat provide important escape cover for juvenile salmon. Aquatic and terrestrial insects, a major component of juvenile salmon diet, are dependent on riparian habitat. Aquatic invertebrates are dependent on the organic material provided be a healthy riparian habitat and many terrestrial invertebrates also depend on this habitat.

Studies by the CDFG as reported in NMFS (NMFS 1997) demonstrated that a significant portion of juvenile Chinook salmon diet is composed of terrestrial insects, particularly aphids, which are dependent on riparian habitat.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Controlled flow regimes and channelization of the upper Sacramento River have resulted in a loss of natural river morphology and function.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The construction of levees and streambank protection measures have resulted in a disconnection of the river with its historic floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

Adverse effects due to entrainment of outmigrating juvenile steelhead at unscreened diversions are similar to those described above for the middle Sacramento River. Although there is a fish bypass facility at the ACID Dam, the screening does not operate consistently particularly under high flow or debris load conditions, and some entrainment may occur. The new downstream migrant fish facility at the RBDD has reduced entrainment problems at the RBDD.

PREDATION

Significant predators of juvenile steelhead in the upper Sacramento River include Sacramento pikeminnow and both hatchery and wild steelhead. Striped bass, a significant predator in lower reaches of the river, typically do not utilize the upper Sacramento River; however, they are present immediately below the RBDD.

The most serious adverse effect due to predation occurs in the vicinity of the RBDD. Passage through Lake Red Bluff can delay outmigrating juvenile steelhead and increases the opportunities for predation by both fish and birds (Vogel and Smith 1986 as citied *in* NMFS 1997). Salmonid juveniles passing under the gates at the RBDD are heavily preyed upon by both striped bass and Sacramento pikeminnow (NMFS 1997). Large concentrations of Sacramento pikeminnow have been observed accumulating immediately below the RBDD when juvenile salmonids are present (Garcia 1989 in NMFS 1997).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The extent of predation on juvenile wild steelhead by hatchery-reared steelhead is not known. However, steelhead releases by the CNFH may have a high potential for inducing high levels of predation on naturally produced wild salmonids (CALFED 2000c). The CNFH has a current production target of releasing approximately 600,000 steelhead in January and February at sizes of 125 to 275 mm (CALFED 2000c). Juvenile steelhead released by the CNFH may also compete for resources with naturally produced juvenile steelhead.

4.3.8 NORTHERN SIERRA NEVADA DIVERSITY GROUP

4.3.8.1 AMERICAN RIVER

The American River drains a watershed of approximately 1,895 square miles (Reclamation 1996), and is a major tributary to the Sacramento River. The American River has historically provided over 125 miles of riverine habitat to anadromous and resident fishes. Presently, use of the American River by anadromous fish is limited to the 23 miles of river below Nimbus Dam (the lower American River).

The Nimbus Fish Hatchery steelhead program mitigates for steelhead spawning habitat eliminated by construction of Nimbus Dam, with an annual goal of releasing 430,000 yearling steelhead. Specific information on the number and status of indigenous American River steelhead is lacking but early reports suggested that steelhead entered the river during most months of the year and included a spring run. Early Nimbus Fish Hatchery broodstock included naturally produced fish from the American River and stocks from the Mad, Eel, Sacramento and Russian rivers. Based on the ESA listing, the indigenous American River steelhead are presumed to be phenotypically similar to Central Valley steelhead. However, American River steelhead may not have been phenotypically or genotypically similar to the Central Valley stock based on antidotal run timing information and Nimbus Fish Hatchery records that suggest some American River steelhead were physically larger than typical Sacramento or Feather River winter-run steelhead. The present run of American River winter steelhead are physically larger and demonstrate a freshwater entry timing more similar to winter run Eel River steelhead than the Central Valley stock Lee 2008).

The American River winter steelhead run appears to be a predominately hatchery supported run and since the 2001-2002 trapping season, 97.8% of the steelhead trapped are of hatchery origin. Surveys also suggest that the number of steelhead actually spawning in the river is small. During the last 10 years, most adult steelhead trapped appear to be three years of age and the number of smaller fish (16 in.) during the same period averaged less than two percent (Lee 2008).

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

In 1955, Folsom and Nimbus dams were constructed on the mainstem of the American River approximately 28 and 23 miles, respectively, upstream from the confluence with the Sacramento River. Fish passage facilities were not built at Folsom or Nimbus dams blocking all anadromous salmonid upstream migration at Nimbus Dam. Anadromous salmonids are now restricted to the lower 23 miles of the American River extending from Nimbus Dam downstream to the confluence with the Sacramento River.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Current fishing regulations allow for the harvest of hatchery-reared steelhead (identified by an adipose fin clip) in the American River. The harvesting of wild steelhead is not allowed. However, heavy angling pressure in the river likely leads to some wild steelhead mortality even for those fish that are caught and released. The number of steelhead harvested in the American River is estimated to have been 116 in 1998 (April through December), 567 in 1999 (January through December), 499 in 2000 (January through December) and 469 in 2001 (January and March through June) (CDFG 1999c, 2000b, 2001d and 2002b).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the American River during the steelhead adult immigration and holding period (November through April) are generally below 55°F, which is suitable for this life stage (SWRI 2004).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the American River is generally good and meets applicable regulatory standards for both aquatic life and human health, with few exceptions. Therefore, water quality conditions in the lower American River are not expected to affect adult steelhead immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams has resulted in higher flows during the fall and summer and significantly lower flows during winter and spring. However, flow standards in the American River are adequate to support steelhead adult immigration.

SPAWNING

Steelhead spawning in the lower American River occurs from December through April. In 2003, 2004 and 2005, between 40 and 48 percent of steelhead redds were found in the upper three miles of the American River (Hannon and Deason 2005). From 2002 through 2005, 95 percent of all steelhead redds in the American River were found upstream of the Watt Avenue Bridge (Hannon and Deason 2005).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Anadromous salmonids are now restricted to the lower 23 miles of the American River extending from Nimbus Dam downstream to the confluence with the Sacramento River.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Current fishing regulations allow for the harvest of hatchery-reared steelhead (identified by an adipose fin clip) in the American River. The harvesting of wild steelhead is not allowed.

WATER TEMPERATURE

In the American River, steelhead spawning generally occurs from January through April. Water temperatures during this time period are generally below 55°F and suitable for steelhead spawning (SWRI 2004).

WATER QUALITY

The Ambient Monitoring Program (AMP) was established under the Sacramento Coordinated Monitoring Program (CMP) to characterize ambient water quality conditions in the Sacramento and American rivers. As reported by the AMP, based on data from 1992 through 1998, monitored ambient water quality constituents meet applicable regulatory standards for both aquatic life and human health, with few exceptions. Therefore, water quality in the lower American River is adequate to support successful steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The construction and operation of Folsom Dam has altered the historic flow regime of the lower American River. Historically, fluctuations during the fall and winter were caused by natural rainfall patterns, but the dry season flows were low and fairly constant. Varying water demands of the CVP have shifted the timing of flow fluctuations to late spring and summer (CDFG 1991c). This shift in the timing of flow fluctuations likely does not affect steelhead spawning. However, flow fluctuations can have an effect on steelhead spawning habitat. For example, reductions from 2,500 cfs to 1,500 cfs would result in a loss of over 60 percent of viable spawning habitat and dewater up to 40 acres of potential spawning habitat (CDFG 2001b).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Observations of lower American River spawning gravel indicate that substrate particle sizes are relatively large compared to those typically used by steelhead in other streams. A lack of suitable spawning gravel may be related to the lack of recruitment of smaller gravel from upstream of Nimbus and Folsom dams (CDFG 1991c).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The lower American River currently provides a diversity of aquatic habitats, including shallow riffles, glides, runs, pools and of channel backwater habitats. From Nimbus Dam downstream to Goethe Park (approximately nine river miles), the river is relatively unrestricted by levees. From Goethe Park downstream to the confluence with the Sacramento River, the river is constrained by levees which have resulted in a corresponding decrease in habitat diversity (SWRI 2004).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The source stock of the Nimbus Hatchery steelhead program is from the Eel River, with one-time genetic infusions of CNFH and Warm Springs Hatchery stocks (SWFSC 2003). The run-timing of Nimbus Hatchery steelhead indicates Eel River derivation, and recent genetic analysis (Nielsen *et al.* 2003) links the hatchery stock to the natural spawning population in the American River. The Nimbus Hatchery stock is not part of the Central Valley steelhead DPS, and its impacts to the American River population include genetic introgression, altered life history, and competition over spawning and rearing habitat in the lower American River. Nimbus Hatchery spawns steelhead and re-releases them back into the American River. This may diversify age structure of steelhead in the hatchery stock (advantage) and river (genetic disadvantage), as kelts have higher fecundity and larger eggs. However, as kelts have the potential to spawn again, they compound the effects from annual number of hatchery stock releases. Hatchery returns increase the abundance of the run overall, but dominate or displace natural steelhead numbers.

The steelhead spawning population of the American River ranges between 200 and 400 adults (Reclamation 2005), and includes an unknown percentage of hatchery steelhead. There have been documented reports of steelhead holding over the summer in the lower American River, which are thought to be potentially the remains of an indigenous summer run or otherwise fish from another watershed. It does not appear at this time that these "summer" fish are being affected by the Nimbus Hatchery stock.

Nimbus Hatchery may affect water quality and aquatic life in the American River from its effluent discharge, with unknown implications of disease transmission.

Nimbus Hatchery trucks and releases its fall-run production to San Pablo Bay, resulting in fall-run adult returns straying outside of the American River watershed and threatening the genetic integrity and fitness of native spring- and fall-run salmon populations.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The lower American River is open to recreational fishing year-round. Therefore, there is a potential for wading anglers to disturb redds.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Embryo incubation of steelhead in the lower American River generally occurs from January through May. During this period, water temperatures are normally below 55°F until about the beginning of May and remain below 60°F for the remainder of May, which is suitable for steelhead embryo incubation (SWRI 2001).

WATER QUALITY

The AMP was established under the Sacramento CMP to characterize ambient water quality conditions in the Sacramento and American rivers. As reported by the AMP, based on data from 1992 through 1998,

monitored ambient water quality constituents meet applicable regulatory standards for both aquatic life and human health, with few exceptions. For aquatic life, four metals exceeded the California Toxics Rule for EPA criteria. At Nimbus Dam, lead and zinc exceed applicable criteria less than once every three years, and cadmium, more than once every three years. At Discovery Park, cadmium would exceed applicable criteria more than once every three years, and copper, lead and zinc would exceed applicable criteria less than once every three years (SWRI 2004). Heavy metal concentrations that exceed EPA criteria may adversely affect developing steelhead embryos.

AMP pesticide monitoring conducted on the lower American River has occasionally detected diazinon, diuron, and simazine. The concentrations of diuron and simazine are well below concentrations identified as slightly toxic to fish; diazinon, however, was detected seven times over four years at concentrations above CDFG's recommended maximum values for fish (SWRI 2004). Pesticide concentrations above CDFG recommended values could adversely affect developing steelhead embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

CDFG aerial redd surveys conducted in the early 1990s have produced evidence that Chinook salmon redds are dewatered as a result of flow reductions during the fall and winter months. The same is likely true for steelhead (Water Forum 1996). The potential for significant losses to steelhead is greatest when flows are low and redds are concentrated (Water Forum 1996). CDFG conducted a four-year flow fluctuation study during 1997 to 2000. Results of the study indicate that (1) flow fluctuations are regular occurrences in the lower American River; (2) flow fluctuations are more common during the October to June time period and (3) flow fluctuations can significantly change steelhead spawning habitat viability (CDFG 2001c). The need to meet water supply requirements south of the Delta and Delta water quality standards has resulted in fluctuating flow patterns that can dewater spawning areas and associated redds (SWRI 2004).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the summer months can become unsuitable for juvenile steelhead rearing and potentially high water temperatures is believed to be one of the limiting factors for steelhead production (SWRI 2001).

WATER QUALITY

The AMP was established under the Sacramento CMP to characterize ambient water quality conditions in the Sacramento and American rivers. As reported by the AMP, based on data from 1992 through 1998, monitored ambient water quality constituents meet applicable regulatory standards for both aquatic life and human health, with few exceptions. For aquatic life, four metals exceeded the California Toxics Rule for EPA criteria. At Nimbus Dam, lead and zinc exceed applicable criteria less than once every three years, and cadmium, more than once every three years. At Discovery Park, cadmium would exceed applicable criteria more than once every three years, and copper, lead and zinc would exceed applicable criteria less than once every three years (SWRI 2004).

AMP pesticide monitoring conducted on the lower American River has occasionally detected diazinon, diuron, and simazine. The concentrations of diuron and simazine are well below concentrations identified as slightly toxic to fish; diazinon, however, was detected seven times over four years at concentrations above CDFG's recommended maximum values for fish (SWRI 2004).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Stranding of juvenile steelhead because of rapid flow fluctuations is frequently observed in the lower American River (SWRI 2001). During a four-year study of isolation events from 1997 to 2000, a total of 22 separate events were observed (CDFG 2001c). Mortality of young salmonids that become stranded is near 100 percent. Sources of mortality in such cases include predation by fish, avian predators and thermal stress (SWRI 2001). Fluctuating flows are believed to result in considerable stranding and loss of steelhead fry in the lower American River (Water Forum 1996).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Riparian habitat along the American River is in relatively good condition from Nimbus Dam downstream to the Howe Avenue Bridge, however, revetted banks become common and riparian cover becomes limited downstream from that point (Water Forum 1996).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

The lower American River currently provides a diversity of aquatic habitats, including shallow fast-water riffles, glides, runs, pools, and off-channel backwater habitats. The reach of the river extending from Nimbus Dam (RM 23) downstream to Goethe Park (RM 14), is primarily unrestricted by levees, but is bordered by some developed areas. This reach of the river is contained by natural bluffs and terraces cut into the side of the channel. The river reach from Goethe Park downstream to the confluence with the Sacramento River is bordered by levees. The construction of levees changed the geomorphology and has resulted in a reduction in river meanders and an increase in depth (SWRI 2001).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

High floodplains produced by the deposition of sandy sediments from upstream hydraulic mining during the Gold Rush are disconnected from the river except during extremely high flow events. Without a regular cycle of floodplain inundation, species favoring infrequent inundation and many non-native species have taken advantage of the altered system and reduced the ecological integrity of the floodplain (USACE *et al.* 2001).

ENTRAINMENT

The City of Sacramento's Fairbairn WTP, located about seven miles upstream of the confluence with the Sacramento River, is the only major diversion on the lower American River. Although the diversion is screened, it reportedly does not meet NMFS/CDFG standards. There is a possibility that juvenile salmonids, including steelhead can become entrained (Water Forum 1996).

PREDATION

American shad, striped bass and species of black bass are all known to inhabit the lower American River and likely prey on juvenile salmonids. Additionally, manmade structures and channel confinement in the lower section of the river may have altered habitat conditions favoring native predators such as Sacramento pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The Nimbus Hatchery raises and releases yearling steelhead into the American River. It is possible that some portion of these fish do not immediately begin a downstream migration and may prey on smaller naturally produced steelhead juveniles in the river.

4.3.8.2 AUBURN/COON CREEK

Auburn Ravine originates north of Auburn in Placer County and drains an area of approximately 70 square miles. Auburn Ravine flows westward out of the Sierra foothills into the East Side Canal, and is hydraulically connected to the Sacramento River via the East Side Canal and the Natomas Cross Canal near the town of Verona.

It is unlikely that Auburn Ravine historically harbored a persistent native population of salmonids. Low elevation streams in the Sierra foothills, such as Auburn Ravine, may have been essentially dry in the summer and fall. Because of their intermittent nature, these streams were not conducive to significant or consistent steelhead populations. However, anecdotal information suggests that adult steelhead have been captured and released by anglers in the Ophir area, approximately 10 miles upstream of the city of Lincoln. Additionally, long-time residents report that steelhead routinely spawned near Auburn (JSA 1999b).

Adult steelhead immigration into the Delta and the lower Sacramento River occurs from August through March (McEwan 2001; NMFS 2004a), and peaks during January and February (Moyle 2002). To reach Auburn Ravine, steelhead would migrate up the Sacramento River and enter the Natomas Cross Canal near the town of Verona. Traveling upstream in the Natomas Cross Canal, fish would then enter the East Canal and migrate slightly over 1 mile upstream to the Auburn Ravine confluence.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Currently, there are numerous water diversions within Auburn Ravine. Most of these are seasonal agricultural diversions supplied by temporary flashboard dams that are normally in place from April 15 to October 15 having little if any effect on upstream migrating adult steelhead. There are two temporary dams located near the city or Lincoln that may remain in place until as late as mid-November, Lincoln Ranch Duck Club Dam and the Hemphill Dam, both of which are barriers to upstream migration at low to moderate flows and could present obstacles to the early part of the steelhead run (Sierra Business Council 2003).

There are several permanent structures within Auburn Ravine that present obstacles to upstream migration at all but high flows. The first of these structures is the Nevada Irrigation District gaging station located about one-quarter mile downstream of State Route 65 in Lincoln. The structure is a full channel width concrete section forming a broad plume with vertical sides and an upward sloping approach. The structure is likely a significant impediment to adult steelhead upstream migration at all but the highest flows (Sierra Business Council 2003). The next permanent manmade structure in Auburn Ravine is the Nevada Irrigation District Auburn Ravine 1 Dam located off Chili Hill Road near Ophir. This is a gravity arch dam with a crest about 8 feet above the tailwater during normal flows. The dam is an impediment to upstream migration at all but high flows. There is also a natural waterfall just upstream of Ophir that is impassable at low flows.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing for trout is allowed from the fourth Saturday in May through October 14. This is outside of the time period when steelhead would be expected to be migrating upstream in Auburn Ravine.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Auburn Ravine typically cool rapidly from mid-October through November and begin warming in March. During this time period, water temperatures generally fall below 60°F in

October, and remain below 55°F from November through the beginning of March (Sierra Business Council 2003). These water temperatures should not adversely affect the adult steelhead immigration and holding life stage.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Auburn Ravine is generally good. In terms of heavy metal concentrations, copper is the only metal found in Auburn Ravine that occasionally exceeds California's Toxic Rule (Sierra Business Council 2003) and is not likely to adversely affect steelhead adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions in Auburn Ravine are significantly different under current management practices than those that occur naturally. Jones & Stokes Associates (1999) estimated flows under natural conditions and current management conditions. The results of this comparison are depicted in **Figure 4-6**. These flow conditions are not likely to adversely affect steelhead adult immigration and may provide some benefit when compared to historic conditions.



Figure 4-6. Estimated Flows in Auburn Ravine Under Natural and Current Conditions
Source: (JSA 1999b)

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The same passage impediments as described above for adult immigration apply to the spawning life stage.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing for trout is allowed from the fourth Saturday in May through October 14. This is outside of the time period when steelhead would be expected to be spawning.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Auburn Ravine typically cool rapidly from mid-October through November and begin warming in March. During this period, water temperatures generally fall below 60°F in October, and remain below 55°F from November through the beginning of March (Sierra Business Council 2003). These water temperatures should not adversely affect the steelhead spawning life stage.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Auburn Ravine is fairly good and is not expected to adversely affect steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Currently, winter flows are dominated by discharges from the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility downstream of the town of Lincoln and runoff caused by rainfall events upstream of that point where most spawning is likely to occur.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

The results of a stream survey by Jones & Stokes Associates downstream of the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility (RM 10.5) indicated relatively poor spawning habitat in this reach of Auburn Ravine (JSA 1999a). The habitat was found to be of low quality because of the lack of gravel for spawning and a shifting sand substrate that could potentially smother redds.

There appears to be good spawning habitat near Ophir, particularly in the vicinity of the Nevada Irrigation District Auburn Ravine 1 Dam. There is also reportedly good spawning habitat in Dutch Ravine, a tributary of Auburn Ravine near Ophir. However, it is not known if impediments to fish passage in Auburn Ravine prevent utilization of this reach.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Auburn Ravine is a relatively small watercourse, and little of the instream flow is from natural runoff. Most of the instream flow is water imported from the Yuba River, Bear River, and American River watersheds through various means, to meet domestic and agricultural needs in western Placer County and southeastern Sutter County (Sierra Business Council 2003). Related to the distribution of these water supplies, there are approximately 10 small seasonal diversion dams installed throughout Auburn Ravine. Each dam is usually less than 10 feet high and ponds water for diversion into agricultural areas. Larger dams also divert water into major canals.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Stocking records do not indicate that steelhead have been planted in Auburn Ravine. Historically, rainbow trout were planted in Auburn Ravine until 1965, and rainbow trout continue to be planted in water bodies connected to Auburn Ravine (e.g., the Bear River and associated reservoirs).

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing for trout is allowed from the fourth Saturday in May through October 14. This is outside of the time period when wading anglers may disrupt steelhead embryos developing in redds.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Discharges from the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility and the Auburn Wastewater Treatment Plant (RM 24.9) increase water temperatures downstream from their respective points of discharge. However, the Basin Plan requires that discharges shall not increase water temperatures more than 5°F above the receiving water temperature (RWQCB 2005). Based on very limited water temperature data collected in 2003 and 2004, water temperatures within and upstream of the area near Ophir provide suitable water temperatures for embryo incubation, however; water temperatures increase rapidly further downstream to the next measurement point, about four miles downstream of Ophir, and are likely not suitable after about mid-March (Sierra Business Council 2003).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Auburn Ravine is fairly good. In terms of heavy metal concentrations, copper is the only metal found in Auburn Ravine that occasionally exceeds California's Toxic Rule (Sierra Business Council 2003).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions upstream of the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment facilities, where most steelhead embryos would likely be developing, are likely similar to historic conditions in that they are dominated by rainfall events and irrigation diversions are minimal.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

The lack of shading provided by loss of riparian buffers in the downstream reaches of Auburn Ravine contributes to elevated summer water temperatures. CDFG conducted electrofishing on seven reaches of Auburn Ravine in the fall/winter of 2004 and the spring of 2005 (CDFG unpublished data). The CDFG survey results suggest that Auburn Ravine contains a fairly strong steelhead/rainbow trout population with almost all juvenile rearing occurring upstream of the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility.

Water temperatures in the vicinity of Ophir are generally cool year-round with the warmest temperatures being recorded in September at 61°F. Water temperatures cool quickly to below 55°F by November and remain below 53°F until the following July (City of Auburn 1997).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Auburn Ravine is generally good. Occasionally concentrations of copper may exceed California's Toxic Rule (Sierra Business Council 2003), but this is not expected to adversely affect juvenile steelhead.

FLOW CONDITIONS

As described above, flows in Auburn Ravine are significantly different under current management practices compared to natural conditions. Because summer flows are typically higher than would be

expected from a Central Valley Sierra foothill stream and winter flows are also higher under existing conditions because of the introduction of water from other sources, flows are likely not a limiting factor in Auburn Ravine. However, there is a two to four week window in late October, when the Wise Powerhouse ceases operations, and prior to the onset of winter rains, which may limit available habitat but likely not more than would have occurred under historic conditions.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

There has been significant urban development in Auburn Ravine which has resulted in a degraded riparian habitat.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Historically, instream flows in Auburn Ravine were ephemeral (Sierra Business Council 2003). Under natural instream flow conditions, flows gradually declined through the spring, summer, and early fall until the first seasonal storm events occurred. Estimated monthly mean flows in Auburn Ravine under natural conditions range from no flow during mid- to late-summer to approximately 26 cfs during the winter (City of Auburn 1997). Under current management practices, flows in Auburn Ravine are much more consistent from spring through mid-fall. Currently, winter flows are dominated by discharges from wastewater treatment facilities and runoff caused by rainfall events. Summer flows are dominated by irrigation water deliveries. Summer flows have been reported to range from 30 to 175 cfs (Nevada Irrigation District, daily flow in Auburn Ravine below State Route 65, 1976 through 1998). In September and October, flows are substantially decreased as irrigation demands diminish or cease. Flows during this period often are less than three cfs (JSA 1999a). Water management practices in Auburn Ravine have altered the natural temporal variation in instream flows, and as a result, have altered the natural temporal variation in water temperatures.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Regulated flows and flood protection have eliminated much of the connectivity of Auburn Ravine with the historic floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

During the irrigation season, there are temporary diversion dams throughout Auburn Ravine. All of these diversions are unscreened or poorly screened creating a high risk of entrainment for outmigrating juvenile salmonids. Although most of these dams are not operational during peak juvenile steelhead outmigration, the Sierra Business Council has rated five of them as having a moderate need for screening (Sierra Business Council 2003). Additionally, two permanent diversions, Hemphill Dam and the Nevada Irrigation District Auburn Ravine 1 Dam, are rated as high in priority for screen installations (Sierra Business Council 2003). The Nevada Irrigation District Auburn Ravine 1 Dam is particularly important as spawning and rearing habitat upstream of the dam are rated as excellent (Sierra Business Council 2003).

PREDATION

Several exotic species have been introduced to Auburn Ravine including bluegill and black bullhead, both of which prey on small salmonids. Additionally, black bass species may have been introduced to the area. Manmade structures and alteration of the natural flow regime may have created conditions favoring native predators including Sacramento pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Most steelhead entering Auburn Ravine are likely of hatchery-origin. It is doubtful that conditions in Auburn Ravine are sufficient to support a self-sustaining population.

4.3.8.3 DRY CREEK

Dry Creek originates in the Sierra Nevada Foothills, drains approximately 101 square miles (ECORP Consulting 2003) and is hydraulically connected to the Sacramento River *via* the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal. Below Elverta Road, Dry Creek diverges into two channels (i.e., the Main Fork and the North Fork). The Main Fork lies to the south and contains flow year-round. The North Fork is several feet higher than the Main Fork and functions as an overflow channel (Foothill Associates 2003). Tributaries to Dry Creek include Secret Ravine, Miners Ravine, Strap Ravine, Antelope Creek, Clover Valley Creek, and Linda Creek.

According to information presented in the *Dry Creek Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Plan* (ECORP Consulting 2003), the mainstem of Dry Creek is not suitable fish habitat, but is considered only as a migratory corridor to upstream areas containing spawning habitat for anadromous salmonids.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS

Potential passage impediments to adult immigration include temporary beaver dams, flashboard dams, pipeline crossings and natural waterfalls. These barriers exist primarily at low flows and likely impede upstream migration of fall-run Chinook salmon and potentially early migrating adult steelhead (Vanicek 1993). As flows increase during winter months, after the irrigation season and the beginning of winter rains, most barriers are likely passable during higher flows. On Miners Ravine, Cottonwood Dam is the largest impediment to upstream migration and is considered a complete barrier to upstream migration (DWR 2002c). Cottonwood Dam blocks several miles of potential steelhead spawning and rearing habitat.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Dry Creek is open for recreational fishing from the Fourth Saturday in May through October 15. Regulations call for catch and release fishing for trout. These angling restrictions are protective of steelhead as it is doubtful that adult steelhead would be present during this time period.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Although little water temperature data exists for Dry Creek, during the winter months, water temperatures are likely suitable for steelhead adult immigration.

WATER QUALITY

Sediment toxicity testing in the Dry Creek watershed indicates potential heavy metals toxicity associated with sediment in Secret Ravine (ECORP Consulting 2003). The presence of sediment toxicity would not likely effect steelhead adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Instream flows during the rainy season, generally from October through April, consist primarily of groundwater discharge and surface runoff. Maximum monthly mean flows typically occur during February, and range from 165 cfs to 591 cfs (City of Roseville 2003).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

As flows increase during winter months, after the irrigation season and the beginning of winter rains, most barriers are likely passable during higher flows. On Miners Ravine, Cottonwood Dam is the largest impediment to upstream migration and is considered a complete barrier to upstream migration (DWR 2002c). Cottonwood Dam blocks several miles of potential steelhead spawning and rearing habitat.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Dry Creek is open for recreational fishing from the Fourth Saturday in May through October 15. Regulations call for catch and release fishing for trout. These angling restrictions are protective of steelhead as it is doubtful steelhead would be spawning during this time period.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Although historic water temperature data for Dry Creek is limited, during the winter months, water temperatures are likely suitable for steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Sediment toxicity in Dry Creek would not directly effect steelhead spawning but, spawning success would likely be negatively impacted.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Instream flows during the rainy season, generally from October through April, consist primarily of groundwater discharge and surface runoff. Maximum monthly mean flows typically occur during February, and range from 165 cfs to 591 cfs (City of Roseville 2003).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Several reaches within Miners Ravine have been identified with high sediment loading (DWR 2002c). High sediment loads create embededness (infilling of interstitial spaces). Generally, riffles with greater than 20 percent embededness are considered unsuitable for spawning. A survey of Miners Ravine found that only 17 of 87 riffles had embededness less than 25 percent (DWR 2002c). This survey also found that the most common substrate fractions sand and silt, not cobbles and gravel.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Within the Dry Creek watershed, numerous canals, aqueducts, siphons, reservoirs, ponds, dams, pipelines and other natural and man-made water features have significantly altered the habitat from historic conditions.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The CDFG Native Anadromous Fish and Watershed Branch initiated a reconnaissance level assessment of steelhead distribution and abundance, relative to stream habitat conditions, in 1998 and 1999. At that time, steelhead escapement to the upper Dry Creek watershed was estimated at a few hundred fish, with the most suitable spawning and rearing habitat in Secret Ravine and to a lesser extent, Miners Ravine. It is likely that many of the steelhead found in Dry Creek are of hatchery-origin.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Dry Creek is open for recreational fishing from the Fourth Saturday in May through October 15. Regulations call for catch and release fishing for trout. These angling restrictions are somewhat protective of steelhead embryo incubation as most eggs would have hatched prior to the beginning of the fishing season.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During the winter months, water temperatures are likely suitable for steelhead embryo incubation.

WATER QUALITY

Sediment toxicity testing in the Dry Creek watershed indicates potential heavy metals toxicity associated with sediment in Secret Ravine (ECORP Consulting 2003). The presence of sediment toxicity would affect salmonid eggs and young. A recent risk assessment identified sediment as the primary stressor for Chinook salmon in Secret Ravine (ECORP Consulting 2003).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Instream flows during the rainy season, generally from October through April, consist primarily of groundwater discharge and surface runoff. Maximum monthly mean flows typically occur during February, and range from 165 cfs to 591 cfs (City of Roseville 2003). Although these flow fluctuations could result in some redd dewatering, it is likely that they mimic historic conditions where redds would occur.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Numerous beaver dams occur within both Miners and Secret ravines (Vanicek 1993). Beaver dams are generally beneficial to fish habitat because they contribute to the creation of pool habitat and they detain water and release it slowly, potentially maintaining and stabilizing downstream flows. However, beaver dams can present passage impediments to outmigrating juvenile steelhead, particularly at low flows.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The upper limit for steelhead growth and development is reported to be 65°F. Also, 65°F was found to be within the preferred water temperature range (i.e., 62.6°F to 68.0°F) and supported high growth of Nimbus strain juvenile steelhead (Cech and Myrick 1999). Increasing levels of thermal stress to this life stage may reportedly occur above 65°F. For example, Kaya *et al.* (1977) reported that the upper avoidance water temperature for juvenile rainbow trout was measured at 68°F to 71.6°F.

Water temperatures, as measured in Dry Creek below the confluence of Secret and Miners ravines typically begin exceeding 65°F in early May and by the end of May normally exceed 70°F (Sierra Business Council 2003). Water temperatures remain above 70°F normally until the end of September and fall below 65°F by mid-October (Sierra Business Council 2003).

Based on sampling conducted by CDFG during the 1998 to 2000 time period, Secret Ravine provides good steelhead rearing habitat while Miners Ravine provides less consistent habitat quality in terms of water temperatures (Sierra Business Council 2003).

WATER QUALITY

Sediment toxicity testing in the Dry Creek watershed indicates potential heavy metals toxicity associated with sediment in Secret Ravine (ECORP Consulting 2003). The presence of sediment toxicity would affect salmonid eggs and young. A recent risk assessment identified sediment as the primary stressor for Chinook salmon in Secret Ravine (ECORP Consulting 2003).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Instream flows during the rainy season, generally from October through April, consist primarily of groundwater discharge and surface runoff. Maximum monthly mean flows typically occur during February, and range from 165 cfs to 591 cfs (City of Roseville 2003). Reportedly, summer instream flows in lower Dry Creek consist primarily of irrigation return and runoff, groundwater discharge, and treated wastewater effluent from the Dry Creek WWTP (EIP Associates 1993). Recorded monthly mean flows in Dry Creek range from a low of 14.3 cfs in August to 378 cfs in February (ECORP Consulting 2003). Minimum monthly mean flows during July and August typically range from 12 cfs to 17 cfs (City of Roseville 2003).

Juvenile rearing habitat in Miners Ravine is considered marginal. Low-flow conditions during the summer months are considered a constraint to rearing juvenile salmonids in Miners Ravine (ECORP Consulting 2003).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Areas within the Dry Creek watershed have experienced significant loss of riparian habitat resulting in increased bank erosion and associated sediment loading. The loss of riparian habitat has also resulted in higher water temperatures in the downstream reach.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Within the Dry Creek watershed, numerous canals, aqueducts, siphons, reservoirs, ponds, dams, pipelines and other natural and man-made water features significantly influence the local hydrology.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The lower Dry Creek watershed has an extensive record of flooding and flood damage, and the most recent flooding occurrences are reported to have occurred in 1986, 1995 and 1997.

ENTRAINMENT

During the irrigation season, there are temporary diversion dams throughout Dry Creek. All of these diversions are unscreened or poorly screened creating a high risk of entrainment for outmigrating juvenile salmonids. However, most of these dams are not operational during peak juvenile steelhead outmigration.

PREDATION

In the mainstem of Dry Creek, downstream of the Miners and Secret ravine confluences, the fish community consists mostly of spotted bass, Sacramento pikeminnow and Sacramento sucker with spotted bass accounting for the largest portion of fish biomass (ECORP Consulting 2003). Spotted bass also occur in the upper watershed including both Miners and Secret ravines. Both spotted bass and Sacramento pikeminnow are known to be important predators of juvenile salmonids.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

It is not likely that Central Valley hatchery operations directly affect juvenile salmonids in the Dry Creek watershed.

4.3.8.4 FEATHER RIVER

The Feather River watershed is located at the north end of the Sierra Nevada. The watershed is bounded by the volcanic Cascade Range to the north, the Great Basin on the east, the Sacramento Valley on the west, and higher elevation portions of the Sierra Nevada on the south. The Feather River watershed upstream of Oroville Dam is approximately 3,600 square miles and comprises approximately 68 percent of the Feather River Basin. Downstream of Oroville Dam, the basin extends south and includes the drainage of the Yuba and Bear Rivers. The Yuba River joins the Feather River near the City of Marysville, 39 river miles downstream of the City of Oroville, and the confluence of the Bear River and the Feather River is 55 river miles downstream of the City of Oroville. Approximately 67 miles downstream of the City of Oroville, the Feather River flows into the Sacramento River, near the town of Verona, about 21 river miles upstream of Sacramento. The Feather River watershed, upstream of the confluence of the Sacramento and Feather Rivers, has an area of about 5,900 square miles.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

The adult immigration and holding life stage for steelhead in the Feather River occurs from September through April, with peak migration extending from October through November (McEwan 2001; Moyle 2002).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The Fish Barrier Dam at RM 67 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration for anadromous salmonids. There are no other known passage impediments to upstream migrating adult steelhead in the lower Feather River.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The sportfishery in the lower Feather River currently allows the taking of hatchery trout or steelhead (identified by an adipose fin-clip) year-round. The taking of wild steelhead is not permitted. Unusually high densities of fish during the fall in the lower Feather River likely create favorable poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Suitable water temperatures for adult steelhead migrating upstream to spawning grounds range from 46.0°F to 52.0°F (NMFS 2000; NMFS 2002; SWRCB 2003). In the lower Feather River, water temperatures are only within the "suitable" range for this life stage during the winter months. Under a 1983 agreement between CDFG and DWR, water temperatures are generally maintained at under 60°F year-round above the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet (DWR 1983).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Feather River likely does not affect steelhead adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Except during flood events, flows in the reach of the lower Feather River extending downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet are maintained at a constant 600 cfs. Under the new Settlement Agreement, as part of the FERC relicensing for the Oroville Facilities, flows in the Low Flow Channel will be

increased to a constant 800 cfs (FERC 2007).The instream flow requirements below the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet are 1,700 cfs from October through March and 1,000 cfs from April through September. It is likely that flow conditions in the lower Feather River seldom affect this life stage.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no known passage impediments to upstream migrating adult steelhead in the lower Feather River downstream of the Fish Barrier Dam.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The sportfishery in the lower Feather River currently allows the taking of hatchery steelhead (adipose fin-clip) year-round. Wild steelhead may not be taken. Unusually high densities of anadromous salmonids in the lower Feather River likely create favorable poaching opportunities.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Optimal spawning temperatures for steelhead range from 39°F to 52°F (CDFG 1991c). Water temperatures in the lower Feather River range from 47°F in the winter to as high as 65°F in the summer; however, releases are made from the coldwater pool in Lake Oroville Reservoir and this cold water generally provides suitable water temperatures in the Low Flow Channel (i.e., reach of the river extending from the Fish Barrier Dam downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet)

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Feather River likely does not affect steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Except during flood events, flows in the reach of the lower Feather River extending downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet are maintained at a constant 600 cfs. Under the new Settlement Agreement, as part of the FERC relicensing for the Oroville Facilities, flows in the Low Flow Channel will be increased to a constant 800 cfs (FERC 2007).The instream flow requirements below the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet are 1,700 cfs from October through March and 1,000 cfs from April through September. It is likely that flow conditions in the lower Feather River seldom affect steelhead spawning.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Based on results from PHABSIM, the steelhead spawning habitat index in the upper reach has a very low magnitude and has no distinct optimum over the range of flow between 150 and 1,000 cfs. In the lower reach, there is a maximum in the index apparent at a flow just under 1,000 cfs. The difference in magnitude and peak can be attributed to the relative scarcity of smaller substrate particle sizes utilized by spawning steelhead (in comparison to adult Chinook salmon) in the Oroville project area of the Feather River (DWR 2004e).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The Oroville Facilities physically block the upstream basin contributions of gravel, sediment, and large woody debris from the lower Feather River, and the upstream passage of anadromous salmonids to historical spawning areas. This has resulted in a gradual depletion of suitable spawning gravels for steelhead.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The FRFH steelhead are part of the Central Valley steelhead DPS, and also appear to compose over 95 percent of the steelhead population in the lower Feather River. As such, the FRFH is maintaining the spatial structure of the ESU and the Feather River steelhead population. The natural population is not self-sustaining in any appreciable number, primarily due to the basin morphology, and relative lack of steelhead habitat in the lower Feather River, and inaccessibility to habitat above Oroville Dam.

FRFH trucks its fall-run production to San Pablo Bay for release. Effects of out-of-basin release include a high degree of straying of adult returns into other streams, with implications to native spring and fall Chinook salmon of competition over habitat and threats to genetic integrity. Straying of fall-run has resulted in the homogeneity of the Central Valley fall-run component of the Central Valley fall-/late fall-run ESU.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The sportfishery in the lower Feather River currently allows the taking of hatchery steelhead (adipose fin-clip) year-round. It is possible that steelhead redds could be disrupted by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Low Flow Channel are normally below 55°F during the steelhead embryo incubation life stage of December through April and seldom exceed 57°F in May (DWR 2001).

WATER QUALITY

As part of the FERC relicensing process for the Oroville facilities, six of the relicensing studies specifically address metals contamination in the lower Feather River. As part of these studies, water quality samples were collected at 17 locations within the lower Feather River. Samples exceeding aquatic life water quality criteria occurred for four constituents: total aluminum, iron, copper, and lead. In the reach of the Feather River extending from the Fish Barrier Dam downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet, 19 percent of the water quality samples exceeded aquatic life water quality criteria. Samples taken from the reach of the Feather River extending from the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet downstream to the confluence with the Sacramento River were variable, but all were higher than the upstream reach and 3 exceeded aquatic life water quality criteria 100 percent of the time. Copper exceeded aquatic life water quality criteria in 5 of 276 samples; two of these occurrences were in the reach of the Feather River extending from the Fish Barrier Dam downstream to the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet. Iron only exceeded aquatic life water quality criteria at three sampling locations; all locations were downstream of the lower Feather River confluence with Honcut Creek. Lead exceeded aquatic life water criteria only once at several stations, but three or four times at the two most downstream stations on the Feather River.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Adverse affects on developing embryos could occur if a flow fluctuation caused redds to become dewatered while eggs were incubating. Oroville facilities releases are regulated and subject to regulatory flow criteria. Flows in the Low Flow Channel are maintained at a constant 600 cfs where almost all spawning of steelhead occurs. Under the new Settlement Agreement, as part of the FERC relicensing for the Oroville Facilities, flows in the Low Flow Channel will be increased to a constant 800 cfs (FERC 2007).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

Almost 100 percent of juvenile steelhead rearing in the lower Feather River occurs upstream of the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet (DWR and Reclamation 2000). Emigration of juvenile steelhead principally occurs from June through September (DWR and Reclamation 2000).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Naturally spawned Feather River steelhead have been observed to rear successfully at water temperatures below 65°F (DWR and Reclamation 2000). Water temperatures in the Low Flow Channel normally remain below 62°F year-round and are suitable for juvenile steelhead rearing. Water temperatures downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet are generally warmer, with the maximum mean daily water temperature at the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet reaching approximately 70°F in the summer (DWR 2001). Because daily summer water temperatures generally exceed 70°F below the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet, it is unlikely that steelhead rear in the lower reach of the river (DWR and Reclamation 2000).

WATER QUALITY

As discussed above under embryo incubation, heavy metal concentrations can occasionally exceed established water quality criteria.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the Low Flow Channel of the Feather River, where most juvenile rearing of salmonids occurs, is maintained at a constant 600 cfs year-round except during flood events. Some flow fluctuations may occur downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet that have the potential to strand juvenile rearing or outmigrating salmonids. Since 2001, DWR has been conducting a juvenile stranding study on Chinook salmon and steelhead in the lower Feather River. Empirical observations and aerial surveys identified over 30 areas that have the potential to strand juveniles with flow decreases. However, sampling of isolated areas indicated relatively little juvenile salmonid standing. Furthermore the proportion of stranded salmonids represented a very small percentage (<<1 percent) of the estimated number of emigrants (DWR 2004).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Fixed flows in the lower Feather River have resulted in fewer channel forming or re-shaping events leading to a lack of habitat diversity. This lack of diversity results in unnatural riparian conditions and a lack of recruitment of riparian vegetation.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Channel complexity refers to the diversity of geomorphic features in a particular river reach. Features such as undercut banks, meanders, point bars side channels and backwaters all provide habitat for juvenile salmonids. Regulation of the lower Feather River by the Oroville facilities has changed both streamflow and sediment discharge. Attenuation of peak flows, decreased winter flows, increased summer flows, and changes to flow frequencies have led to a general decrease in channel complexity downstream of Oroville Dam. Because several species and races of fish occur in the lower Feather River, a diversity of habitat types is required. Decreases in channel diversity lead to a decrease in habitat diversity and quality.

The high concentration of spawning salmonids in the Low Flow Channel results in a high concentration of juveniles in the Low Flow Channel. Based on historic accounts of juvenile salmonid emigration, the current peak in the emigration period is somewhat earlier than pre-dam conditions (Painter *et al.* 1977; Warner 1954). Seesholtz *et al.* (2003) further report that substantial numbers of juveniles remain in the Low Flow Channel through the end of June. Seesholtz *et al.* (2003) speculate that this early emigration

may be caused by competition with other juvenile salmonids, including Chinook salmon and hatchery steelhead, for rearing habitat.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Regular intermediate flood flushing flows to maintain geomorphic function of the river and replenish fish and riparian habitats are generally rare in the lower Feather River because of flow regulation by the Oroville facilities. Lack of frequent high flow/flood events has led to a lack of floodplain renewal and connectivity to the channel.

ENTRAINMENT

The main diversion on the lower Feather River downstream of the Thermalito Afterbay occurs at Sunset Pumps at RM 38.6. The pumps divert 65,500 acre-feet of water annually. Although the diversion is screened, some entrainment of juvenile salmonids likely occurs.

PREDATION

Counts of known predators on juvenile anadromous salmonids are reported to be very low in the Low Flow Channel (Seesholtz *et al.* 2003). Naturally spawned steelhead are an exception because little is known about their relative abundance. Because water temperatures are relatively low in the Low Flow Channel, it is doubtful that significant predation occurs in this reach by non-salmonid species.

Significant numbers of predators do reportedly exist in the High Flow Channel below the Thermalito Afterbay Outlet. Analysis of CWT recovery data indicates that predation on hatchery-reared Feather River Chinook salmon released in the Feather River is high, however further analysis reveals that most of this predation takes place in the Sacramento River downstream of the Feather River confluence (DWR 2004).

One aspect of the Oroville Project operations and facilities that may enhance predation in the High Flow Channel is that the high density of juveniles in the Low Flow Channel may cause early emigration of juvenile salmonids. Because juvenile rearing habitat in the Low Flow Channel is limited, juveniles may be forced to emigrate from the area due to competition for resources. Relatively small juvenile salmonids may be less capable of avoiding predators than those that rear to a larger size in the Low Flow Channel prior to beginning their seaward migration.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Although most Feather River steelhead are likely of hatchery-origin, the release of yearling steelhead to the Feather River likely creates predation and competition for resources with smaller naturally spawned steelhead

4.3.8.5 BEAR RIVER

The Bear River originates on the west side of the Sierra just below Lake Spaulding at the 5,500-foot elevation and flows southwest 65 miles to its confluence with the Feather River at RM 12 of the Feather, draining portions of Nevada, Placer, Sutter and Yuba counties. Anadromous salmonids have access to 15 miles of habitat in the Bear River. The South Sutter Irrigation District Dam (SSIDD) presents an impassable barrier and marks the upstream extent of potential anadromous salmonid habitat. Inadequate streamflow in the Bear River prevents the establishment of a self-sustaining steelhead population (JSA 2004).

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The SSIDD presents an impassable barrier and marks the upstream extent of potential anadromous salmonid habitat.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling is permitted in the Bear River from the last Saturday in April through November 15. Because water temperatures in the Bear Rive likely prevent an early migration of steelhead into the Bear River, very few steelhead would be harvested in the recreational fishery.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The USFWS's CVPIA *Tributary Production Enhancement Report* of May 1998 identifies high water temperatures as one of the factors limiting steelhead production in the Bear River. However, water temperatures should be cool enough by November to support steelhead adult immigration.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Bear River is generally considered to be good and should be adequate to support steelhead adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Inadequate streamflow in the Bear River prevents the establishment of a self-sustaining steelhead population (JSA 2004). However, during periods of high flows, steelhead are known to utilize the river for limited spawning (JSA 2004).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The SSIDD presents an impassable barrier and marks the upstream extent of potential anadromous salmonid habitat. During periods of low flows or dry water years, steelhead may not have access to spawning habitat in the Bear River.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling is permitted in the Bear River from the last Saturday in April through November 15. This time period should be protective of any steelhead spawning that may occur in the river.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During winter months, water temperatures in the Bear River are adequate to support steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Bear River is generally considered to be good and should not present adverse conditions to steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Inadequate streamflow in the Bear River prevents the establishment of a self-sustaining steelhead population (JSA 2004). However, during periods of high flows, steelhead are known to utilize the river for limited spawning (JSA 2004).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Habitat conditions in the Bear River below Camp Far West Reservoir currently are not favorable for natural production of anadromous fish, including Chinook salmon and steelhead. Salmonid reproduction is severely limited by silted spawning gravels.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The primary modification to habitat in the Bear River stems from water diversions during the irrigation season. Additionally, the Bear River was far more heavily impacted by hydraulic mining (i.e., tons of mining sediment per unit of drainage area) than the Yuba or American Rivers. Closure of Rollins Dam caused a significant reduction in sediment yields and very little sediment remains in the middle Bear today. It is estimated that 125 million cubic meters (160 million cubic yards) of mining sediment is stored in the lower Bear. The high volume of mining sediment, in combination with restricting levees, has caused the lower Bear River to change from wide and shallow to deeply incised.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Because environmental conditions do not support a self-sustaining population of steelhead in the Bear River, those steelhead that do spawn during high flow years have likely originated from the FRFH.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling is permitted in the Bear River from the last Saturday in April through November 15. This time period should prevent the inadvertent disruption of redds by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The USFWS's CVPIA *Tributary Production Enhancement Report* of May 1998 identifies high water temperatures as one of the factors limiting steelhead production in the Bear River. However, steelhead embryos developing during the winter months should not be affected by warm water temperatures.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Bear River is generally considered to be good. However, the river is considered to be an impaired water body by the SWRCB. The pollutant or stressor in the river downstream of Camp Far West Reservoir is diazinon and the pollutant upstream is mercury (JSA 2004). Agricultural runoff is the likely source of diazinon (JSA 2004). These pollutants could adversely impact developing steelhead embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The USFWS's CVPIA *Tributary Production Enhancement Report* identifies instream flows as one of the factors limiting steelhead production in the Bear River. Because steelhead spawning likely only occurs during wet years, flows should be adequate to support embryo incubation.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

The USFWS's CVPIA *Tributary Production Enhancement Report* identifies high water temperatures as one of the factors limiting steelhead production in the Bear River. Warm water temperatures during the summer months likely preclude steelhead juvenile rearing in the Bear River.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Bear River is generally considered to be good. However, the river is considered to be an impaired water body by the SWRCB. The pollutant or stressor in the river downstream of Camp Far West Reservoir is diazinon and the pollutant upstream is mercury (JSA 2004). Agricultural runoff is the likely source of diazinon (JSA 2004).

FLOW CONDITIONS

During the dry summer months, flows in Bear River sometimes decrease to zero at the USGS gaging site near Wheatland (JSA 2004). The USFWS's CVPIA *Tributary Production Enhancement Report* identifies instream flows as one of the factors limiting steelhead production in the Bear River.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Much of the lower Bear River is under private ownership and the condition of riparian habitat has not been investigated. However, it is likely that some riparian habitat has been degraded due to agricultural encroachment into the riparian zone.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

This watershed is one of the most heavily managed in California for water conveyance. Flows are largely controlled by the Nevada Irrigation System and PG&E. The present system of diversions also results in fluctuations that are harder on the riverine habitat and fisheries than the more gradual natural seasonal variations.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The Bear River was far more heavily impacted by hydrologic mining than the Yuba or American rivers and, unlike the Yuba or American rivers, contains a large volume of mining sediment stored in its main channel which is subjected to continual erosion. It is estimated that 125 million cubic meters (160 million cubic yards) of mining sediment is stored in the lower Bear River. The high volume of mining sediment, in combination with restricting levees, has caused the lower Bear River to change from wide and shallow to deeply incised (Sierra Club Website 2007).

ENTRAINMENT

The USFWS's CVPIA *Tributary Production Enhancement Report* identifies unscreened diversions as one of the factors limiting steelhead production in the Bear River.

PREDATION

The same suite of predators (e.g., large and smallmouth bass) as exists in the lower Feather River likely occurs in the Bear River.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Steelhead released from the Feather River Hatchery may intercept and prey on naturally spawned steelhead emigrating from the Bear River.

4.3.8.6 YUBA RIVER

The Yuba River watershed encompasses 1,339 square miles on the western slopes of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range, and is located in portions of Sierra, Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties (Reynolds *et al.* 1993). The primary watercourses of the upper Yuba River watershed are the South, Middle, and North Yuba rivers, which flow into Englebright Reservoir. The lower Yuba River, from Englebright Dam downstream to the confluence with the Feather River, is approximately 24 miles long, and supports a wild Chinook salmon and steelhead fishery.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Englebright Dam, at RM 24, presents an impassable barrier to anadromous salmonid upstream migration and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat in the Yuba River. Physical passage impediments on the lower Yuba River are primarily limited to the passability of Daguerre Point Dam fish ladders during certain flow conditions. The design of Daguerre Point Dam fish ladders are suboptimal, as currently operated by the USACE. For example, during high flows across the spillway, the fish ladder is obscured making it difficult for salmonids migrating upstream to find the entrances to the fish ladders. Both ladders tend to become loaded with organic material and sediment, which can directly inhibit passage and/or reduce attraction flows at the ladder entrances. The fish ladder exits are close to the spillway, which can result in fish being swept back over the dam while attempting to exit the ladder. The policy of the USACE is to close the fish ladders when the water surface elevation reaches 130 feet, and remain closed until the water surface elevation drops to an elevation of 127 feet.

Options to improve fish passage at Daguerre Point Dam were identified by the AFRP. The Project Modification Report recently completed by the USACE included engineering surveys, hydraulic evaluation, and a preliminary environmental assessment. There is no anticipated date for the implementation or completion of improvements to Daguerre Point Dam.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Fishing for steelhead on the lower Yuba River is regulated by CDFG. CDFG 2007-2008 angling regulations permit fishing for steelhead from the mouth of the Yuba River to the Highway 20 Bridge with only artificial lures with barbless hooks all year-round. A one hatchery steelhead (identified by an adipose fin clip) limit is permitted all year from the mouth of the Yuba to the Highway 20 Bridge. From the Highway 20 Bridge to Englebright Dam, fishing for steelhead is permitted from December 1 through August 31 only. During this time, no harvest is permitted. The use of artificial lures with barbless hooks in the lower Yuba River is considered a stressor to immigrating and holding steelhead during August through November.

The extent to which steelhead are targeted for poaching is unknown. However, due to their ESA listing, any level of poaching or angler harvest may constitute a significant limiting factor to the population

WATER TEMPERATURE

Upstream spawning migration of adult steelhead has been reported to cease at temperatures < 39.2°F and ≥ 64.4°F. CDFG found in-river water temperatures to be near or above 57°F at the Marysville gage until after mid-October and into November.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Yuba River is adequate to support steelhead adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The Yuba Goldfields are located along the lower Yuba River near Daguerre Point Dam, approximately 10 miles north of Marysville. The area of the Goldfields is approximately 8,000 acres. The Goldfields have been used for gold mining for about 100 years. As a result thousands of acres of continuous mounds of cobble and rock terrain have been left behind. As a result of the permeability of the substrates composing the Goldfields, several interconnected channels and ponds have formed throughout the area. Surface water and subsurface water in the ponds and canals of the Goldfields are hydraulically connected to the Yuba River downstream of Daguerre Point Dam via an outlet canal.

Prior to 2003, a fraction of the lower Yuba River steelhead population routinely migrated from the mainstem of the Yuba River into the Yuba Goldfields via the outlet canal. In 2003, a fish barrier was constructed at the outlet canal to prevent fish from entering the Yuba Goldfields. High flows during May 2004 breached the barrier structure. However, repairs to the fish barrier have been subsequently made, and the integrity of the barrier is monitored during high flows. Therefore, for the most part, the Yuba Goldfields does not present a direct threat to anadromous salmonids in the lower Yuba River. However, as mentioned above, high flows can create partial barriers to upstream migration at Daguerre Point Dam.

SPAWNING

Steelhead spawn in the lower Yuba River from January through April. Suitable steelhead spawning habitat occurs in the Garcia Pit Gravel Reach and the Daguerre Point Dam Reach. However, steelhead redds have not been found below Daguerre Point Dam (CALFED and YCWA 2005).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

From Daguerre Point Dam upstream to Englebright Dam there are no barriers to upstream adult immigration.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling impacts to spawning steelhead in the Yuba River are similar to those discussed above for adult immigration.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Average daily water temperatures recorded at Daguerre Point Dam from 1997 to 2001 ranged from 50.3ºF in January to 53.7ºF in April. These temperatures are adequate to support steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Yuba River is adequate to support steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

CDFG (1991b) developed steelhead WUA-flow relationships for the lower Yuba River from suitability habitat criteria recommended by Bovee (1978). These relationships indicate that potential spawning habitat is maximized at flows around 800 cfs. Flows ranging from 500 to 1,000 cfs provide good habitat availability above Daguerre Point Dam. Currently, flow regimes in the lower Yuba River range from 600 to 700 cfs depending on water year type.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Most spawning habitat in the lower Yuba River is upstream of Daguerre Point Dam. Although water temperatures below the dam are likely suitable for steelhead spawning, gravel downstream of the dam is embedded with silt (YCWA 2000). Spawning habitat above Daguerre is considered marginal as Englebright Dam blocks recruitment of spawning gravel to the lower Yuba River.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The most extensive habitat alterations in the lower Yuba River have occurred as a result of gold mining operations. The Yuba Goldfields are located along the lower Yuba River near Daguerre Point Dam, approximately 10 miles north of Marysville. The area of the Goldfields is approximately 8,000 acres. The Goldfields have been used for gold mining for about 100 years. As a result thousands of acres of continuous mounds of cobble and rock terrain have been left behind. As a result of the permeability of the substrates composing the Goldfields, several interconnected channels and ponds have formed throughout the area. Surface water in the ponds and canals of the Goldfields are hydraulically connected to the Yuba River. A proportion of flow entering the Goldfields is eventually returned to the Yuba River downstream of Daguerre Point Dam via an outlet canal. Prior to 2003, a fraction of the lower Yuba River Chinook salmon population (e.g., spring-run, fall-run, and late-fall-run) and, presumably, steelhead routinely migrated from the mainstem of the Yuba River into the Yuba Goldfields via the outlet canal. In 2003, a fish barrier was constructed at the outlet canal to prevent fish from entering the Yuba Goldfields. However, fish were still observed passing the barrier during flood or high flow events.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The lower Yuba River is currently thought to support a self-sustaining population of steelhead while the lower Feather River population of steelhead is mostly of hatchery-origin. It is likely that some straying of Feather River steelhead into the lower Yuba River occurs.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because the lower Yuba River supports a year-round recreational fishery, it is possible that some level of redd disturbance by wading anglers occurs.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Steelhead embryo incubation primarily occurs in the lower Yuba River from January through July (CALFED Website 2005). The intragravel residence times of incubating eggs and alevins (yolk-sac fry) are highly dependent upon water temperatures. Maximum steelhead embryo survival reportedly occurs in water temperatures ranging from 41°F to 56°F (USFWS 1995c). The average water temperature in the Yuba River at Daguerre Point Dam is typically around 47ºF in January and February and rises to approximately 56°F in July.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Yuba River is generally good. There is a concern that a substantial amount of mercury may be in the Yuba Goldfields that could be mobilized by flood events but this would likely be downstream of developing embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

On March 1, 2001, the SWRCB issued a D-1644 which specified flow requirements limiting the magnitude and rate of flow reductions in the lower Yuba River to prevent salmonid redd dewatering and juvenile stranding. The seasonal flow requirements to protect salmonid redds were based on a redd dewatering study conducted by YWCA (SWRCB 2001).

Pursuant to the SWRCB's RD-1644 and agreements between CDFG and YCWA, daily flow fluctuations below Englebright Dam must not be reduced to less than 55 percent of the maximum daily flow release that previously occurred from September 15 to October 31. In addition, during the period from November 1 to March 31 the flow downstream of Englebright Dam cannot be reduced to less than 65 percent of the maximum flow release that occurred during the November through March 31 period, or the minimum instream flow requirement, whichever is greater (SWRI 2002).

FERC issued a License Amendment for the Yuba Project (Project No. 2246) on November 22, 2005, which imposes a more protective set of flow fluctuation and ramping requirements for the Yuba Project. The new criteria govern YCWA's releases of water from the Narrows II Powerhouse and require YCWA to make reasonable efforts to operate New Bullards Bar and Englebright reservoirs to avoid flow fluctuations in the lower Yuba River.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

The vast majority of steelhead emigrate as yearlings during October through May, with a relatively small percentage of individuals remaining in the lower Yuba River and emigrating as two or three year olds.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The average daily mean water temperature downstream of Daguerre Point Dam from October through May ranges between 57.5ºF in October to 57.8ºF in May at Marysville (SWRI 2002). These temperatures are within the suitable range for juvenile steelhead rearing and outmigration.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the lower Yuba River is generally good. There is a concern that a substantial amount of mercury may be in the Yuba Goldfields that could be mobilized by flood events.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Field observations on the lower Yuba River indicate that both natural and controlled flow reductions can cause some degree of fish stranding (YCWA 1998; YCWA 1999). The magnitude of stranding is site-specific and associated with the specific developmental stage of the fry prior to the onset of flow reductions, channel morphology, and aquatic habitat characteristics.

There are two types of stranding that are associated with flow reductions:

- Stranding associated with the rate of flow reductions (i.e., ramping rates), which determines if the juvenile fish can react quickly enough to avoid being stranded from exposed substrates in side channels and channel margins as flows decrease; and
- Stranding associated with the magnitude of flow reductions, regardless of ramping rate, which determines the extent of stranding within off channel habitats as flows decrease.

The SWRCB requires that YCWA, in consultation with the CDFG, NMFS, and USFWS verify that salmon fry are being protected from dewatering events during controlled flow reductions on the lower Yuba River. However, some level of mortality associated with controlled flow reductions is unavoidable,

and therefore should be considered as a factor when assessing threats to juvenile salmonids in the lower Yuba River (YCWA 1999).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The reduction of peak flows in the late winter and spring have resulted in a reduction of riparian vegetation. There is a wide variation throughout the growing season f willow regeneration because each species of willow requires flows at specific periods for reproduction and growth. Cottonwood regeneration is also more prominent under natural flow regimes (YCWA 2000).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Attenuated peak flows and controlled flow regimes have altered the areas geomorphology and have affected the natural meandering of the river downstream of Englebright Dam.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Controlled flows and decreases in peak flows has reduced the frequency of floodplain inundation resulting in a separation of the river channel from its natural floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

As juvenile steelhead pass Daguerre Point Dam, physical injury may occur as they pass over the dam or through its fish ladders (SWRI 2002). Water diversions in the lower Yuba River generally begin in the early spring and extend through the fall. As a result, potential threats to juvenile steelhead occur at the Hallwood-Cordua and South Yuba Brophy diversions.

Fish screens recently installed at the Hallwood-Cordua diversion are considered to be an improvement over those previously present but, the current pipe design may not allow sufficient flow to completely eliminate juvenile salmonid losses at the diversion.

The South Yuba – Brophy system diverts water through an excavated channel from the south bank of the lower Yuba River to Daguerre Point Dam. The water is then subsequently diverted through a porous rock dike that is intended to exclude fish. The current design of this rock structure does not meet NMFS or CDFG juvenile fish screen criteria (SWRI 2002).

There are also three major unscreened diversions on the lower Yuba River located upstream of Daguerre Point Dam: (1) the Browns Valley Pumpline Diversion Facility; (2) the South-Yuba/Brophy Water District Canal; and (3) the Hallwood-Cordua Canal. In addition, there are 16 unscreened water diversion facilities downstream of Daguerre Point Dam (SWRI 2002) which could potentially entrain juvenile salmonids in the lower Yuba River.

PREDATION

The extent of predation on juvenile steelhead in the Yuba River is not well documented, however, several non-native introduced known predators of juvenile salmonids are found in the Yuba River including striped bass, American shad and black bass species. Sacramento pikeminnow, a native predatory species is also found in the lower Yuba River. Manmade alterations to the lower Yuba River channel (i.e., Daguerre Point Dam) may provide more predation opportunities for pikeminnow than would occur under natural conditions.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The extent of potential hatchery effects on juvenile steelhead in the lower Yuba River is unknown. It is possible that some hatchery-reared steelhead from the FRFH may move into the lower Yuba River in

search of rearing habitat. Some competition for resources with naturally spawned steelhead could occur as a result.

4.3.8.7 BUTTE CREEK

Butte Creek flows from the western slope of the Sierra Nevada through a steep canyon for approximately 25 miles and meets the valley floor near Chico. The Centerville Diversion Dam, located immediately downstream of the DeSabla Powerhouse is generally considered to be the upper limit of anadromous salmonid habitat.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Butte Creek is a highly developed watershed system with multiple diversions as well as water imports from foreign sources. Fish passage through Butte Creek is affected by about 22 major structures and an estimated 60 to 80 minor structures (e.g., pump diversions). Currently, it is estimated that salmonids have access to approximately 53 miles of Butte Creek (DWR 2005a).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational harvest of steelhead, as stated in the CDFG 2007-2008 fishing regulations, is limited to catch and release, and occurs from November 15 through February 15 with gear restrictions including artificial lures and barbless hooks only.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the steelhead adult immigration time period are suitable for this life stage.

WATER QUALITY

Available data indicate that overall water quality in Butte Creek ranges from good to excellent in the upper watershed and degrades in quality lower in the system (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004). Both pH and dissolved oxygen concentrations appear to be below CVRWQCB criteria all of the time. Turbidity, mineral concentrations, nutrient loads and heavy metal concentrations (e.g., lead) have at times exceeded Central Valley RWQCB criteria for short periods of time (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004). Although water quality is somewhat degraded, it should be adequate to support steelhead adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Because there are no large storage facilities on Butte Creek, flow regimes during the winter months when agriculture diversions are not occurring tend to mimic the historic hydrology of the watershed.

SPAWNING

Steelhead primarily spawn in stream reaches between the Parrot-Phelan Diversion Dam and the Centerville Head Dam (USFWS 2003a).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no significant passage impediments in the reach of Butte Creek where most steelhead spawning would occur during the winter months.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Potential angling impacts to spawning steelhead are similar to those describe above for the adult immigration life stage.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the winter months when steelhead would be spawning are within the suitable range for this life stage.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Butte Creek where steelhead spawning is likely to occur is generally considered of high quality.

FLOW CONDITIONS

PG&E's minimum instream flow requirement at the Lower Centerville Diversion Dam is 40 cfs from June 1 to September 14. Flows in Butte Creek begin to increase during the steelhead spawning period from November through April. Because there are no large storage facilities on Butte Creek, flow regimes during the winter months when agriculture diversions are not occurring tend to mimic the historic hydrology of the watershed.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

In Butte Creek, the spawning area for steelhead extends from the Centerville Head Dam downstream to the vicinity of the Western Canal Siphon crossing. Steelhead generally spawn upstream of the Parrott-Phelan diversion. Spawning gravel in the reach of the creek from the Centerville Head Dam downstream to the vicinity of Helltown is extremely limited, with the major gravel beds existing below the Centerville Powerhouse (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Hydropower generation has altered flows in Butte Creek since about 1908. The reach of Butte Creek from the Centerville Powerhouse downstream to the Parrott-Phelan Dam has undergone and continues to undergo residential development. Channel modification projects designed to repair or prevent flood-related damage to roads and houses have degraded natural processes which serve to recruit gravel, provide instream cover and forage, and provide holding pools (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

There is likely very little direct hatchery influence on steelhead in Butte Creek. The extent to which hatchery steelhead from the Feather River Hatchery or the Coleman National Hatchery steelhead stray into Butte Creek is unknown.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because Butte Creek is open to angling year-round, there may be some inadvertent negative impacts to embryo incubation from anglers wading through redds or otherwise disturbing substrates containing redds.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The optimum water temperature range reported for steelhead embryo incubation is between 48ºF and 52ºF (NMFS 2000). Mean monthly water temperatures in Butte Creek near Chico (DWR Gage) generally remain suitable during the embryo incubation period until May, when they reach approximately 56ºF.

WATER QUALITY

Turbidity, mineral concentrations, nutrient loads and heavy metal concentrations (e.g., lead) have at times exceeded Central Valley RWQCB criteria for short periods of time (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004). Any of these factors could affect developing steelhead embryos, however, most developing embryos would be higher up in the watershed where conditions are better.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Fluctuation in flows during the embryo incubation period which could potentially cause redd dewatering events have not been reported to date.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the period when flows are managed and juvenile steelhead would be present, are likely near optimal ranges. However, water temperatures could be a concern during the late spring and summer for juvenile rearing in the lower reaches of Butte Creek near the Sutter Bypass.

WATER QUALITY

Available data indicate that overall water quality in Butte Creek ranges from good to excellent in the upper watershed and degrades in quality lower in the system (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004). Both pH and dissolved oxygen concentrations appear to be below CVRWQCB criteria all of the time. Turbidity, mineral concentrations, nutrient loads and heavy metal concentrations (e.g., lead) have at times exceeded Central Valley RWQCB criteria for short periods of time (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Butte Creek is primarily a free flowing stream lacking large dams to control or buffer flows (CDFG 1999a). Flows are highly variable with the majority of out migration of juveniles occurring during high flow events (CDFG 1999a). The extent to which flow fluctuations from water diversions in Butte Creek may affect juvenile salmonid habitat availability and cause juvenile stranding is currently unknown.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The distribution of riparian habitat, particularly in the lower reaches of Butte Creek has been reduced by anthropogenic changes for flood control, agriculture and urbanization (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

The reach of Butte Creek from the Centerville Powerhouse downstream to the Parrott-Phelan Dam has undergone and continues to undergo residential development. Channel modification projects designed to repair or prevent flood-related damage to roads and houses have degraded natural processes which serve to recruit gravel, provide instream cover and forage, and provide summer holding pools (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Although Butte Creek is bordered by levees in some areas, it also passes through Butte Slough and the Sutter Bypass where connectivity to the floodplain still exists to some extent (Butte Creek Watershed Website 2004)

ENTRAINMENT

In Butte Creek most water diversion facilities have been screened or modified to prevent juvenile fish entrainment (PG&E 2005).

PREDATION

The extent of predation on juvenile steelhead in the Butte Creek is not well documented, however, several known predators of juvenile salmonids are found in the Butte Creek. Striped bass are commonly found in the Sacramento River as well as in Butte Creek. The Sacramento pikeminnow is another well know predator of juvenile salmonids and has been documented as far upstream in the Sacramento River as the RBDD suggesting the presence of pikeminnow in Butte Creek (NMFS 1996b). Increasing flow regulation and associated increasing temperatures, in addition to increased turbulence associated with spillways, may cause increased predator upstream movement, increased predator success, and increased predator survival (NMFS 1996b).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

There are likely no adverse effects due to hatchery production on juveniles in Butte Creek. However, naturally produced steelhead juveniles that utilize portions of the Sutter Bypass for rearing may encounter hatchery produced salmon and steelhead resulting in potential competition for resources.

4.3.8.8 BIG CHICO CREEK

Big Chico Creek originates on Colby Mountain, located in Tehama County, California. The creek flows 45 miles to its confluence with the Sacramento River in Butte County. The creek's elevation ranges from 120 feet at the Sacramento River to 6000 feet at Colby Mountain. A portion of Big Chico Creek flows through the city of Chico, California's Bidwell Park and California State University, Chico.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Big Chico Creek has no major reservoirs, but has five small dams and three natural barriers that could impede anadromous fish migration. Presently, 24 miles of Big Chico Creek are accessible to steelhead (DWR 2005b)

Five Mile Dam was built by the USACE for the purpose of flood control in 1963. The dam effectively spilt the Big Chico Creek flows into three separate channels, Big Chico Creek, Sycamore Channel, and Lindo Channel. The design of the flood control structure creates a ponding effect upstream during flood events. This causes gravels to drop out of suspended load upstream of the diversion which creates gravel bar that blocks the flow to Lindo Channel unless it is mechanically removed. As a result, Lindo Channel frequently lacks sufficient flows to allow upstream migrants to pass, and has the potential to trap adults within the channel during immigration to spawning areas upstream (DWR 2005b).

The Iron Canyon fish ladder was built in the late 1950s to facilitate fish passage through Bidwell Park. This structure has been damaged, and frequently impedes adult salmonid upstream migration. Currently, a project is underway to repair the fish ladder to allow fish passage to an additional 9 miles of spawning habitat over a wider range of flows (CDFG Website 2005). In addition, fish passage through the narrow

canyon walls of Bear Hole, located downstream of the Iron Canyon fish ladder, impedes fish passage during low flows.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational catch and release of trout is allowed from the mouth of Big Chico creek to one mile downstream of Bidwell Park during June 16 through October 15, and from October 16 through February 15 with gear restrictions (i.e., artificial lures and barbless hooks only); and from Bear Hole to the Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve from November 1 through April 30 with gear restrictions (i.e., artificial lure and barbless hooks only). Fishing between the upper boundaries of Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve to Higgins Hole Falls is prohibited year-round.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Big Chico Creek normally fall below 60°F by late October and are under 50°F by the beginning of December, when adult steelhead would be immigrating. These temperatures are suitable for that life stage.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Big Chico Creek and Lindo Channel has been degraded by cadmium, mercury, and other metals associated with gold mining in the upper watershed. However, Big Chico Creek currently meets EPA water quality constituent standards and should be adequate to support steelhead adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions in Big Chico Creek during normal and wet years are adequate to support steelhead adult immigration. During dry years, low flows may create passage impediments or even strand upstream migrating steelhead in Lindo Channel.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The first barrier to upstream migration on Big Chico Creek occurs in Iron Canyon where a jumble of boulders has accumulated in the Creek. These boulders present an impassable barrier at normal flows but allow passage at high flow (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007). The Iron Canyon fish ladder was built in the late 1950s to facilitate fish passage. This structure has been damaged, and frequently impedes adult salmonid upstream migration. Currently, a project is underway to repair the fish ladder to allow fish passage to an additional nine miles of spawning habitat over a wider range of flows (CDFG Website 2005). The waterfall at Higgins Hole is currently thought to be the uppermost barrier to anadromous fish migrations (CDFG 2001a).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Most steelhead spawning occurs upstream of the Ecological Reserve where fishing is closed year-round. Therefore, harvest and angling impacts to steelhead are minimized in Big Chico Creek.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The reported optimum water temperature range for steelhead during the spawning period is between 46.0ºF and 52ºF (USFWS 1995b). Mean monthly water temperatures in Big Chico Creek near Chico (DWR gage) from during the spawning period from 1999 through 2005 ranged from approximately 47ºF in November to 54ºF in April.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Big Chico Creek and Lindo Channel has been degraded by cadmium, mercury, and other metals associated with gold mining in the upper watershed. However, Big Chico Creek currently meets EPA water quality constituent standards and is adequate to support steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The Iron Canyon fish ladder was built in the late 1950s to facilitate fish passage through Bidwell Park. This structure has been damaged, and frequently impedes adult salmonid upstream migration. Currently, a project is underway to repair the fish ladder to allow fish passage to an additional 9 miles of spawning habitat over a wider range of flows.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

A survey of spawning gravels was conducted by DWR in 1997 to determine the gravel size distribution at various spawning sites in Big Chico Creek. The sites were located along Big Chico Creek at Highway 32; below the Five-Mile Area flood control structure; and at Rose Avenue. The gravel sizes ranged from 20 mm to 100 mm (approximately 1 to 4 inches) in mean diameter. Gravels within these ranges are considered to be suitable for salmonid spawning (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

Gravel recruitment downstream of the Five-Mile Flood Diversion Complex is reduced and gravel also becomes trapped in the One-Mile Pond from which it is customarily removed rather than transported downstream (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007). Additionally, the practice of removing large woody debris from urban and floodway stream reaches has reduced habitat and increased streambed scouring (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The presence of dams on Big Chico Creek limits the composition and volume of sediments transported which reduces the supply of spawning gravels downstream of the dams. Large volumes of suspended sediment in the bedload are deposited within the stilling pond above Five-Mile area. As a result, coarse sediments are not transported downstream below the Five-Mile area. At Chico's One Mile Recreation Area, the flow is again reduced and additional volumes of sediment are deposited on the upstream side of the dam. Low-flow silt transport in the Big Chico Creek has been increased by swimming pool clean out and summer water activities by humans, dogs and horses. Unlike high-flow conditions in which silt only deposits where flow velocity is reduced in backwater and overflow sites, silt carried during low flow settles out in riffles and pools where it degrades habitat for spawning (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Steelhead are produced at both the Feather River Hatchery, south of Big Chico Creek, and the Coleman National Hatchery, north of Big Chico Creek. It is possible that some hatchery produced steelhead could stray into Big Chico Creek.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Most steelhead spawning occurs upstream of the Ecological Reserve where fishing is closed year-round. Therefore, harvest and angling impacts to developing steelhead embryos are minimized in Big Chico Creek.

WATER TEMPERATURE

The average monthly water temperature in Big Chico Creek near Chico (DWR Gage) from November through July from 1999 through 2004 ranged from approximately 50ºF in November to approximately 75ºF in July. Water temperatures in the upper reaches of Big Chico Creek are likely more suitable during the peak embryo incubation period; however, developing embryos from late spawning steelhead could be negatively affected by high water temperatures.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Big Chico Creek and Lindo Channel has been degraded by cadmium, mercury, and other metals associated with gold mining in the upper watershed. Although, Big Chico Creek currently meets EPA water quality constituent standards, heavy metal contamination may cause decreased survival of developing embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Due to flood control management structures (e.g., Lindo Channel and the Sycamore Creek Bypass Channel) Big Chico Creek lacks the flows necessary to maintain the optimal substrate size distributions for the successful incubation of salmonid embryos. Substrates are often dominated by small gravel, sand, and fine sediments which reduce the interstitial spaces between substrates. Such reductions can result in decreased water flow through redds, leading to low dissolved oxygen concentrations, and poor removal of metabolic wastes. These conditions could reduce embryo growth rates, fitness, and survival. In addition, steelhead embryos are generally less tolerant of fine sediments due to the smaller surface area of the ova.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Big Chico Creek, downstream of Iron Canyon, are not suitable for salmonids during the summer months. Most juvenile rearing of steelhead occurs in the foothill reaches (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Big Chico Creek and Lindo Channel has been degraded by cadmium, mercury, and other metals associated with gold mining in the upper watershed. The California State University, Chico reported significant concentrations of fecal coliform bacteria during the summer months due to Sycamore pool, which is heavily used swimming hole. Although, Big Chico Creek currently meets EPA water quality constituent standards water quality conditions, particularly during the summer months could lead to decreased juvenile survival.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Big Chico creek begin to decline in the late-spring and are continuous only in the main channel by summer. The Lindo Channel and Mud Creek channels have only intermittent flow during most years during the summer months (DWR 2005a). As a result of these receding flows there is a potential that juvenile fish emigrating later in the spring may be exposed to sub-optimal water temperatures and stranding due to receding flows in Big Chico Creek and its flood control channels (CDFG 2001a).

Lindo Channel often ceases to flow, sometimes trapping downstream migrants several times during a single season (Ward *et al.* 2004). However, a habitat evaluation of Big Chico Creek, Lindo Channel, and Mud Creek conducted by CDFG in 2001 determined that these waterways provided juvenile steelhead

with a variety of habitats with suitable cover, substrates, and water temperatures during the winter and early spring (CDFG 2001a).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Anthropogenic changes in the Big Chico Creek watershed have reduced or degraded riparian habitat. However, some programs are underway to improve riparian habitat by various groups in the area. For example, there has been marked improvement in riparian habitat in Lindo Channel between Manzanita Avenue and Mangrove Avenue (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Some of the valley reaches in Lindo Channel, Mud and Rock creeks that are maintained for flood control, lack sufficient vegetation to maintain stream structure (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Flows in Big Chico Creek, as it emerges onto the Chico Fan at the Five-Mile Recreation area are regulated for flood control by diversion of flows into two bypass channels: Lindo Channel and the Sycamore Creek Bypass Channel. This has resulted in a disconnection of the river to its normal floodplain and likely results in less habitat diversity in the lower reaches of Big Chico Creek (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007).

ENTRAINMENT

Entrainment and/or impingement of juvenile fish at the various flood control structures and diversions in Big Chico Creek could potentially cause physical harm to rearing and emigrating juveniles during high flows in the winter and early spring. As a result these structures constitute a chronic threat to the juvenile steelhead rearing and emigration life stages.

PREDATION

The extent of predation on juvenile steelhead in the Big Chico Creek is not well documented, however, several known predators of juvenile salmonids are found in the Big Chico Creek. Smallmouth bass are abundant in the valley zone of Big Chico Creek. Smallmouth bass are particularly abundant in dry years while in wet years, high flows typically scour the fish from streams (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007). Big Chico Creek also supports a population of brown trout which are a known piscivorous species (Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance Website 2007). Sacramento pikeminnow, which is a native species known to prey on juvenile salmonids is also present in Big Chico Creek. The presence of manmade instream structures may confer an advantage to pikeminnow altering the natural predator-prey dynamics of the two species.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

There are likely no direct effects on juvenile salmonids in Big Chico Creek presented by hatcheries.

4.3.8.9 DEER CREEK

Deer Creek is part of the lower Cascade Mountain Range and drains an area of approximately 229 square miles. Deer Creek meets the Sacramento River near the town of Vina at RM 230.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The first natural barrier in the stream is a falls about nine miles upstream of Polk Springs and approximately 40 miles from the mouth. This falls is about 16 feet high, and salmon had never been known to pass beyond it until a fish ladder was constructed in 1943. There is a second falls on Deer Creek about ten miles upstream of the falls near Polk Springs. This falls is a sheer drop of about 20 feet. A fish ladder was also constructed at this barrier in early 1950s, and is only functioning during the time steelhead would be migrating upstream (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007). The ladder is closed during the time when spring-run Chinook salmon would be migrating upstream because very little holding habitat exists above this point.

There are also diversion dams on Deer Creek that can provide passage impediments to adult steelhead during low flows. All of the diversion structures have CDFG designed and operated fish ladders and screens (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling on Deer Creek is restricted to catch-and-release only. Additionally, the fishery is closed from November 15 through the end of April which coincides with peak steelhead immigration timing.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Deer Creek during the late-fall and winter time period are low enough to adequately support steelhead adult immigration.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Deer Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Deer Creek currently meets EPA water quality standards.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Steelhead begin migration into Deer Creek during the late-fall and winter, primarily when flows increase from storms. Because there are no large storage facilities on Deer Creek, winter flows tend to mimic historic natural conditions.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no significant barriers to upstream migration within the reach of Deer Creek upstream from Dillon Cove in the lower canyon reach to upper Deer Creek Falls where most steelhead spawning occurs.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Deer Creek is closed to fishing during the winter months when steelhead would be spawning.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the winter months when steelhead would be spawning are sufficiently low to support this life stage.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Deer Creek is adequate to support steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

There has been no salmonid flow habitat relationships developed for salmonids in Deer Creek. Because there are no major storage facilities on Deer Creek, winter flow patterns in the area where steelhead spawning occurs, mimic natural patterns.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Steelhead habitat in the upper watershed is considered to be excellent with an abundance of spawning gravel (DWR 2005a; USFWS 1999). Flood protection, cattle grazing and water diversions have had a negative effect on habitat in the lower watershed. Stream channelization has reduced the opportunities for gravel deposition. Gravels that might have been deposited are likely to be washed downstream during high flow events because of the increased shear stress produced in these straightened reaches (DWR 2005a; USFWS 1999).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

While habitat in the upper watershed is relatively pristine, channelization has occurred in the lower watershed reducing opportunities for natural deposition of spawning gravel. Additionally, water diversions have led to low-flow conditions which can effect habitat availability (DWR 2005a; USFWS 1999).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Deer Creek is likely supporting a small self-sustaining population of steelhead. However, because significant numbers of steelhead are produced by hatcheries in the Central Valley, it is likely that hatchery fish occasionally stray into Deer Creek.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Deer Creek is closed to fishing during most of the embryo incubation life stage, therefore disturbance of redds by wading anglers should be minimal.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Deer Creek, when embryos are incubating, are suitable for this life stage.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Deer Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR

2005a).Deer Creek currently meets EPA water quality standards and should not present problems to developing embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

There are no significant water diversions in the upstream reaches (i.e., primary spawning habitat) of Deer Creek that could result in unnatural flow fluctuations that could cause redd dewatering events.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures throughout the Deer Creek watershed are suitable for juvenile steelhead rearing except for the summer months when temperatures in the lower watershed become to high to support juvenile steelhead rearing. Cold water refugia are likely available during the summer months in the upper watershed.

WATER QUALITY

Deer Creek currently meets EPA water quality standards and should not present problems to juvenile steelhead.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The explicit time period when juvenile steelhead emigrate from Deer Creek is not known. However, it is likely that it occurs from October through May as seasonal flows increase. The extent to which flow fluctuations from water diversions in Deer Creek may cause juvenile stranding is currently unknown.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Recent studies have concluded that aquatic habitat in Deer Creek is limited by the current flood control project. Effects of the flood control project include lack of habitat diversity and riparian vegetation due to channel maintenance and clearing (MacWilliams *et al.* 2004)

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Flood control activities such as stream channelization and clearing have led to a lack of habitat diversity by constraining high flow and flood events between the levees (MacWilliams *et al.* 2004).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The Deer Creek Flood Control Project was completed by the USACE in 1953. About 16 km of levees were built along lower Deer Creek to control flooding and the channel was straightened and cleared. As a result of this work, natural geomorphic processes were disrupted and the riparian zone was limited to a small band within the constructed levees effectively severing the connection between Deer Creek and the floodplain (MacWilliams *et al.* 2004).

ENTRAINMENT

Entrainment of juvenile steelhead in Deer Creek is assumed to be low because the three water diversions from Deer Creek have fish screens that comply with CDFG fish screen design criteria. These screens are operated, maintained and monitored by CDFG.

PREDATION

Green sunfish, largemouth and smallmouth bass, striped bass and American shad are all piscivorous species that have been introduced to the Sacramento watershed. It is likely that sunfish and bass species both occur in Deer Creek and the loss of natural stream function associated with flood control measures likely enhances predation opportunities, particularly in the lower reaches of the stream.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

There are likely no direct effects of hatchery operations on juvenile steelhead in Deer Creek.

4.3.8.10 MILL CREEK

Mill Creek is an eastside tributary to the Sacramento River that flows in a southwesterly direction for approximately 60 miles and drains 134 square miles. The creek originates near a thermal spring area in Lassen Volcanic National Park at an elevation of approximately 8,200 feet. It initially flows through meadows and dense forests and then descends rapidly through a steep rock canyon into the Sacramento Valley. Upon emerging from the canyon, the creek flows 8 miles across the Sacramento Valley floor, entering the Sacramento River about 1 mile north of the town of Tehama, near Los Molinos, at an elevation of approximately 200 feet.

The Revised Draft AFRP identifies Mill Creek as one of the high priority tributaries to the upper Sacramento River, particularly for its populations of spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Prior to 1997, Clough Dam created a partial barrier to upstream migration in Mill Creek and was utilized as a counting station. In 1997, a flood breached Clough Dam allowing unimpaired access to the Mill Creek watershed (CDFG 1999b).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Mill Creek. For proposes of fishing regulations, the creek is divided into two reaches. From the Lassen National Park boundary downstream to the USGS gaging station at the mouth of Mill Creek Canyon, fishing with barbless hooks and artificial lures is allowed from the last Saturday in April through November 15. From that point downstream to the mouth, fishing is allowed from June 16 through September 30. Therefore, some migrating steelhead could be affected by the recreational fishery.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures are suitable during the late fall and winter months to support steelhead immigration.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Mill Creek is adequate to support steelhead adult immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

There are no major water storage facilities on Mill Creek and water diversions are not occurring during the time adult steelhead are immigrating to the Mill Creek watershed. Therefore, flows during the adult immigration life stage tend to mimic historic conditions that occurred under natural flow regimes.

SPAWNING

In Mill Creek, steelhead spawning occurs from approximately the Lassen National Park Boundary downstream to the Little Mill Creek confluence (SRCS Report 1997).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no known passage impediments for steelhead within the area used for spawning.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Mill Creek. For proposes of fishing regulations, the creek is divided into two reaches. From the Lassen National Park boundary downstream to the USGS gaging station at the mouth of Mill Creek Canyon, fishing with barbless hooks and artificial lures is allowed from the last Saturday in April through November 15. From that point downstream to the mouth, fishing is allowed from June 16 through September 30. Under existing regulations, spawning steelhead are not likely to be affected by the recreational fishery.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the upper reaches of Mill Creek during the steelhead spawning period are adequate to support steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Mill Creek is suitable for steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

There have been no flow habitat relationships developed for salmonids in Mill Creek. Because there are no major water storage facilities on Mill Creek and diversions are not occurring during the steelhead spawning season, flows likely mimic natural conditions.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

The upper reaches of Mill Creek located above diversion dams reportedly provide excellent salmonid spawning habitat (DWR 2005a). Approximately 48 miles of potential spawning habitat exists from the confluence of Little Mill Creek upstream to Morgan Hot Springs (Klamath Resources Information Website 2007).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The Mill Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow, with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as barriers to activity and land use allocations have protected these areas such that the mainstem of the stream is essentially undisturbed (CDFG 1999b).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Steelhead are produced at the CNFH and the current steelhead population in Mill Creek may be augmented by hatchery strays.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational fishing in Mill Creek is not permitted during most of the steelhead embryo incubation life stage.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Salmonid redds are located in the upstream reaches of Mill Creek which are generally characterized as having favorable water temperatures during the majority of the embryo incubation period.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Mill Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum and copper have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Erosion from recent volcanic deposits in and near Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the headwaters of Mill Creek, contributes turbidity to the stream nearly year-round (CDFG 1999b). Although not known to occur, any of these water quality factors could negatively impact developing steelhead embryos.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions in the upstream reaches of Mill Creek are not affected by water diversions. As a result, any changes in flow that could potentially result in decreased oxygen flow, or redd dewatering events would be due to natural fluctuations in streamflow.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Mill Creek reportedly provides relatively good habitat for juvenile salmonids (DWR 2005a). Water temperatures within the upper watershed are likely suitable for juvenile steelhead rearing year-round. During summer months, water temperatures in the lower reaches of Mill Creek may become too warm to support steelhead rearing.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality monitoring in Mill Creek has shown levels of coliform bacteria, minerals and nutrients to be low and not restrictive to beneficial use (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Concentrations of aluminum and copper have at times exceeded the California Toxic Rule and the EPA chronic criteria for the protection of freshwater organisms (Deer Creek Conservancy Website 2007; DWR 2005a). Erosion from recent volcanic deposits in and near Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the headwaters of Mill Creek, contributes turbidity to the stream nearly year-round (CDFG 1999b). Although not reported to have occurred, any of these factors could adversely affect juvenile steelhead.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The extent to which flow fluctuations from water diversions in Mill Creek may affect juvenile salmonid habitat availability and cause juvenile stranding is currently unknown.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The Mill Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow, with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as barriers to activity and land use allocations have protected these areas such that the mainstem of the stream is essentially undisturbed (CDFG 1999b).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Because the Mill Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow, with steep slopes, little natural river function has been lost.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Because Mill Creek is a relatively narrow watershed with steep slopes, there is little natural connection with the floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

In Mill Creek, fish screens have been in place at all diversions, although some mortality of juvenile salmonids is still reported to occur (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

PREDATION

Smallmouth bass, brown trout and green sunfish are all non-native predators known to exist in Mill Creek. The extent of predation that occurs on juvenile steelhead is unknown.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Hatchery operations within the Central Valley likely have no effect on juvenile steelhead in Mill Creek.

4.3.8.11 ANTELOPE CREEK

Antelope Creek flows southwest from the foothills of the Cascade Range entering the Sacramento River nine miles southeast of the town of Red Bluff. The drainage is approximately 123 square miles and the average stream discharge is 107,200 acre-feet per year.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Though there are diversion structures in the valley sections of Antelope Creek, there are no major impoundments. Anadromous fish (spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead) have been able to maintain passage to the upper watershed (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Catch and release fishing is allowed in Antelope Creek. For proposes of fishing regulations, the creek is divided into two reaches. From the confluence with the north fork downstream to the USGS gaging station at the mouth of Antelope Creek Canyon, fishing with barbless hooks and artificial lures is allowed from the last Saturday in April through November 15. From that point downstream to the mouth, fishing is allowed from June 16 through September 30. Therefore, the recreational fishery is closed for most of the steelhead adult immigration life stage.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Antelope Creek are adequate to support adult steelhead immigration during the late fall and winter months.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Antelope Creek is sufficient to support adult steelhead immigration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Because there are no major water storage facilities on Antelope Creek and water diversions normally occur during the late spring and summer months, flows in Antelope Creek during the steelhead immigration time period mimic those of historic conditions.

SPAWNING

Based on reported observations of spring-run Chinook salmon spawning, the potential range and distribution for steelhead spawning is equal to approximately 9 miles, and extends from approximately 1.6 miles downstream of the Paynes Creek crossing upstream to near McClure Place on the North Fork, and to Bucks Flat on the South Fork (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007). However, as previously noted the actual range of steelhead may exceed that of spring-run Chinook due to their smaller size (i.e., ability to navigate instream obstructions and utilize reaches with decreased channel widths).

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no known passage impediments affecting steelhead spawning.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational fishing is not permitted during the steelhead spawning period.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the upper reaches of Antelope Creek, where steelhead spawn are sufficiently cold to support steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Antelope Creek is adequate to support steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the upper Antelope Creek watershed are unregulated and are not affected during the steelhead spawning period. There have been no flow-habitat relationships developed for salmonids in Antelope Creek.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Vanicek (Vanicek 1993) rated spawning habitat as fair to poor in Antelope Creek. There have been no flow habitat relationships developed for Antelope Creek.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The Antelope Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as a barrier to human activity and the environment is essentially undisturbed (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The last report of hatchery steelhead stocking in Antelope Creek occurred in 1980 (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007). The current population may occasionally be augmented by hatchery strays.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational fishing in Antelope Creek is not permitted for most of the time when steelhead embryos would be developing in redds.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Antelope Creek during the winter and early spring months when steelhead embryos are developing are sufficiently cool.

WATER QUALITY

Although little water quality information on Antelope Creek is available, because Antelope Creek habitat in the upstream watershed is basically undisturbed, water quality in the upstream reaches likely have no adverse effects on embryo incubation.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions on Antelope Creek during the steelhead embryo incubation period are unaffected by diversions or storage impoundments and are the same as under historic natural conditions.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures within the upper watershed are likely suitable for juvenile steelhead rearing year-round. During summer months, water temperatures in the lower reaches of Mill Creek may become too warm to support steelhead rearing.

WATER QUALITY

Although little water quality information on Antelope Creek is available, because Antelope Creek habitat in the upstream watershed is basically undisturbed, water quality in the upstream reaches likely have no adverse effects on juvenile salmonids.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The downstream migration of juvenile steelhead likely occurs concurrently with peak flows from January through March. The extent to which flow fluctuations from water diversions in Antelope Creek may affect juvenile salmonid habitat availability and cause juvenile stranding is currently unknown. However, there are two diversions in Antelope Creek at the canyon mouth. One is operated by the Edwards Ranch,

which has water rights of 50 cfs, and the other by the Los Molinos Water Company which has a water right of 70 cfs. Flows are diverted between April 1 and October 31. The stream is usually dewatered when both diversions operate (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The Antelope Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow with steep slopes. Steep slopes adjacent to the main channel have served as a barrier to human activity and the environment is essentially undisturbed (Klamath Resource Information System Website 2007).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Because the Antelope Creek watershed is relatively long and narrow, with steep slopes, little natural river function has been lost.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Because Mill Creek is a relatively narrow watershed with steep slopes, there is little natural connection with the floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

The Antelope Main canal could potentially cause entrainment or impingement of juvenile steelhead. It is unknown how many diversions associated with this canal are equipped with fish screens that meet NMFS and CDFG juvenile fish screen criteria.

PREDATION

Smallmouth bass, brown trout and green sunfish are all non-native predators known to exist in Antelope Creek. The extent of predation that occurs on juvenile steelhead is unknown.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Central Valley hatchery operations likely do not directly affect juvenile steelhead in Antelope Creek.

4.3.9 BASALT AND POROUS LAVA DIVERSITY GROUP

4.3.9.1 BATTLE CREEK

Battle Creek enters the Sacramento River approximately five miles southeast of the Shasta County town of Cottonwood. It flows into the Sacramento Valley from the east, draining a watershed of approximately 360 square miles. Battle Creek spring-run Chinook salmon adult escapement estimates ranged from 40 to 177 adults from 2000 to 2006.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The mainstem of Battle Creek has four structures that act as potential impediments to adult anadromous fish migration: (1) the CNFH barrier weir that diverts returning hatchery fish into the hatchery for brood stock collection each year from September through early March; (2) the CNFH Intake 3 diversion weir that diverts water for the hatchery; (3) the Orwick seasonal gravel diversion dam; and (4) the tailrace from PG&E's Coleman Powerhouse, which has been known to attract steelhead into an area with little spawning habitat.

Natural-origin adult steelhead comprise 10 percent of the broodstock for the steelhead artificial propagation program at CNFH. Steelhead produced at the CNFH are part of the Centrally Valley steelhead DPS. As of 2005, only natural steelhead (non-clipped) adults are intentionally bypassed into upper Battle Creek as part of the Battle Creek Restoration Project (**Table 4-2**). Based upon parental genotyping, the progeny of bypassed natural steelhead have shown a statistically significant higher adult return rate than that of bypassed hatchery steelhead stock, within one generation (K. Niemela, USFWS, pers. comm.).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Battle Creek supports a popular recreational fishery (e.g., fall-run Chinook salmon, steelhead). As a result, some level of poaching likely occurs. Current fishing regulations do not allow any fishing from the mouth of Battle Creek to 250 feet upstream of the weir at the CNFH. Upstream of that point, catch and release fishing with artificial lures and barbless hooks is allowed from the last Saturday in April to November 15. These regulations likely limit potential adverse effects on immigrating adult steelhead.

Table 4-2. Steelhead Passage Above Coleman National Fish Hatchery Barrier Weir, 2001-2006.

Methodology		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Weir Trap Mar - May	Non-clipped	61	103	62	62	44	126
	Clipped	25	13	1	7	0	0
Video May - Aug	Non-clipped	33	80	56	69	30	56
	Clipped	5	1	2	7	0	2
Hatchery Sep – Mar	Non-clipped	131	237	428	179	270	249
	Clipped	1,352	1,629	769	314	0	0
Bypassed	Non-clipped	225	420	546	304	344	431
	Clipped	1,382	1,643	772	329	0	2
Total Bypassed		**1,607**	**2,063**	**1,318**	**633**	**344**	**433**

Source: USFWS 2006 Preliminary Draft; USFWS 2004 Weekly Summaries; Brown *et al*. 2004, draft; Brown and Alston 2003, draft; Brown and Newton 2002

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Battle Creek during the late fall and winter months are suitable for adult steelhead immigration.

WATER QUALITY

Little information on water quality in Battle Creek is available. However, it is assumed to be quite good as Battle Creek also provides water to the CNFH.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Two studies were conducted to determine the flows necessary to facilitate fish passage within the Battle Creek watershed (Kier and Assoc 1999). The results of these two studies were used to develop instream flow alternatives for the *Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project* (SDEIR 2005).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Prime quality spawning, holding, and rearing habitat for steelhead, winter-run, and spring-run Chinook is upstream of Wildcat and Coleman dams on the north and south forks of Battle Creek, respectively.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Battle Creek is closed year-round from the mouth to the CNFH. Upstream of that point, catch and release fishing with artificial lures and barbless hooks is allowed from the last Saturday in April to November 15. These regulations basically serve to close the recreational fishery during the steelhead spawning period.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Battle Creek have not been explicitly evaluated for the steelhead life stage given that the majority of steelhead returning to Battle Creek are of hatchery-origin. However, water temperatures in Battle Creek during the late-fall and spring are likely suitable for adult steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Little information on water quality in Battle Creek is available. However, it is assumed to be quite good as Battle Creek also provides water to the CNFH.

FLOW CONDITIONS

There have been no flow habitat relationships developed for steelhead in Battle Creek. However, protective flow regulations exist to protect steelhead spawning.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Brown and Kimmerer (Brown and Kimmerer 2004) report that areas suitable for salmonid spawning – based on substrate particle size – are relatively scarce. However, they also report that in-river conditions are likely not a limiting factor due to the current low population numbers of targeted species.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Stream channel conditions in Battle Creek during the late 20th century have been considered suitable for salmonid production. Key stream habitat conditions appear to be of sufficient quality such that the abundance of threatened or endangered salmonid populations could be increased by increasing instream flows and constructing fish passage facilities at the Battle Creek Hydroelectric Project diversion dams. Land management activities currently occurring in the watershed appear to have little impact on the potential to restore anadromous salmonids to this watershed (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

A technical review panel determined that CNFH may pose a significant risk to steelhead recovery in Battle Creek through increased adverse effects of interbreeding as well as increased pathogen exposure (CALFED Bay-Delta Program 2004). The effects of interbreeding may include a reduction in productivity and viability of the wild stock (CALFED Bay-Delta Program 2004). The Battle Creek technical review team also identified several ecological risks to wild steelhead associated with CNFH steelhead introduction in Battle Creek, including increased competition and predation, in addition to CNFH operation related risks, including stranding and isolation, as well as screen entrainment. Currently, hatchery production is dominating the Battle Creek system as indicated by the technical review panel findings of approximately 65 percent of the steelhead passing above CNFH are of hatchery-origin (CALFED Bay-Delta Program 2004).

CNFH releases spent hatchery steelhead adults upon completion of the hatchery spawning season; natural steelhead broodstock are released immediately after their utilization as broodstock. The use of kelts for repeat spawning in the hatchery program diversifies the age structure within the stock and population; kelts are more fecund and contribute larger eggs and subsequently, larger fish, to the population.

CNFH steelhead are residualizing in the upper Sacramento River, and may be the dominant component of the Sacramento River population. Effects of integrating the two populations include possible loss of unique genetic complexes and diversity with homogenization of the gene pool, and increased rates of straying between Battle Creek and the upper Sacramento River. The primary source stock of the current Battle Creek steelhead population is the upper Sacramento River population (Nielsen *et al.* 2003), and continuing supplementation by CNFH may counter natural selection in the Sacramento River population.

CNFH has developed a late fall Chinook salmon run to the hatchery for artificial propagation purposes, and may be maintaining this component of the fall/late fall-run ESU to a great extent. Many of the CNFH late fall-run are raised exclusively for monitoring studies.

CNFH annually releases 12 million fall-run Chinook salmon juveniles into the upper Sacramento River, with possible consequences of the "pied piper" effect and habitat/prey competition with natural salmonids in the system. CNFH fall-run exhibit a high degree of homing back to Battle Creek.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Currently, recreational fishing during most of the time period when steelhead embryos are developing is not allowed.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the upper stream reaches of Battle Creek when the majority of steelhead spawning period are reportedly excellent for all life stages (DWR 2005a).

WATER QUALITY

Little information on water quality in Battle Creek is available. However, it is assumed to be quite good as Battle Creek also provides water to the CNFH.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The operations of the Battle Creek Hydroelectric Project causes water level changes in some reaches of Battle Creek that are more frequent and rapid then those which occur naturally. The effects of these flow changes on steelhead redds have not been the direct focus of any study to date. As part of the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project, PG&E in cooperation with the resource agencies, has agreed to adaptively manage instream flows in Battle Creek by adjusting flows at diversion dams to prevent redd dewatering events (Reclamation *et al.* 2004).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperature problems may occur during some years due to the diversion of coldwater springs into canals away from adjacent stream channels on the North Fork and South Fork of Battle Creek. However, it is unknown the degree to which these operations would potentially affect the steelhead the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages (Reclamation *et al.* 2004).

WATER QUALITY

Little information on water quality in Battle Creek is available. However, it is assumed to be quite good as Battle Creek also provides water to the CNFH.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Powerhouse operations cause flow fluctuations of up to 200 cfs in some reaches of the Battle Creek watershed which could potentially lead to juvenile stranding events. It has been estimated that powerhouse diversions on the North Fork and South Fork of Battle Creek divert up to 97 percent of the natural unimpaired flow (Reclamation *et al.* 2004).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Land management activities currently occurring in the watershed appear to have little impact on the potential to restore anadromous salmonids to this watershed (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004). Restoration of riparian corridors in lower Battle Creek are currently underway (Battle Creek Working Group 1999).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Stream channel conditions (e.g., gravel distribution and abundance, sedimentation, channel morphology) in Battle Creek are considered to be suitable for salmonid production (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004). Similarly, land management activities in the watershed are assumed to have little impact on the potential to restore anadromous salmonids to the system (Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy 2004).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Flood control measures have resulted in less frequent high flow events and resulted in a loss of connectivity with the river and historic floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

The high volume of surface water diverted from unscreened agricultural and hydroelectric diversions in Battle Creek constitutes a substantial threat to rearing and emigrating juvenile salmonids. However, it is anticipated the installation of positive fish barrier screens in the near future as part of the proposed water management strategy for the Battle Creek watershed will reduce the amount of juvenile entrainment at water diversions (Reclamation *et al.* 2004).

PREDATION

USFWS has identified predation as one of the ways that juvenile salmonids released from the CNFH may affect natural populations of salmonids (Battle Creek Working Group 1999). However, the actual extent of predation on natural populations by steelhead and Chinook salmon on natural populations is not known (Battle Creek Working Group 1999).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

USFWS has expressed concern that predation, disease transmission and competition/displacement are ways in which juvenile salmonids released from the CNFH may affect natural salmonid populations (Battle Creek Working Group 1999). The actual extent of these potential impacts is not known, although there is speculation that these factors are minimal or non-existent (Battle Creek Working Group 1999). However, these conclusions were not based on completed investigations. Furthermore, these conclusions that suggest minimal impact were derived during a period when Chinook salmon and steelhead populations were depressed. As restoration of Battle Creek salmonid populations proceed, increased interactions between hatchery operations and natural fish populations are expected, suggesting that more investigations of possible impacts are required (Battle Creek Working Group 1999).

4.3.9.2 COW CREEK

The Cow Creek watershed encompasses approximately 430 square miles and drains the base and foothills of Mt. Lassen. Cow Creek joins the Sacramento River 23 miles downstream of Shasta Dam.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Natural barriers restrict anadromous salmonids to the low elevation portions of the Cow Creek Basin. These barriers (waterfalls) occur on all five of the main Cow Creek tributaries (Hannaford 2000). Agricultural diversions likely present partial barriers to upstream migration during low flows.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational catch-and-release fishing is permitted in Cow Creek from the last Saturday in April through November 15. These regulations are protective of immigrating adult steelhead in that the fishery is closed during the time of peak immigration.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the mainstem of Cow Creek generally fall below 60°F in the beginning of October and are likely suitable for immigrating adult steelhead (Hannaford 2000).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Cow Creek is generally good. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are normally near saturation. Hannaford (2000) found high fecal coliform concentrations in three of nine sites sampled in the Cow Creek Basin. Samples taken near the Afterthought Mine on Little Cow Creek have shown high concentrations of heavy metals but these concentrations appear to be quickly diluted downstream on Little Cow Creek (Hannaford 2000) and should not adversely affect adult steelhead.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the Cow Creek watershed are not controlled and mimic historic conditions during the steelhead adult immigration period.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Natural barriers restrict anadromous salmonids to the low elevation portions of the Cow Creek Basin. These barriers (waterfalls) occur on all five of the main Cow Creek tributaries (Hannaford 2000).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational catch-and-release fishing is permitted in Cow Creek from the last Saturday in April through November 15. The fishery is closed during the time that steelhead would be spawning.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Cow Creek are generally below 55°F from December through March and are suitable for steelhead spawning (Hannaford 2000).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Cow Creek is generally good and should not adversely affect steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the Cow Creek watershed are not controlled and mimic historic conditions during most of the steelhead spawning period.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Steelhead populations have not been estimated in Cow Creek. No specific studies have been conducted on Cow Creek to estimate the size of the steelhead spawning run, although CDFG (1965) estimated that Cow Creek supported annual spawning runs of 500 steelhead (current estimates would be much lower). Adult steelhead have been observed in North Cow, Old Cow and South Cow creeks; however, it is unknown what percentage of the steelhead run utilizes the other tributaries. Most steelhead spawning in South Cow Creek probably occurs above South Cow Creek diversion. The best spawning habitat occurs in the 5-mile reach of stream extending from about 1.5 miles below South Cow Creek Diversion Dam to 3.5 miles above the diversion dam. Additional spawning habitat occurs upstream of this reach, but it is much less abundant. Sightings of adult steelhead have been made at the South Cow Creek Campground (approximately 8.5 miles upstream of the South Cow Creek Diversion Dam) and in Atkins Creek, located just upstream from the campground (SHN 2001).

The *Working Paper on Restoration Needs,* compiled by the AFRP Core Group in 1995, identified Cow Creek and its tributaries as in "relatively good condition" related to salmon and steelhead spawning habitat (SHN 2001).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Substrate composition is a critical factor in spawning suitability. It is vitally important that spawning gravels percolate to deliver fresh oxygen to the eggs and developing embryos. Fine sediment reduces oxygen flow; therefore, adequate substrate crust has low proportions of sand and fine sediment. Water quality in Cow Creek has been significantly affected by siltation and erosion in the upper watershed. Stream banks have been eroded by excessive livestock grazing along Cow Creek and its principal tributaries. The resulting soil erosion and stream channel siltation have degraded salmon and steelhead spawning substrate in Cow Creek and its tributaries (SHN 2001).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The extent of hatchery fish interaction with wild steelhead that may be present in Cow Creek is unknown. However, because of the proximity of the CNFH to Cow Creek, some interaction is likely.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational fishing is permitted in Cow Creek from the last Saturday in April through November 15. This schedule is protective of steelhead embryos as most embryo development would occur while the fishery is closed.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Cow Creek are generally below 55°F from December through March and are suitable for steelhead embryo incubation, but warm rapidly in April and are likely marginal for this life stage (Hannaford 2000).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Cow Creek is generally good. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are normally near saturation. Hannaford (2000) found high fecal coliform concentrations in three of nine sites sampled in the Cow Creek Basin. Samples taken near the Afterthought Mine on Little Cow Creek have shown high concentrations of heavy metals but these concentrations appear to be quickly diluted downstream on Little Cow Creek (Hannaford 2000).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in the Cow Creek watershed are not controlled and mimic historic conditions during most of the steelhead embryo incubation period. Once irrigation season begins, typically in April, flows may be somewhat diminished by water diversions.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Cow Creek may warm to above 77°F from June through September which may be lethal to juvenile steelhead that cannot find coldwater refuge (Hannaford 2000).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Cow Creek is generally good. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are normally near saturation. Hannaford (2000) found high fecal coliform concentrations in three of nine sites sampled in the Cow Creek Basin. Samples taken near the Afterthought Mine on Little Cow Creek have shown high concentrations of heavy metals but these concentrations appear to be quickly diluted downstream on Little Cow Creek (Hannaford 2000).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Although flows in the Cow Creek watershed are not controlled, in that there are no major storage facilities, diversions during the irrigation season diminish flows and likely lead to increased water temperatures (Western Shasta Resource Conservation District and Cow Creek Watershed Management Group 2001).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Extensive livestock grazing in the Cow Creek watershed has resulted in significant loss of riparian habitat and instream cover (Western Shasta Resource Conservation District and Cow Creek Watershed Management Group 2001). No detailed riparian inventory or damage assessment has been conducted in the watershed.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Because flows in Cow Creek have no been constrained and basically mimic historic conditions, there has been little loss of natural river morphology and function.

ENTRAINMENT

Habitat surveys conducted by CDFG identified 14 unscreened permanent and temporary water diversions in the reaches of the main stem of Cow Creek (Hannaford 2000). Water diversions normally extend from April through October, during which time juvenile steelhead may become entrained in the unscreened diversions.

A loss of juvenile migrating fish to water diversions and entrainment of juvenile salmon and steelhead is assumed to occur in Cow Creek and the tributaries. Only the PG&E diversions have fish screens that comply with CDFG fish screen design criteria (Western Shasta Resource Conservation District and Cow Creek Watershed Management Group 2001).

PREDATION

Largemouth and smallmouth bass have been identified in Cow Creek (Thompson *et al*. 2006). Both of these species likely prey on juvenile steelhead. Additionally, brown trout were introduced to Cow Creek in 1931 (Western Shasta Resource Conservation District and Cow Creek Watershed Management Group 2001) and a self-sustaining population now exists. Brown trout are also a likely predator on juvenile salmonids.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

From 1991 to present, North Cow, Clover, Old Cow and South Cow creeks have been planted with a total of 49,492 catchable rainbow trout. Darrah Springs Hatchery also planted Eagle Lake trout in Clover Creek in the early 1990s. The CNFH planted steelhead in North Cow, Old Cow, and South Cow creeks, as well as the mainstem of Cow Creek. Buckhorn Lake and Kilarc Reservoir are also planted twice a year with catchable trout for sportfishing purposes (Western Shasta Resource Conservation District and Cow Creek Watershed Management Group 2001). These planted species may be significant predators on naturally spawned salmonids in Cow Creek.

4.3.9.3 UPPER SACRAMENTO RIVER TRIBUTARIES[10]

Steelhead utilization of upper Sacramento River tributaries including Stillwater, Churn, Sulphur, Olney and Paynes creeks is not well documented. However, it is likely that those same factors that may affect steelhead in the upper Sacramento River as discussed in Section 4.3.7 would apply to these fish.

Extensive mining, road building, railroad construction and sewer line construction in the Sulphur Creek watershed has resulted in large bedload, extreme bank erosion and loss of riparian vegetation, however, Sulphur Creek reportedly supports anadromous salmonids, including steelhead (Sacramento Watersheds Action Group 1998). The Churn Creek watershed reportedly exhibited high rates of erosion and subsequent sedimentation, loss of riparian vegetation and chemical and nutrient water pollution in the early 1990s (Churn Creek Task Force 1991). Extensive spawning by Chinook salmon and large rainbow trout/steelhead has been noted on Salt Creek below Highway 299; however, there is no evidence of identified steelhead in Salt Creek (Vestra Resources, Inc. 2005). Spawning Chinook salmon and steelhead have been documented in Olney Creek (Vestra Resources, Inc. 2005). Suitable spawning gravel has been identified up to approximately four miles upstream of the mouth of Olney Creek (Vestra Resources, Inc. 2005).

4.3.10 NORTHWESTERN CALIFORNIA DIVERSITY GROUP

4.3.10.1 STONY CREEK

Stony Creek is a westside stream originating in the Coast Range and draining into the Sacramento River south of Hamilton City. There are three storage reservoirs in the watershed. The lowermost dam, Black Butte, is a barrier to anadromous fish. The GCID canal crosses Stony Creek downstream of Black Butte

[10] This population includes steelhead utilizing the small tributaries in the Redding area including Stillwater, Churn, Suphur, Salt, Olney, and Paynes creeks.

Dam and consists of a seasonal gravel dam constructed across the creek on the downstream side of the canal. This crossing not only allows the canal to continue flowing south but it also allows capture of Stony Creek water and is a complete barrier to salmon migration. The GCID berm was removed in 1999. Although steelhead spawning has not been documented in Stony Creek in recent years, there is now access to suitable spawning habitat for steelhead in the creek, following the removal of the GCID berm, and it is reasonable to assume that water management can and will have an effect on steelhead numbers, distribution and reproduction in Stony Creek (NMFS 2002b).

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

From the confluence with the Sacramento River, Stony Creek extends 24.6 miles upstream to Black Butte Lake, impounded by the Black Butte Dam. Black Butte Dam presents an impassable barrier to anadromous fish migration and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat (NMFS 2002b). Four miles downstream of Black Butte Dam is the North Side Diversion Dam that operates during the irrigation season and also for flood control. The Diversion Dam may present a partial obstacle to upstream migration.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Legal harvest of salmonids in Stony Creek is permitted from the last Saturday in April through November 15. For the remainder of the year, catch and release fishing with barbless hooks is allowed.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During the winter months, if flows permit access to upstream areas, water temperatures are likely suitable for steelhead immigration.

WATER QUALITY

The surface water quality of streams draining eastward from the Coast Range is generally poor. These streams generally have very high suspended sediment loads due to the metavolcanic bedrock and schist formations which produce clays that stay in suspension during turbulent flow conditions. Soil disturbance within these watersheds can accelerate erosion and sedimentation processes and lead to increased metal and nutrient concentrations. High concentrations of metals and nutrients are commonly present during both low flow and storm runoff events. These concentrations frequently exceed water quality criteria established for the protection of beneficial use or the maintenance of aquatic life. Water is generally warm in streams flowing through the proposed reservoir sites. Total phosphorus concentrations are at stimulatory levels for algae (DWR Website 2007b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

A minimum flow of 30 cfs is required to be released from Black Butte Dam year round.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Black Butte Dam represents the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat. Most of the habitat in Stony Creek that may be suitable to steelhead spawning occurs in the four mile reach upstream of the Northside Diversion Dam (NDD). In most years, diversions at the NDD have ceased by mid-November, prior to the initiation of steelhead spawning migrations, and do not resume until late March. During periods of non diversion at NDD, flashboards are removed from the crest of the dam and a large drum

gate on the east side of the dam is often raised to allow creek flows to pass through this section of the dam. The level of obstruction caused by the dam during the periods when flashboards are removed is unknown, however a cursory visual inspection of the dam by a NMFS engineer has indicated that the dam is unlikely to pose a significant passage barrier for adult steelhead (NMFS 2000b).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Harvest of steelhead in Stony Creek is permitted up to November 15 which may affect early spawning steelhead.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During the winter months, when steelhead spawning in Stony Creek would occur, water temperatures are cool enough to support spawning steelhead without adverse effects. However, water temperatures can rise quickly in the spring, potentially leading to mortality of late spawned embryos. Water temperature data collected at the Black Butte gage indicate that conditions for juvenile steelhead or developing embryos may become to warm as early as mid-April suggesting that successful steelhead spawning could only continue until mid-February (NMFS 2002b).

WATER QUALITY

See the discussion on water quality above in the adult immigration section.

FLOW CONDITIONS

The Stony Creek watershed is characterized by cool, wet winters with high flows during the steelhead spawning period.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Current habitat conditions in Stony Creek are at best, marginal (NMFS 2002b). Although in recent years steelhead spawning has not been documented in Stony Creek, some salmon spawning has been observed near the confluence with the Sacramento River (NMFS 2002b). The construction of Black Butte Dam has blocked the recruitment of spawning gravel to downstream areas. A substrate study conducted in 1998 concluded that “nearly all samples possessed a level of fine particles (sand) within the level of concern for salmonid reproduction” (NMFS 2002b).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Construction of dams and subsequent water diversions have depleted streamflows and contributed to higher water temperatures, lower dissolved oxygen levels, and decreased gavel and large woody debris recruitment. The existing streamflow conditions downstream of Black Butte Dam are highly dependent on flood control operations and water diversions.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Because Stony Creek likely does not support a persistent population of steelhead, it is likely that hatchery steelhead compose a significant portion of any spawning population that may exist.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Stony Creek is open to recreational fishing year round. Some disruption of redds could occur as a result of wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Stony Creek during the winter and early spring months are cool enough to support steelhead embryo incubation. Late spawning would likely result in embryos experiencing unsuitable to lethal conditions.

WATER QUALITY

See the discussion on water quality above in the adult immigration section.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Stony Creek during the embryo incubation period are highly dependant on flood control and water storage operations which may lead to of redd dewatering during drier years. Day-to-day flow fluctuations due to flood control operations can be large, on the order of 100 to 1300 percent of the previous days flow, and range in magnitude of from several hundred to 6,000 cfs.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in lower Stony Creek during the summer months are likely too warm to support juvenile steelhead rearing.

WATER QUALITY

See the discussion on water quality above in the Adult Immigration section.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Stony Creek during the summer months are maintained at a minimum of 30 cfs, however, because of often lethal water temperatures during the summer months steelhead juveniles are likely not present.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The lower reach of Stony Creek has been significantly altered by the construction of flood-control levees and bank protection measures (i.e., riprapping). These measures have resulted in reduced habitat for juvenile steelhead.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Channel modification projects designed to prevent flood-related damage (e.g., levee construction and bank riprapping) have degraded natural processes which serve to recruit gravel, provide instream cover and forage, and provide habitat diversity in lower Stony Creek.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The construction of levees and bank riprapping of lower Stony Creek have disconnected the channel from its historic floodplain thereby preventing the recruitment of large woody debris and natural processes associated with periodic floodplain inundation.

ENTRAINMENT

If adult steelhead are able to pass the NDD and successfully spawn in the reach above the dam, operation of the NDD and North Canal are likely to adversely affect juveniles hatched above the structure. Throughout much of the irrigation season the majority of the water flowing down Stony Creek is diverted into the unscreened North Canal where they are unlikely to survive (NMFS 2002b).

PREDATION

Sacramento pikeminnow is likely the most important predator of juvenile salmonids in Stony Creek. While the pikeminnow is native to these waters, habitat alteration may have changed the predator prey dynamics in the system conferring an advantage to pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

It is possible that some hatchery steelhead released at the CNFH enter Stony Creek and may compete with naturally spawned steelhead for resources or prey on smaller outmigrating juvenile steelhead.

4.3.10.2 THOMES CREEK

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

Thomes Creek enters the Sacramento River four miles north of the town of Corning. It flows into the Sacramento Valley from the west, draining a watershed of approximately 188 square miles. There are no significant dams on the stream other than two seasonal diversion dams, one near Paskenta and the other near Henleyville. Several small pump diversions are seasonally operated in the stream. The stream is usually dry or intermittent below the USGS stream gage near Paskenta until the first heavy fall rains occur.

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no significant dams on Thomes Creek other than two seasonal diversion dams, one near Paskenta and the other near Henleyville. Several small pump diversions are seasonally operated in the stream (DWR Website 2007b). These dams would not be in place during the time when steelhead would be immigrating to upstream areas and likely not present obstacles to upstream immigration. Additionally, gravel mining downstream of the Tehama-Colusa Canal siphon crossing has reportedly resulted in a partial barrier to salmonids returning to Thomes Creek to spawn (Vestra Resources, Inc. 2006).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Legal harvest of salmonids in Thomes Creek is not permitted. Angling is permitted but restricted to catch-and-release with barbless hooks and artificial flies and lures only.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During the winter months, if flows permit access to upstream areas, water temperatures are likely suitable for steelhead immigration.

WATER QUALITY

The surface water quality of streams draining eastward from the Coast Range is generally poor. These streams generally have very high suspended sediment loads due to the metavolcanic bedrock and schist formations which produce clays that stay in suspension during turbulent flow conditions. Soil disturbance within these watersheds can accelerate erosion and sedimentation processes and lead to increased metal and nutrient concentrations. High concentrations of metals and nutrients are commonly present during both low flow and storm runoff events. These concentrations frequently exceed water quality criteria established for the protection of beneficial use or the maintenance of aquatic life. Water is generally warm in streams flowing through the proposed reservoir sites. Total phosphorus concentrations are at stimulatory levels for algae (DWR Website 2007b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Thomes Creek has an unimpaired natural pattern of flashy winter and spring flows and very low summer and fall flows creating an environment of fairly inconsistent habitat (CALFED 2000d). These conditions are not conducive to supporting a persistent population of steelhead. However, during wet years some steelhead may migrate into Thomes Creek and limited spawning may occur.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are no identified manmade barriers too upstream migrations during the steelhead spawning season.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Harvest of steelhead in Thomes Creek by recreational anglers is not permitted.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During the winter months, when steelhead spawning in Thomes Creek would occur, water temperatures are cool enough to support spawning steelhead without adverse effects..

WATER QUALITY

See the discussion on water quality above in the adult immigration section.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Thomes Creek are not regulated and mimic historic conditions. It is not likely that flows in Thomes Creek are consistent enough over the years to support a self-sustaining population of steelhead. More likely, during wet years, Thomes Creek supports sporadic steelhead spawning by either hatchery strays or upstream migrating adults attracted into Thomes Creek by high flow events.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Historically, there was about 30 river miles of potential steelhead habitat available in Thomes Creek, of which only the lower 4 miles are currently available (NMFS Website 2005).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Channel modification projects designed to prevent flood-related damage (e.g., levee construction and bank riprapping) have degraded natural processes which serve to recruit gravel suitable for steelhead spawning.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Because Thomes Creek likely does not support a persistent population of steelhead, it is likely that hatchery steelhead compose a significant portion of the spawning population.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Thomes Creek is closed to recreational fishing during most of the steelhead embryo incubation time period.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Thomes Creek during the winter and early spring months are cool enough to support steelhead embryo incubation.

WATER QUALITY

See the discussion on water quality above in the adult immigration section.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Thomes Creek are not controlled and are described as flashy. These conditions likely lead to some level of redd dewatering during drier years.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in lower Thomes Creek during the summer months are likely too warm to support juvenile steelhead rearing.

WATER QUALITY

See the discussion on water quality above in the Adult Immigration section.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The lower reach of Thomes Creek has been significantly altered by the construction of flood-control levees and bank protection measures (i.e., riprapping) (CALFED 2000d). These measures have resulted in reduced habitat for juvenile Chinook salmon.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Channel modification projects designed to prevent flood-related damage (e.g., levee construction and bank riprapping) have degraded natural processes which serve to recruit gravel, provide instream cover and forage, and provide habitat diversity in lower Thomes Creek.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The construction of levees and bank riprapping of lower Thomes Creek have disconnected the channel from its historic floodplain thereby preventing the recruitment of large woody debris and natural processes associated with periodic floodplain inundation.

ENTRAINMENT

Agricultural diversions on Thomes Creek are unscreened and any outmigrating salmonids likely are susceptible to entrainment in the diversions.

PREDATION

Sacramento pikeminnow is likely the most important predator of juvenile salmonids in Thomes Creek. While the pikeminnow is native to these waters, habitat alteration may have changed the predator prey dynamics in the system conferring an advantage to pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

It is possible that some hatchery steelhead released at the CNFH enter Thomes Creek and may compete with naturally spawned steelhead for resources or prey on smaller outmigrating juvenile steelhead.

4.3.10.3 COTTONWOOD/BEEGUM CREEK

Cottonwood Creek drains the west side of the Central Valley and enters the Sacramento River a short distance downstream from the Redding-Anderson area.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

There are several irrigation diversions but no storage reservoirs on Cottonwood Creek. These diversions likely present passage obstacles to most areas of Cottonwood Creek other than Beegum Creek.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Legal harvest of salmonids in Cottonwood Creek and its tributaries is not permitted. Angling is permitted but restricted to catch-and-release with barbless hooks and artificial flies and lures only. Additionally, angling is not permitted from November 15 through the end of April; therefore the fishery is closed during most of the steelhead immigration time period.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Cottonwood and Beegum creeks are likely suitable for supporting steelhead adult immigration during the winter months.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in Cottonwood Creek does not like adversely affect immigrating adult salmonids.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions in Cottonwood Creek during the late fall and winter months likely do not impede steelhead upstream migration.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

See discussion above under Adult Immigration and Holding.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling is not permitted from November 15 through the end of April; therefore the fishery is closed during most of the steelhead spawning time period.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Cottonwood Creek and its tributaries are sufficiently cool during the winter and early spring months to support steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Two major instream gravel extraction projects operate in Cottonwood Creek below the Interstate 5 bridge (CALFED 2000d) which likely degrade water quality for a short distance downstream. However, these activities occur downstream of where steelhead would be expected to be spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Cottonwood and Beegum creeks likely mimic historic conditions.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Gravel mining in Cottonwood Creek has reduced gravel recruitment leading to channel armoring and reduced spawning habitat.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

There are no large water development projects or comprehensive flood control measures in the Cottonwood Creek drainage. Habitat alteration has arisen from timber harvest in the upper watershed, grazing in the middle watershed and extensive gravel mining in the lower watershed.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

There is a potential for native steelhead to interact with strays from the Coleman National Fish Hatchery.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Cottonwood Creek and tributaries are closed to fishing during the steelhead embryo incubation period.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Cottonwood and Beegum creeks are likely suitable for supporting steelhead embryo incubation.

WATER QUALITY

The surface water quality of streams draining eastward from the Coast Range is generally poor. These streams generally have very high suspended sediment loads due to the metavolcanic bedrock and schist formations which produce clays that stay in suspension during turbulent flow conditions. Soil disturbance within these watersheds can accelerate erosion and sedimentation processes and lead to increased metal and nutrient concentrations. High concentrations of metals and nutrients are commonly present during both low flow and storm runoff events. These concentrations frequently exceed water quality criteria established for the protection of beneficial use or the maintenance of aquatic life.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Cottonwood and Beegum creeks likely mimic historic conditions during the steelhead embryo incubation life stage.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the lower reaches of Cottonwood Creek are likely too warm to support steelhead in the summer months.

WATER QUALITY

See discussion presented above under Embryo Incubation.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows in Cottonwood and Beegum creeks likely mimic historic conditions and likely do not adversely affect juvenile steelhead.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Extensive gravel mining occurs in lower Cottonwood Creek, which has resulted in a loss of riparian habitat. The remaining portion of the watershed is primarily rural which has helped avoid adverse impacts to the riparian areas.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

There has been little development in the Cottonwood Creek watershed. This has resulted in Cottonwood Creek maintaining most of its historic characteristics and function.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

No comprehensive flood control measures have occurred in the Cottonwood Creek drainage resulting in the creek retaining its connection to the floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

There are irrigation diversions but no storage reservoirs on the Cottonwood Creek. Outmigrating juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon could potentially be entrained at unscreened diversions.

PREDATION

Sacramento pikeminnow is likely the most important predator of juvenile salmonids in Cottonwood/Beegum Creek system. While the pikeminnow is native to these waters, habitat alteration may have changed the predator prey dynamics in the system conferring an advantage to pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

It is possible that juvenile steelhead released from the CNFH may enter Cottonwood Creek for rearing purposes and compete with naturally spawned steelhead.

4.3.10.4 CLEAR CREEK

Clear Creek, a westside tributary to the upper Sacramento River, enters the mainstem Sacramento River at RM 289 near the south Redding city limits in Shasta County, California. Whiskeytown Dam is a complete barrier to fish passage and is the uppermost boundary of habitat available to anadromous salmon and steelhead. The stream channel below Whiskeytown Dam can be divided into two predominant types at Clear Creek Road Bridge (RM 8.5). Upstream, the creek is mainly confined by steep canyon walls and is characterized by falls, high gradient riffles, and deep pools. The substrate is mainly bedrock, large boulders, and fine sand. Downstream from RM 8.5 is the alluvial reach with a much lower gradient and a much wider valley relatively unconstrained by bedrock. Substrate is mainly a mixture of cobble, gravel, and sand.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Whiskeytown Dam, at RM 16.4, is a complete barrier to fish migration and represents the upstream extent of potential anadromous salmonid habitat.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Clear Creek does not have any special regulations regarding recreational fishing. Existing general regulations that apply to Clear Creek do not permit fishing during winter months when most steelhead adult immigration would be occurring.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the late fall and winter months when steelhead would be immigrating to upstream spawning areas are maintained under 60°F and are suitable for this life stage.

WATER QUALITY

The impact of significant accumulations of mercury is an issue in Clear Creek. Mercury contamination is the result of historic gold mining practices in the watershed (CDFG 2004b).

FLOW CONDITIONS

A flow schedule for Clear Creek has been incorporated into the CVPIA Anadromous Fisheries Restoration Program Plan that is designed to maintain flows in Clear Creek that will allow cool water temperatures conducive to all salmonid life stages. Currently the release schedule call for maintenance of 200 cfs flows from October 1 to June 1 and 150 cfs, or less, from July through September in order to maintain water temperatures below 60°F (USFWS 2003b). These flows are adequate to support steelhead adult immigration and holding.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Whiskeytown Dam, at RM 16.4, is a complete barrier to fish migration and represents the upstream extent of potential anadromous salmonid habitat.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Clear Creek does not have any special regulations regarding recreational fishing. Existing general regulations that apply to Clear Creek do not permit fishing during winter months when most steelhead spawning would be occurring.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Clear Creek during the winter months when steelhead would be spawning are suitable.

WATER QUALITY

See above section under adult immigration and holding.

FLOW CONDITIONS

See above section under adult immigration and holding. The flow schedule described is supportive of steelhead spawning.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

The construction of Whiskeytown Dam and significant gravel mining in the Clear Creek watershed has diminished suitable spawning gravel substrate. Currently, gravel replacement projects are being conducted in the watershed (CDFG 2004b).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The Clear Creek watershed has undergone extensive modification because of Whiskeytown Dam. Currently, Whiskeytown Dam diverts most of the Clear Creek natural streamflow to Spring Creek. However, extensive watershed rehabilitation efforts are currently underway in the watershed.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Steelhead released from the Coleman National Fish Hatchery may have some interaction with native Clear Creek steelhead.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Clear Creek does not have any special regulations regarding recreational fishing. Existing general regulations that apply to Clear Creek do not permit fishing during winter months when most steelhead embryo incubation would be occurring.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Clear Creek during the winter and early spring months are suitable for steelhead embryo incubation.

WATER QUALITY

See above section under adult immigration and holding.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the summer months are kept relatively cool by controlling flows at Whiskeytown dam and are generally suitable year-round for juvenile steelhead rearing.

WATER QUALITY

See above section under adult immigration and holding.

FLOW CONDITIONS

In 1999, streamflows in Clear Creek were increased to a minimum of 150 cfs to provide adequate habitat for juvenile steelhead (USFWS 2004).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Over 30 years of gravel mining in Clear Creek has led to a reduction in riparian habitat along the lower sections (CDFG 2004b). Riparian habitat provides cover for rearing juveniles as well as insect habitat that serves as an important food source.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Whiskeytown Dam diverts most of the historic flow from Clear Creek into Spring Creek and also regulates flows in Clear Creek such that natural flow regimes no longer occur.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Because Clear Creek flows are regulated, the channel has become incised and some connection to the historic floodplain has been lost.

ENTRAINMENT

The level of potential entrainment in Clear Creek has not been investigated.

PREDATION

Sacramento pikeminnow is likely the most important predator of juvenile salmonids in Clear Creek. While the pikeminnow is native to these waters, habitat alteration may have changed the predator prey dynamics in the system conferring an advantage to pikeminnow.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Juvenile steelhead in Clear Creek are likely not affected by steelhead released from the Coleman National Fish Hatchery.

4.3.10.5 PUTAH CREEK

Putah Creek drains an area of approximately 576 square miles. It is the southernmost major drainage entering the Sacramento Valley from the west. Lower Putah Creek is located in the southwestern corner of the Sacramento Valley and flows 26 miles across the valley floor from the Putah Diversion Dam to the Toe Drain in the Yolo Bypass. Putah Diversion Dam is a reregulating reservoir below Monticello Dam, which controls runoff from 90 percent of the watershed and impounds Lake Berryessa. Steelhead are reported to have historically spawned in the upper tributaries of Putah Creek above the Berryessa Valley

(now Lake Berryessa) but there have been no recently confirmed reports of steelhead in Putah Creek (EDAW 2005).

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Monticello Dam, located at river mile 30 presents an absolute barrier to upstream anadromous salmonid migration. There are three other dams and one road crossing on lower Putah Creek which impede migration at certain flows. The bypass dam and the road crossing are seasonal barriers, which are only impediments to migration when they are in the creek, but they are normally removed by the time upstream migration of steelhead begins (DWR 2005a). The town of Winters Percolation Dam is the unused remains of an old dam. This dam is passable at certain flows but it is not clear what those flows are (DWR 2005a).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Lower Putah Creek has no special fishing regulations. The potential anadromous waters of lower Putah Creek allow fishing all year but no fish may be kept.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Putah Creek during the late fall and winter months are suitable for steelhead immigration.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in lower Putah Creek is monitored by the Solano Irrigation District, the Bureau of Reclamation and the State Water Resources Control Board. Water quality in lower Putah Creek is of sufficient quality to not adversely affect adult immigrating salmonids in the creek.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Water flow has been the biggest deterrent to anadromous fish in Putah Creek since 1957 when the Solano Project dams were built. In May of 2000, as a result of several law suits, an agreement was reached whereby required flows from Monticello Dam were established and are specified by month. The purpose of the required flows is to benefit the fish and habitat of lower Putah Creek (DWR 2005a).

The instream flows and water releases from Monticello Dam became regulated through the May 2000 Putah Creek Accord (Accord) (Solano County Superior Court 2000, *as cited in* EDAW 2005). The purpose of the Accord is to create as natural of a flow regime as feasible (EDAW 2005). Four functional flow requirements are contained in the Accord pertaining to rearing flows, spawning flows for native resident fishes, supplemental flows for anadromous fishes, and drought-year flows (EDAW 2005). **Table 4-3** shows the basic required flow regimes specified by the Accord as prescribed for "normal" and "drought" conditions (EDAW 2005).

Table 4-3. Putah Creek flow summaries before and after construction of the Solano Project.

Summary of Flows at or Near Putah Diversion Dam Before and After Construction of the Solano Project

Variable	Flow (cfs)											
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Pre-Project (1934–1956) [1]												
Max	3,957	6,468	3,506	2,729	452	156	64	32	21	45	807	5,110
Med	794	1,075	736	281	125	42	7	5	6	6	37	296
Min	45	67	151	50	17	7	2	0	2	1	3	9
Post Project (1971–1981, 1985–1990) [1]												
Max	1,239	2,239	3,403	2,020	51	43	43	34	36	20	50	85
Med	38	41	33	46	43	43	43	34	20	20	25	25
Min	25	18	26	45	33	33	33	26	16	15	26	25
Putah Creek Accord Release Schedule [2]												
Normal Year – PDD [3,4,5]	25	16	26	46	43	43	43	34	20	20	25	25
Normal Year – I-80 [3, 4, 5]	15	15	25	30	20	15	15	10	5	5	10	10
Drought Year – PDD [6]	25	16	26	46	33	33	33	26	15	15	25	25
Drought Year – I-80 [6]	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

1 Adapted from USFWS 1993; years post-project data selected to reflect periods similar to available pre-project conditions.
2 Solano County Superior Court 2000 and Moyle, pers. comm., 2002. Note: specific pulse flow requirements not shown.
3 Normal year rearing flows. Normal year exists when Lake Berryessa storage exceeds 750,000 acre-feet on April 1. Values are shown as daily average flow requirements. Continuous flow must be maintained from the I-80 bridge to the Yolo Bypass.
4 Spawning flows modify the normal year rearing flows, as follows: a) 3-day pulse release at PDD sometime between February 15 and March 31 every year, with minimum of 150 cfs, then 100 cfs, then 80 cfs, each for 24 hours, and following the pulse; b) 30 days of releases sufficient to maintain 50 cfs at I-80 bridge, then ramped down over 7 days to match the normal year rearing requirements.
5 Supplemental flows modify the normal year rearing flows, as follows: a) 5-day pulse is required sometime between November 15 and December 15 (timed following removal of flash boards at Los Rios dam) to maintain at least 50 cfs average daily flow at confluence with East Toe Drain, and following the pulse; b) a minimum of 19 cfs is required at I-80 bridge until March 31; and c) 5 cfs flow at East Toe Drain is required from November 1 to December 15 and from April 1 to May 31.
6 Drought year exists when Lake Berryessa storage is less than 750,000 acre-feet on April 1. Values reported in same format as for normal year flow requirements. Continuous flow is not required at Yolo Bypass.

Source: EDAW 2005, p. 4-7

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

See section above describing barriers to upstream migration.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Lower Putah Creek has no special fishing regulations. The potential anadromous waters of lower Putah Creek allow fishing all year but no fish may be kept.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in lower Putah Creek during the winter months are suitable for steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

See section above describing water quality for upstream migration.

FLOW CONDITIONS

In addition to the flow agreements described above under adult immigration, the agreement also specifies spawning flows to be released from the diversion dam for a three day period between February 15 and March 31 each year. These flows are 150 cfs for the first day, 100 cfs on the second and 80 cfs on the third. For the following 30 days, flows must be at least 50 cfs (DWR 2005a).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Overall, gravel is not scarce along lower Putah Creek, however, recent gravel surveys indicate that gravel substrate size is generally smaller than that preferred by salmonids for spawning (Yates 2003). Additionally, both Monticello Dam and the Putah Diversion Dam block the transport of gravel from upstream reaches to potential spawning reaches downstream of the Putah Diversion Dam.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Habitat in Putah Creek has been drastically altered by human activities over the past 120 years. Construction of levees, channel excavation, gravel mining and groundwater extraction have all led to a deeper, narrower creek channel. This has led to a disconnection with the floodplain. Additionally, construction of the Solano Project dams has resulted in reduced gravel and sediment recruitment, decreasing the natural dynamics of the creek.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Because Putah Creek does not currently support a persistent unique population of steelhead, it is unlikely that hatchery effects (e.g., straying) would have adverse effects.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Because recreational fishing is allowed year-round; it is possible that steelhead redds could be disturbed by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the winter and early spring months are suitable for steelhead embryo incubation. Any late developing embryos (i.e., after April) may experience warmer water temperatures that could potentially reduce survival.

WATER QUALITY

See section above describing water quality for adult upstream migration in Putah Creek.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow regimes in Putah Creek are described above under adult immigration and spawning.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in Putah Creek normally remain below 60°F rear round just below the Putah Diversion Dam, but during the summer months, water temperatures increase rapidly downstream. For example, water temperatures at the I-505 Bridge normally begin exceeding 70°F in mid-May.

WATER QUALITY

See section above describing water quality for adult upstream migration in Putah Creek.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow regimes in Putah Creek are described above under adult immigration and spawning.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

The riparian zone surrounding Putah Creek has been changed drastically from historic conditions. Human activities related to levee construction, flood control, agricultural encroachment into the riparian zone, burning and dumping of trash have all negatively affected riparian habitat. Currently, the riparian forest is dominated by valley oak, black walnut and eucalyptus.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

The flow regime in lower Putah Creek is highly regulated because Monticello Dam controls a large percentage of the watershed, and because the capacity of Lake Berryessa is much larger than the annual watershed runoff. In particular, high flows that formerly sustained much of the geomorphic processes along the creek have been greatly decreased.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Controlled flows in lower Putah Creek have significantly decreased connectivity with the floodplain. For example, the estimated 100-year peak flow in lower Putah Creek is now only about one-third of pre-dam natural flow (Yates 2003).

ENTRAINMENT

The level of entrainment into unscreened water diversions is unknown at this time.

PREDATION

The level of predation on native anadromous salmonids is unknown. However, Putah Creek is a popular recreational fishery that supports non-native brown trout, a known predator on juvenile salmonids.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Because Putah Creek does not currently support a persistent unique population of steelhead, it is unlikely that hatchery effects (e.g., straying) would have adverse effects.

4.3.11 SOUTHERN SIERRA NEVADA DIVERSITY GROUP

All steelhead that comprise the Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity group utilize the lower San Joaquin River as a migratory corridor. A potential treat common to these steelhead is presented by the operation, usage and maintenance of the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel (DWSC). Required periodic dredging of the DWSC creates noise pollution that could adversely affect salmonid populations in close proximity

to dredging operations. Additionally, dredging would create sediment plumes potentially harmful to juvenile salmonids, mobilize heavy metal pollutants in the sediments, and there is a possibility of entrainment of juveniles in the dredging equipment. Potential threats created by DWSC usage by large ships include both noise pollution and propeller entrainment. Additionally, maintenance of the DWSC requires bank stabilization activities that negatively affect the riparian zone, further disconnect the river from its historic floodplain resulting in a loss of loss of natural river morphology and function. The potentially adverse effects and mitigation measures associated with the DWSC are described in the NMFS 2006 Biological and Conference Opinion for the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel Maintenance Dredging and Levee Stabilization Project (NMFS 2006b).

Another factor influencing steelhead production in the Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group is the different water management practices used in the San Joaquin drainage as opposed to the Sacramento River drainage. Brown and Bauer (2008) compared estimates of full natural runoff before construction of major foothill storage reservoirs with measured discharge after construction. In the Sacramento drainage, pre-dam and pos-dam mean annual discharges were within 10 percent and the hydrograph was flattened. In the San Joaquin River drainage, post-dam mean annual discharges were 42 to 62 percent less than pre-dam values and mean discharges declined in most months, especially during the spring. Brown and Bauer (2008) conclude that when considered with species life history characteristics, these results support the hypothesis that water management has a major influence on the relative success of native and invasive fish species and that water deliveries through natural channels in the Sacramento River drainage appear to favor native species while water diversions in the San Joaquin River drainage appear to favor invasive species.

4.3.11.1 MOKELUMNE RIVER

The Mokelumne River drains an area of approximately 661 square miles with headwaters at an elevation of over 10,000 feet. The lower Mokelumne flows from Comanche Dam, at RM 64, to its confluence with the San Joaquin River. Comanche Dam is an impassable barrier and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Comanche Dam, constructed in 1963 at RM 63.7, presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat in the Mokelumne River. A potential low flow migration barrier occurs at Thornton just upstream of tidal influence. The potential barrier extends over a 600-foot section of the river and is characterized by shallow water over a sandy bottom. The channel thalweg shifts continuously through this reach (CDFG 1991a). Woodbridge Dam creates Lodi Lake and supplies water to the Woodbridge Canal during the irrigation season. Woodbridge Dam may present an upstream migration barrier at low flows. CDFG suggests that flows of about 300 cfs are necessary to provide passage over the Woodbridge Dam (CDFG 1991a). Woodbridge Dam impounds Lodi Lake which extends upstream for about 8.5 miles. At low flows, there is no dominant flow pattern within the lake which probably delays upstream migration (CDFG 1991a).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The lower Mokelumne River is open to recreational fishing during most of the year and the taking of hatchery steelhead (identified by an adipose fin clip) is allowed. The reach from the confluence upstream to Peltier Road is open year-round and the reach upstream of Peltier Road to Comanche Dam is open from January 1 through March 31 and again from the fourth Saturday in May through October 15.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Upstream adult immigration of steelhead in the Mokelumne River occurs from August through March. Water temperatures in August can be as high as 68°F but normally lower to below 60°F by October (CDFG 1991a).

WATER QUALITY

Dissolved oxygen levels lethal to salmonids frequently occur in the Mokelumne River (CDFG 1991a). High levels of turbidity have also been observed. Additionally, heavy metals and hydrogen sulfide in concentrations toxic to aquatic life have been shown to cause fish kills in the Mokelumne River. Copper and zinc from Penn Mine were identified as the main metals causing fish kills. Recently, hazardous levels of cadmium have been determined to be present from Penn Mine as well as from the base of Comanche Dam (CDFG 1991a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

During dry years flows in the Mokelumne River near Woodbridge can be well under 100 cfs from August through the beginning of November while flows just below Comanche Reservoir typically are fairly constant at 200 to 300 cfs.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Comanche Dam, constructed in 1963 at RM 63.7, presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat in the Mokelumne River. A potential low flow migration barrier occurs at Thornton just upstream of tidal influence. The potential barrier extends over a 600-foot section of the river and is characterized by shallow water over a sandy bottom. The channel thalweg shifts continuously through this reach (CDFG 1991a). Woodbridge Dam creates Lodi Lake and supplies water to the Woodbridge Canal during the irrigation season. Woodbridge Dam may present an upstream migration barrier at low flows. CDFG suggests that flows of about 300 cfs are necessary to provide passage over the Woodbridge Dam (CDFG 1991a). Woodbridge Dam impounds Lodi Lake which extends upstream for about 8.5 miles. At low flows, there is no dominant flow pattern within the lake which probably delays upstream migration (CDFG 1991a).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The lower Mokelumne River is open to recreational fishing during most of the year and the taking of hatchery steelhead (identified by an adipose fin clip) is allowed. The reach from the confluence upstream to Peltier Road is open year-round and the reach upstream of Peltier Road to Comanche Dam is open from January 1 through March 31 and again from the fourth Saturday in May through October 15. This time period in the reach above Peltier Road likely is protective of most steelhead natural spawning.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Steelhead spawning in the Mokelumne River occurs from December through April. Water temperatures during this time period are generally below 54°F (CDFG 1991a) which is near the upper temperature limit for successful steelhead spawning (Humpesch 1985; Timoshina 1972).

WATER QUALITY

Dissolved oxygen levels lethal to salmonids frequently occur in the Mokelumne River (CDFG 1991a). High levels of turbidity have also been observed. Additionally, heavy metals and hydrogen sulfide in

concentrations toxic to aquatic life have been shown to cause fish kills in the Mokelumne River. Copper and Zinc from Penn Mine were identified as the main metals causing fish kills. Recently, hazardous levels of cadmium have been determined to be present from Penn Mine as well as from the base of Comanche Dam (CDFG 1991a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Based on IFIM studies, maximum steelhead spawning habitat availability occurs at flows ranging from 100 to 500 cfs (CDFG 1991a). Flows are generally in this range during dry years. During wet years, flows are much more variable and range from about 200 cfs to 1,800 cfs during the steelhead spawning season (CDFG 1991a). CDFG (1991a) suggests that during normal water years, maintaining a flow of about 300 cfs during the mid-October through February time period at Woodbridge will provide maximum spawning habitat for steelhead and Chinook salmon.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Potential spawning habitat for salmonids extends approximately nine miles downstream of Comanche Dam (Heady 2008). Recruitment of suitable spawning gravels downstream of Comanche Dam is minimal. The dam blocks the downstream movement of gravel from upstream areas. Also, there have been several gravel mining operations along the river. Although most gravel mining now occurs off channel behind levees, mined gravel has not been replaced (CDFG 1991a).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Water developments and diversions, mining activities, and discharge of waste material have had significant adverse effects on aquatic resources in the Mokelumne River. As a result, flows in the river have been substantially reduced and temperature and water quality have deteriorated from conditions that occurred naturally (CDFG 1991a).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The Mokelumne River Fish Hatchery (MRFH) steelhead program has been founded and heavily supplemented by out-of-ESU (Eel River) or out-of-basin (Feather River) stock, and currently is not part of the ESU by lack of genetic confirmation. Steelhead returns back to the hatchery have been poor; experimental releases of CWT marked hatchery stock were conducted from 2004 through 2006 to determine the cause but insufficient recovery of data has hampered this effort. Recently, hydroacoustic-tagged MRFH steelhead adult releases have been found in the American River, indicating straying as one possible factor for poor escapement back to the MRFH, with a high degree of residualization being another. Possible effects of MRFH straying include genetic introgression of native steelhead stocks with the Eel River and Feather River genome, loss of genetic structure of the ESU, competition over spawning habitat and redd superimposition.

The MRFH carries out a number of release protocols: volitional, trucking and release within the watershed, trucking and release into San Pablo Bay, trucking to net pens at Avila, Santa Cruz, and Tiburon. Effects of out-of-basin releases include a high degree of straying of adult returns into other streams in the Central Valley and California coast, with implications to native spring and fall Chinook salmon of competition over habitat and threats to genetic integrity. Straying of fall-run has resulted in the homogeneity of the fall-run component of the Central Valley fall-/late fall-run ESU.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The lower Mokelumne River is open to recreational fishing during most of the year. The reach from the confluence upstream to Peltier Road is open year-round and the reach upstream of Peltier Road to Comanche Dam is open from January 1 through March 31 and again from the fourth Saturday in May through October 15. This time period overlaps with the embryo incubation life stage and some disruption of redds by wading anglers may occur.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Steelhead spawning in the Mokelumne River occurs from December through April. Therefore, some embryo incubation may extend into June. Water temperatures during this time period are generally below 54°F (CDFG 1991a) which is adequate for steelhead embryo incubation.

WATER QUALITY

See discussion above under adult immigration and holding.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Based on IFIM studies, maximum steelhead spawning habitat availability occurs at flows ranging from 100 to 500 cfs (CDFG 1991a). Flows are generally in this range during dry years. During wet years, flows are much more variable and range from about 200 cfs to 1,800 cfs during the steelhead spawning season (CDFG 1991a). CDFG (1991a) suggests that during normal water years, maintaining a flow of about 300 cfs during the mid-October through February time period at Woodbridge will provide maximum spawning habitat for steelhead and Chinook salmon. Variable flows during the embryo incubation life stage may lead to some redd dewatering. However, this variability in flows likely mimics historic conditions.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Juvenile steelhead rear in the Mokelumne River year-round. Smolt outmigration normally occurs from January through June. Peak water temperatures normally occur in July and August and can reach 68°F. Water temperatures fall below 60°F by October and remain near 54°F from November through May (CDFG 1991a). Steelhead can be found where daytime water temperatures range from nearly 32°F to 81°F in the summer (Moyle 2002). However, an upper water temperature limit of 65°F is preferred for growth and development of Sacramento River and American River juvenile steelhead (NMFS 2002a).

WATER QUALITY

Dissolved oxygen levels lethal to salmonids frequently occur in the Mokelumne River (CDFG 1991a). High levels of turbidity have also been observed. Additionally, heavy metals and hydrogen sulfide in concentrations toxic to aquatic life have been shown to cause fish kills in the Mokelumne River. Copper and zinc from Penn Mine were identified as the main metals causing fish kills. Recently, hazardous levels of cadmium have been determined to be present from Penn Mine as well as from the base of Comanche Dam (CDFG 1991a).

FLOW CONDITIONS

CDFG (1991a) suggests that maintaining flows between 350 and 400 cfs at the Woodbridge gage during March and April will prevent the stranding of juvenile steelhead and facilitate movement through Lodi Lake to the Delta. Woodbridge Dam also impounds Lodi Lake and at low flows, dominant flow patterns in Lodi Lake may be difficult to detect. Downstream migrants have their progress slowed considerably upon reaching the lake. These outmigrants may reside in the lake for considerable periods of time during which they are subject to increased predation and warm water conditions (CDFG 1991a).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Riparian vegetation is found along most of both banks of the lower Mokelumne River. However, there is no regeneration along the relatively thin riparian corridor in many areas. It is subject to erosion, as well as removal for housing, agriculture, flood control, levee maintenance and gravel mining (CDFG 1991a).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

The river tends to be wider the first six miles downstream of Comanche Reservoir and with the exception of Lodi Lake tends to be much narrower downstream. Because flows have been substantially reduced in this section of the river, the river characteristics are quite different than those that occurred historically and much side channel habitat has been lost.

In 2005, EBMUD, in cooperation with CDFG and USFWS, acquired funds to engineer 1,915 m^2 of side channel habitat. Monitoring of the engineered habitat has shown usage by both juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead (Heady 2008). Heady (2008) reports that juvenile salmonids seem t6o respond to preferred diet items made available by the engineered habitat.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Much of the narrowing of the river channel in the downstream reaches of the lower Mokelumne River can be attributed to flood control levees built to protect homes and agriculture on the historic floodplain. There are approximately 40 miles of levees on the lower Mokelumne River downstream of Comanche Dam (CDFG 1991a).

ENTRAINMENT

The diversion at Woodbridge Dam into Woodbridge Canal during the irrigation season (April 15 through October 15) averages 128 cfs but can be as high as 400 cfs. The diversion was screened in 1968. The screens do no meet CDFG or NMFS standards and some entrainment of juvenile steelhead is likely (CDFG 1991a). Another smaller diversion occurs below Comanche Dam and is operated by the North San Joaquin Water Conservation District. Losses of juveniles at this diversion are unknown. At the diversion, the north pump is unscreened and the south pump is screened but the screen is in disrepair. Observations indicate that there are few losses of juvenile salmonids at this site (CDFG 1991a).

PREDATION

Non-native largemouth and smallmouth bass have been introduced to the lower Mokelumne River. Both species are likely predators on juvenile salmonids, particularly as outmigrants are slowed in Lodi Lake. Additionally, introduced striped bass likely prey on juvenile native salmonids in the Mokelumne River downstream of the Woodbridge Dam.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Because early attempts to create a natural run of steelhead in the Mokelumne River were unsuccessful, the fishery is currently managed by CDFG as a catchable rainbow trout fishery. Steelhead averaging

three to a pound are released annually. These fish likely prey on juvenile salmonids in the lower river (EBMUD 1992).

4.3.11.2 CALAVERAS RIVER

The Calaveras River, a tributary to the San Joaquin River, is a relatively small, low elevation Central Valley drainage that receives runoff mainly from winter rainfall. Flow in the Calaveras River is regulated by New Hogan Dam, located approximately 38 miles upstream from the river's mouth at Stockton, where it meets the San Joaquin River. New Hogan Dam marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat in the Calaveras River.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Currently, New Hogan Dam at RM 36 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration and marks the upper extent of potential steelhead habitat in the Calaveras River. Bellota Weir at RM 18 can be a barrier to upstream migration at low flows (Marsh 2007). At Bellota weir, the river is split into two channels, the old Calaveras River channel and Mormon Slough. Mormon Slough, converted to a flood control channel in the 1960s, now typically has more flow than the old Calaveras River channel. In recent years, steelhead have been documented using winter and spring flows from rain, runoff and occasional reservoir flood releases to migrate up the river, though barriers such as Bellotta Dam can stop steelhead once flows recede after a storm. Additionally, numerous in-channel migration barriers and dry reaches during low flows present complete or partial barriers to upstream migration below Bellota Weir (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling is allowed in the Calaveras River from the fourth Saturday in May through March 31 of the following year. Current regulations allow for the taking of hatchery trout or steelhead (identified by an adipose fin clip).

WATER TEMPERATURE

A water temperature study was conducted from the spring of 2002 through the winter of 2003. During this study, water temperatures between New Hogan Dam and the Bellota Weir were found to be well within the acceptable limits for steelhead (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

WATER QUALITY

Environmental conditions such as high water temperatures and low dissolved oxygen concentrations may be a problem for migrating adult salmonids below Bellota Weir (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Currently, adult steelhead have two potential migration routes to upstream spawning habitat: (1) the old Calaveras River channel downstream of the town of Bellota, and 2) Mormon Slough via the Stockton Diverting Canal. The majority of steelhead migrate through Mormon Slough because there is typically more water in this route. However, in many years, the timing and magnitude of flows below Bellota Weir are not sufficient to allow steelhead to migrate upstream during winter months (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Currently, New Hogan Dam at RM 36 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration and marks the upper extent of potential steelhead habitat in the Calaveras River. Bellota Weir at RM 18 can be a barrier to upstream migration at low flows (Marsh 2007). At Bellota weir, the river is split into two channels, the old Calaveras River channel and Mormon Slough. Mormon Slough, converted to a flood control channel in the 1960s, now typically has more flow than the old Calaveras River channel. In recent years, steelhead have been documented using winter and spring flows from rain, runoff and occasional reservoir flood releases to migrate up the river, though barriers such as Bellotta Dam can stop steelhead once flows recede after a storm.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling is allowed in the Calaveras River from the fourth Saturday in May through March 31 of the following year. Current regulations allow for the taking of hatchery trout or steelhead (identified by an adipose fin clip).

WATER TEMPERATURE

During a water temperature study that was conducted from the spring of 2002 through the winter of 2003, water temperatures between New Hogan Dam and the Bellota Weir were found to be well within the acceptable limits for steelhead (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality appears to be adequate to support steelhead spawning upstream of Bellota Weir.

FLOW CONDITIONS

After construction of New Hogan Dam, and subsequent river regulation, barriers in the lower river became serious impediments to upstream migration causing stranding when flows high enough to pass fish over the barriers drops (Marsh 2007).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Spawning habitat upstream of Mormon Slough is considered adequate (Marsh 2007). However, the increased shear stress caused by tailing piles and the associated river channel confinement have resulted in the mobilization of spawning size gravel resulting in some loss of spawning habitat (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

A reconnaissance survey, conducted in 2002, indicated the extensive nature of gold dredging activities in the basin and encroachment of the river channel by tailings piles, resulting in the confinement of the river channel (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Because Calaveras River does not support a persistent population of steelhead at this time, there are no likely hatchery effects.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

Recreational angling is allowed in the Calaveras River from the fourth Saturday in May through March 31 of the following year. Current regulations allow for the taking of hatchery trout or steelhead (identified by an adipose fin clip). Therefore, it is possible that redds could be inadvertently disturbed by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During a water temperature study that was conducted from the spring of 2002 through the winter of 2003, water temperatures between New Hogan Dam and the Bellota Weir were found to be well within the acceptable limits for steelhead (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality appears to be adequate to support egg development and embryo incubation upstream of Bellota Weir.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flows between New Hogan Reservoir and the Bellota Weir are fairly constant throughout the steelhead embryo incubation period (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

During a water temperature study that was conducted from the spring of 2002 through the winter of 2003, water temperatures between New Hogan Dam and the Bellota Weir were found to be well within the acceptable limits for steelhead (Fishery Foundation of California 2004). However, water temperatures below Bellota Weir often rise above suitable levels for juvenile salmonids (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

WATER QUALITY

There is no evidence that water quality, other than temperature, may limit juvenile rearing (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Significant obstacles impede smolt outmigration in the fall and winter when low or no flow conditions are common and smolts can become stranded (Marsh 2007). From late-winter to the middle of April, flows sufficient to carry smolts from spawning and rearing areas to the San Joaquin River are infrequent (Fishery Foundation of California 2004). Under current flow management practices, before the beginning of the irrigation season, full connection of flows in Mormon Slough between Bellota Weir and the San Joaquin River occurs only when storm runoff below New Hogan Dam results in uncontrolled spill over the top of Bellota Weir. Diversion of flows away from the mouth of the old Calaveras channel and development of extensive irrigation infrastructure in Mormon Slough has likely blocked smolt outmigration to a large degree (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Dewatering of the Old Calaveras River channel and simplification and reduction of riparian cover in Mormon Slough have resulted in higher water temperatures that would not be expected to support significant numbers of rearing juvenile salmonids (Fishery Foundation of California 2004). In contrast to conditions below Bellota Weir, a great deal of rearing habitat is available upstream (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

A reconnaissance survey, conducted in 2002, indicated the extensive nature of gold dredging activities in the basin and encroachment of the river channel by tailings piles, resulting in the confinement of the river channel (Fishery Foundation of California 2004).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

According to historical accounts, the Calaveras River's valley reach downstream of Bellota was a large floodplain with many braided streams during times of high flows. This reach has changed from an uncontrolled floodplain of sloughs and oak groves to a system of controlled channels, dams, and levees (Marsh 2007).

ENTRAINMENT

Juvenile steelhead can become entrained at the Bellota Weir (Marsh 2007).

PREDATION

Reconnaissance surveys indicate the presence of large run pools between Jenny Lind Bridge and Shelton Road that may support warmwater prey species such as largemouth and smallmouth bass. Brown (2000) suggests that introduced species found in the lower reaches of tributaries to the San Joaquin River and the lower mainstem San Joaquin River likely compete with and predate upon downstream migrants.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

It is not likely that juvenile steelhead rearing in the Calaveras River are affected by hatchery production.

4.3.11.3 STANISLAUS RIVER

The Stanislaus River is one of the largest tributaries of the San Joaquin River. The river is 65 miles long and has north, middle and south forks. The north and south forks meet several miles upstream from New Melones Lake and the middle fork joins the north fork a few miles before that. The Stanislaus River is extensively dammed and diverted. Donnells Dam on the middle fork forms Donell Lake, high in the Sierra Nevada. Downstream is Beardsley Dam, which forms Beardsley Lake. McKays' Point Diversion Dam diverts water on the north fork for hydroelectricity production and domestic use. The New Melones Dam blocks the river after the confluence of all three forks. Downstream from New Melones Lake, there is Tulloch Dam, which forms Tulloch Reservoir, and Goodwin Dam, which is the first major barrier for anadromous fish on the Stanislaus River. The Stanislaus River historically supported a large population of spring-run Chinook salmon which was extirpated with the construction of Goodwin Dam. Below Goodwin Dam, the Stanislaus eventually meets the San Joaquin River and flows into the Delta.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Goodwin Dam, at RM 58.4 presents an impassable barrier to anadromous salmonids and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat on the Stanislaus River.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

There is a catch and release steelhead fishery in the lower Stanislaus River from January 1 through October 15. Artificial lures with barbless hooks are required from Goodwin Dam downstream to the Highway 120 Bridge in Oakdale. Below the bridge, bait fishing is permitted. Poaching and illegal fishing methods are reported to be problems for steelhead in the Stanislaus River (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Because steelhead immigration to the Stanislaus River primarily occurs during the winter months, water temperature downstream of Goodwin Dam is likely suitable for steelhead adult immigration.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Stanislaus River is adequate to support steelhead adult immigration and holding.

FLOW CONDITIONS

It is likely that flow conditions in the Stanislaus River are adequate to support steelhead adult immigration during the winter months.

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

Goodwin Dam, at RM 58.4 presents an impassable barrier to anadromous salmonids and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat on the Stanislaus River.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

There is a catch and release steelhead fishery in the lower Stanislaus River from January 1 through October 15. Artificial lures with barbless hooks are required from Goodwin Dam downstream to the Highway 120 Bridge in Oakdale. Below the bridge, bait fishing is permitted. Poaching and illegal fishing methods are reported to be problems for steelhead in the Stanislaus River (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

WATER TEMPERATURE

Because steelhead spawning in the Stanislaus River occurs primarily during the winter months, water temperatures are likely suitable for this life stage in downstream of Goodwin Dam.

WATER QUALITY

Gravel mining and the subsequent production of pits and long flowing ditches have led to reduced dissolved oxygen concentrations in the lower river (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).Section in preparation.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Reclamation is required to release up to 98,000 acre-feet of water each year from the New Melones Reservoir to the Stanislaus River on a distribution pattern to be specified each year by CDFG for fish and wildlife purposes (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

There has been extensive gravel mining in the Stanislaus River. Increased encroachment and reduced gravel recruitment has led to the coarsening of the bed material, particularly in spawning habitat in the unmined reaches of the river below Goodwin Dam (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Habitat downstream of Goodwin Dam has been substantially altered by gravel mining. Drag lines were used to dredge the gravel and the spawning habitat from several reaches of the active riverbed. The dredged channels are now either large instream pits or long, uniform ditches that provide almost no spawning habitat (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

A genetic analysis of steelhead smolts captured in the Stanislaus River indicates that they are closely related to upper Sacramento River steelhead, but not steelhead from the MRFH or the Nimbus Hatchery on the American River and so they appear to be a natural population (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

There is a catch and release steelhead fishery in the lower Stanislaus River from January 1 through October 15. Artificial lures with barbless hooks are required from Goodwin Dam downstream to the Highway 120 Bridge in Oakdale. Below the bridge, bait fishing is permitted. It is likely that there is some disturbance of steelhead redds by wading anglers during the embryo incubation life stage.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Because embryo incubation of steelhead eggs in the Stanislaus River primarily occurs during the winter and spring months, water temperatures are suitable for this life stage downstream of Goodwin Dam.

WATER QUALITY

Gravel mining and the subsequent production of pits and long flowing ditches have led to reduced dissolved oxygen concentrations in the lower river (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow conditions in the Stanislaus River downstream of Goodwin Dam are likely adequate to support embryo incubation of steelhead. However, turbidity from storm events during January and February have been shown to mobilize fine sediment which may decrease oxygen availability to redds (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures reach critical levels during the summer months between Goodwin Dam and the Orange Blossom Bridge (where most steelhead juvenile rearing occurs) (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002). However, because of hypolimnetic releases of cold water from Goodwin Dam, water temperatures are likely suitable for a short distance downstream of Goodwin Dam even during summer months (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

WATER QUALITY

Dissolved oxygen concentration reach critical levels during the summer months between Goodwin Dam and the Orange Blossom Bridge (where most steelhead juvenile rearing occurs) (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Stream flow releases from Goodwin Dam are probably adequate to support juvenile rearing of steelhead except under the driest of conditions. Even during relatively hot spells, releases from the dam provide adequate cooling to the river downstream to about Orange Blossom Bridge (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

No analyses have been conducted to assess the amount of riparian habitat along the lower Stanislaus River that has been converted for agricultural use or commercial gravel mining. CDFG conducted analyses of aerial photographs taken in 1958 and 1965 that indicated that there were approximately 3,300 acres of riparian habitat between Knights Ferry Bridge and the San Joaquin River in 1958, but only 2,550 acres in 1965 as a result of conversion for agricultural uses and commercial gravel mining (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002). The amount of riparian habitat appears to have stabilized since 1965 based on a third analysis conducted by the USFWS in 1998 (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

It is speculated that the construction and subsequent operation of the New Melones Dam has reduced channel diversity and the channel has become incised (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

A study of aerial photographs and field observations indicate that the Stanislaus River has changed from a dynamic river system, characterized by depositional and scour features, to a relatively static and entrenched system. Changes since the construction of New Melones Dam include: (1) large scale vegetation encroachment in the active channel; (2) reduced reproduction of cottonwoods; and (3) substantial encroachment by urban and agricultural development, particularly orchards, in floodplain areas thereby altering the natural river floodplain connection (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

ENTRAINMENT

There are 44 unscreened diversions in the Stanislaus River downstream of Goodwin Dam. However, entrainment rates at these sites have not been studied (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002).

PREDATION

Dredged channels and pits from gravel mining operations have reduced turbulence and thereby providing habitat for potential predators of juvenile salmonids. Concentrations of predators in slow flowing ditches that lack cover may result in high rates of juvenile mortality through predation (Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates 2002). Brown (2000) suggests that introduced species found in the lower reaches of tributaries to the San Joaquin River and the lower mainstem San Joaquin River likely compete with and predate upon downstream migrants.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Juvenile steelhead rearing in the Stanislaus River are not likely affected by hatchery production.

4.3.11.4 TUOLUMNE RIVER

The Tuolumne River is the largest tributary of the San Joaquin River. It drains a 1,900-square mile water shed that includes the northern portion of Yosemite National Park. La Grange Dam marks the upstream extent of potential anadromous salmonid habitat. From La Grange Dam, the Tuolumne River flows in a westerly direction for approximately 50 miles before entering the mainstem San Joaquin River. Although some steelhead reportedly persist in the Tuolumne River, debate over historical distribution and less emphasis on commercial value have shifted the primary focus of restoration efforts from steelhead to fall-run Chinook salmon in the Tuolumne Basin (McBain and Trush 2000).

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The Tuolumne River, from La Grange Dam downstream to the confluence with the San Joaquin River supports a catch and release recreational trout fishery from January 1 through October 15. Therefore, it is possible that redds could be inadvertently disrupted by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Tuolumne River during the time period when most steelhead embryos are incubating are likely suitable. However, water temperatures in the Tuolumne River begin rising in the spring and may become unsuitable within redds that were constructed later in the spawning season (DWR 2007).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Tuolumne River is adequate to support steelhead adult immigration and holding.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow standards protective of salmonids were established in 1991 for the Tuolumne River. Prescribed baseflows for October 1 through May 15 range from between100 cfs and 200 cfs for the drier 50 percent exceedance water years, and 300 cfs for the wetter 50 percent exceedance years (McBain and rush 2000). Minimum instream flows during summer are 50 cfs and 250 cfs for critically dry and normal-wet years respectively (McBain and Trush 2000).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The La Grange Dam at RM 52.2 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migrating anadromous salmonids and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat in the Tuolumne River.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The Tuolumne River, from La Grange Dam downstream to the confluence with the San Joaquin River supports a catch and release recreational trout fishery from January 1 through October 15.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Tuolumne River during winter months are likely suitable for steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Tuolumne River likely does not adversely affect steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow standards for the protection of steelhead in the Tuolumne River were implemented in 1991.

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Habitat suitable for spawning on the Tuolumne River is finite, such that there is an absolute limit on production. A 1986 estimate of spawning habitat enumerated 72 riffles and 2.9 million square feet of riffle area at a flow of 230 cfs (McBain & Trush 1998). Studies on spawning habitat conducted in the 1980s concluded that spawning habitat availability was a significant factor in limiting salmon production in the Tuolumne River.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

Dams, aggregate extraction, agricultural and urban encroachment, and other land uses have caused sediment imbalances in the channel. Reduced magnitude, duration and frequency of high flows has allowed fine sediment to accumulate in the Tuolumne River. Additionally, the elimination of coarse sediment from upstream reaches has degraded salmonid spawning habitat (McBain & Trush 1998).

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The extent of interaction with steelhead spawning in the Tuolumne River with hatchery produced steelhead is unknown. Genetic studies indicate that Tuolumne River steelhead are closely related to other populations in the San Joaquin Basin.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The Tuolumne River, from La Grange Dam downstream to the confluence with the San Joaquin River supports a catch and release recreational trout fishery from January 1 through October 15. Therefore, it is possible that redds could be inadvertently disrupted by wading anglers.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Tuolumne River during the time period when most steelhead embryos are incubating are likely suitable. However, water temperatures in the Tuolumne River begin rising in the spring and may become unsuitable within redds that were constructed later in the spawning season (DWR 2007).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Tuolumne River likely does not adversely affect steelhead embryo incubation.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow standards for the protection of steelhead in the Tuolumne River were implemented in 1991.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

High water temperatures during summer months are likely a limiting factor for steelhead rearing in the lower Tuolumne River. Water temperatures are particularly problematic at low flows. High daily fluctuations in water temperature at low flows have been observed in the lower river (ranging from 12°F to 14°F daily) (McBain & Trush 1998). Current FERC flow schedules appear to provide suitable rearing habitat for the first 15 miles downstream of La Grange Dam (McBain & Trush 1998).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the Tuolumne River likely does not adversely affect juvenile steelhead.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow standards for the protection of steelhead in the Tuolumne River were implemented in 1991.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

An area of management concern in the Tuolumne River is the health of the riparian vegetation along the entire rive corridor. The primary concern is that many of the riparian forests on the Tuolumne River consist of mature trees that are not being replaced with new growth (Mesick et al. 2007).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Controlled flows in the Tuolumne River have reduced the magnitude and frequency of high flow events that are part of the natural flow regime thereby decreasing habitat diversity and complexity in the lower river.

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

Attenuation of peak flows in the Tuolumne River have reduced the frequency of floodplain inundation and severed the frequency of river connection to the floodplain.

ENTRAINMENT

The extent of entrainment in water diversions occurring on the Tuolumne River ha not been well studied and no data is available to assess effects.

PREDATION

Predation by introduced species of bass may be a dominant source of mortality under low-flow conditions for juvenile salmonids in the Tuolumne River. In-channel aggregate extraction pits appear to provide ideal habitat for predators. The largemouth bass population in the lower Tuolumne River was estimated to be between 10,000 and 11,000 fish in 1992 (McBain & Trush 1998). Brown (2000) suggests that introduced species found in the lower reaches of tributaries to the San Joaquin River and the lower mainstem San Joaquin River likely compete with and predate upon downstream migrants.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Juvenile steelhead rearing in the Tuolumne River are not likely affected by hatchery production.

4.3.11.5 MERCED RIVER

The Merced River is a tributary to the San Joaquin River in the southern portion of California's Central Valley. The river, which drains an area of 1,276 square miles, originates in Yosemite National Park and flows southwest through the Sierra Nevada, where it joins the San Joaquin River 87 miles south of Sacramento.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The confluence of the Merced and San Joaquin Rivers is at RM 113 of the San Joaquin River. The first 51 miles of the Merced River is accessible to anadromous salmonids. The Crocker-Huffman Dam at RM 51 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The Merced River supports a catch and release fishery from January 1 through October 31. Only artificial lures with barbless hooks are allowed from Crocker-Huffman Dam downstream to the Schaffer Bridge on Oakdale road. From that point downstream to the confluence with the San Joaquin River, bait may be used but with restrictions on hook size.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the steelhead adult immigration life stage normally range from 50°F to 55°F (Vogel 2003).

WATER QUALITY

Little is known about water quality in the Merced River and the effects on aquatic life. Factors that may affect aquatic life include nutrients, point source discharges from wastewater treatment facilities and non-point source contaminants from agricultural runoff. For example, the Merced River has been identified as impaired for the agricultural pesticides diazinon, chlorpyrifos, and Group A pesticides. It is not likely that water quality parameters are at a level to adversely affect adult steelhead.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Minimum instream flow requirements in the Merced River are defined under Merced Irrigation District's current licenses and agreements and are attended to provide adequate flows for anadromous salmonids and for the Merced River Riparian Water Users Association diversions (Stillwater Sciences 2001). Flows

vary by month but typically range from about 230 cfs to 270 cfs during the steelhead adult immigration life stage (Stillwater Sciences 2001).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The confluence of the Merced and San Joaquin Rivers is at RM 113 of the San Joaquin River. The first 51 miles of the Merced River is accessible to anadromous salmonids. The Crocker-Huffman Dam at RM 51 presents an impassable barrier to upstream migration and marks the upstream extent of potential steelhead habitat.

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The Merced River supports a catch and release fishery from January 1 through October 31. Only artificial lures with barbless hooks are allowed from Crocker-Huffman Dam downstream to the Schaffer Bridge on Oakdale road. From that point downstream to the confluence with the San Joaquin River, bait may be used but with restrictions on hook size.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the steelhead spawning life stage normally range from 50°F to 55°F (Vogel 2003).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality is discussed above under Adult Immigration. Agricultural runoff likely occurs downstream of steelhead spawning and likely does not adversely affect steelhead spawning.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Minimum instream flow requirements in the Merced River are defined under Merced Irrigation District's current licenses and agreements and are attended to provide adequate flows for anadromous salmonids and for the Merced River Riparian Water Users Association diversions (Stillwater Sciences 2001). Flows vary by month but typically range from about 230 cfs to 270 cfs during the steelhead spawning life stage(Stillwater Sciences 2001)

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Accumulation and retention of coarse sediment suitable for steelhead spawning has been prevented by flow regulation and sediment capture by dams, likely reducing the quantity and quality of spawning habitat.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The lower Merced River has been altered substantially by gravel mining and dredging activities. This has resulted in channelization of the river as well as substrate armoring.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Recent genetic analysis of the Merced River Hatchery (MRH) fall-run stock (Garza *et al*. 2007) found the hatchery stock to be the most divergent of the fall-run populations examined for the study, and genetically distinct from the Merced River fall-run population. Its genetic dichotomy is conjectured as a product of either hybridization with a fall-run genome not found in the Central Valley ESU of the Klamath River, or

strong natural selection acting on the hatchery stock, although this is questionable as some number of in-river fish are likely incorporated into the broodstock for the program.

MRH fall-run are primarily utilized for the VAMP mark-recapture monitoring activities, and otherwise propagated for recreational purposes. VAMP releases all occur in the Delta, with some component of fish releases never recovered and therefore having the potential to stray as adult returns into streams other than the Merced River. Recent habitat and disease problems in the Merced River have resulted in fewer fish returning to the hatchery and forcing the downsizing or adaptive management of the VAMP study, which would decrease the effects of straying by virtue of smaller release numbers.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The Merced River supports a catch and release fishery from January 1 through October 31. It is possible that redds may be disturbed by wading anglers during the embryo incubation life stage.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures during the steelhead embryo incubation life stage normally range from 50°F to 55°F (Vogel 2003).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality is discussed above under Adult Immigration. Agricultural runoff likely occurs downstream of where steelhead spawning occurs and likely does not adversely affect embryo incubation.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Minimum instream flow requirements in the Merced River are defined under Merced Irrigation District's current licenses and agreements and are attended to provide adequate flows for anadromous salmonids and for the Merced River Riparian Water Users Association diversions (Stillwater Sciences 2001). Flows vary by month but typically range from about 230 cfs to 270 cfs during the steelhead embryo incubation life stage (Stillwater Sciences 2001).

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the Merced River, measured at Crocker-Huffman Dam are normally below 60°F year-round other than September and October when temperatures near 63°F (Vogel 2003).

WATER QUALITY

Water quality is discussed above under Adult Immigration. Agricultural runoff and pollutants from wastewater treatment facilities likely occur downstream of where most steelhead rearing occurs. However, outmigrating juvenile would be exposed and may exhibit decreased survival particularly during the irrigation season.

FLOW CONDITIONS

Minimum instream flow requirements in the Merced River are defined under Merced Irrigation District's current licenses and agreements and are attended to provide adequate flows for anadromous salmonids and for the Merced River Riparian Water Users Association diversions (Stillwater Sciences 2001). Flows vary by month but typically range from about 230 cfs to 270 cfs during the winter months, increase to

about 300 cfs during the spring and begin decreasing in August. Low flows of 65 cfs to 75 cfs occur in October (Stillwater Sciences 2001).

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Gravel mining along the Merced River has resulted in significant loss of riparian vegetation, particularly in the seven-mile reach downstream from Crocker Huffman Dam. Farther downstream the riparian zone ranges in width from 100 to 300 feet.

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Since the completion of New Exchequer Dam in 1967, mean annual flood discharge has been reduced by 80 percent (based on records from WY 1968 to 2000 at the Snelling gage) (Stillwater Sciences 2003). Operating rules for the Merced Irrigation District imposed by the USACE currently limit releases from New Exchequer Dam to 6,000 cfs. The lower flows reduce the incidence of flow events believed to be geomorphically effective for maintaining properly functioning stream channels and associated riparian and floodplain habitats (Stillwater Sciences (2003).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

No state or federal levee system has been constructed on the Merced River and existing levees are limited to privately owned structures. The levee system is, however, extensive, especially downstream of the State Route 99 Bridge at RM 20.5. Private landowners have constructed and maintain these levees which protect agricultural lands and houses. These levees confine the river and floodplain width and isolate the river from its former floodplain (Stillwater Sciences 2001).

ENTRAINMENT

The extent of entrainment in water diversions occurring on the Merced River ha not been well studied and no data is available to assess effects.

PREDATION

Extensive gravel mining in the lower Merced River has resulted in deep instream pits in the river and has also led to a decrease in riffles and riparian cover. These factors likely change predator-prey dynamics in the system likely favoring predators. Brown (2000) suggests that introduced species found in the lower reaches of tributaries to the San Joaquin River and the lower mainstem San Joaquin River likely compete with and predate upon downstream migrants.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

The MRH is located immediately downstream of the Crocker-Huffman Dam. The hatchery raises and releases Chinook salmon to supplement natural production in the Merced River. Although most of the production is released on-site, the hatchery likely has little effect on steelhead juveniles as hatchery Chinook likely migrate downstream upon release.

4.3.11.6 UPPER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER

The San Joaquin River drains the southern portion of California's Central Valley. The river basin is bounded by the Sierra Nevada to the east and the Coast Ranges to the west. The southern boundary of the drainage is the divide that separates it from the Tulare Lake basin, and its northern boundary is the Delta near Stockton. The river, which drains a 13,536-square-mile watershed, originates in the Sierra Nevada and flows for approximately 350 miles before joining the Delta. Elevations in the watershed range from 11,000 feet at the headwaters to sea level at the Delta. Friant Dam (RM 267), which impounds Lake

Millerton, is the primary mainstem dam controlling flows on the San Joaquin River. Friant Dam also marks the potential upstream extent of anadromous salmonid habitat.

ADULT IMMIGRATION AND HOLDING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The San Joaquin River upstream of the confluence with the Merced River has no remaining significant native fishery (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999). Although Friant Dam presents an upstream migration barrier to anadromous salmonids, flows released from Friant Dam are insufficient to provide year-round flow except during high flow events (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The upper San Joaquin River, from Friant Dam downstream to the Highway 140 Bridge is open for trout fishing year-round and the taking of five trout is allowed. From the Highway 140 Bridge downstream to the Interstate 5 Bridge, the fishery is open year-round but trout must be released.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During the winter months, water temperatures in the San Joaquin River are likely low enough to support steelhead upstream migration.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the San Joaquin River varies seasonally, but in periods of low flow is generally degraded due to high temperatures, heavy metals, and pesticides from drainage. During the irrigation season (March through October) and occasionally following the flushing of the drainage water from duck clubs (January and February), degraded quality drainage water makes up a significant portion of the total San Joaquin River flow (USDI *et al.* 1999).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow releases from Friant Dam are maintained year-round, but the required 5 cfs measured at Gravelly Ford rapidly infiltrates into the gravel substrate near Gravelly Ford. The net result is no flow from Gravelly Ford to Mendota Pool, except during high flow events. The river channel often does not have water again until agricultural return flows begin to make up the majority of flow around Madera Pool (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999).

SPAWNING

PASSAGE IMPEDIMENTS/BARRIERS

The San Joaquin River upstream of the confluence with the Merced River has no remaining significant native fishery (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999). Although Friant Dam presents an upstream migration barrier to anadromous salmonids, flows released from Friant Dam are insufficient to provide year-round flow except during high flow events (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999).

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The upper San Joaquin River, from Friant Dam downstream to the Highway 140 Bridge is open for trout fishing year-round and the taking of five trout is allowed. From the Highway 140 Bridge downstream to the Interstate 5 Bridge, the fishery is open year-round but trout must be released.

WATER TEMPERATURE

During the winter months, water temperatures in the San Joaquin River are likely low enough to support steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the San Joaquin River varies seasonally, but in periods of low flow is generally degraded due to high temperatures, heavy metals, and pesticides from drainage. During the irrigation season (March through October) and occasionally following the flushing of the drainage water from duck clubs (January and February), degraded quality drainage water makes up a significant portion of the total San Joaquin River flow (USDI *et al.* 1999).

FLOW CONDITIONS

Flow releases from Friant Dam are maintained year-round, but the required 5 cfs measured at Gravelly Ford rapidly infiltrates into the gravel substrate near Gravelly Ford. The net result is no flow from Gravelly Ford to Mendota Pool, except during high flow events. The river channel often does not have water again until agricultural return flows begin to make up the majority of flow around Madera Pool (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999).

SPAWNING HABITAT AVAILABILITY

Only limited spawning habitat is available in the San Joaquin River and low flows likely make that habitat unusable. It is likely that the San Joaquin River is utilized only as a migratory corridor to habitat in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers.

PHYSICAL HABITAT ALTERATION

The construction of dams and resultant controlled flows and extensive gravel mining have likely destroyed almost all potential spawning habitat in the San Joaquin River.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Hatchery effects on spawning steelhead in the San Joaquin River are not well known.

EMBRYO INCUBATION

HARVEST/ANGLING IMPACTS

The upper San Joaquin River, from Friant Dam downstream to the Highway 140 Bridge, is open for trout fishing year-round and the taking of five trout is allowed. From the Highway 140 Bridge downstream to the Interstate 5 Bridge, the fishery is open year-round but trout must be released. If any steelhead spawning were to occur in the San Joaquin River, redd disruption by wading anglers is likely.

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the San Joaquin River downstream of Friant Dam are likely cold enough to support steelhead embryo incubation but it is likely that the lack of spawning habitat and low flows preclude the San Joaquin River from steelhead spawning.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the San Joaquin River varies seasonally, but in periods of low flow is generally degraded due to high temperatures, heavy metals, and pesticides from drainage. During the irrigation season

(March through October) and occasionally following the flushing of the drainage water from duck clubs (January and February), degraded quality drainage water makes up a significant portion of the total San Joaquin River flow (USDI *et al.* 1999).

FLOW CONDITIONS

It is not likely that any significant steelhead spawning activity occurs in the San Joaquin River and it is used only as a migratory corridor.

JUVENILE REARING AND OUTMIGRATION

WATER TEMPERATURE

Water temperatures in the late spring, summer and early fall are likely to warm to support use of the San Joaquin River by steelhead for other than a migratory corridor.

WATER QUALITY

Water quality in the San Joaquin River varies seasonally, but in periods of low flow is generally degraded due to high temperatures, heavy metals, and pesticides from drainage. During the irrigation season (March through October) and occasionally following the flushing of the drainage water from duck clubs (January and February), degraded quality drainage water makes up a significant portion of the total San Joaquin River flow (USDI *et al.* 1999).

FLOW CONDITIONS

During periods of low flow, the San Joaquin River likely provides poor to marginal habitat for steelhead juveniles. Currently, the San Joaquin River is probably only utilized as a migratory corridor.

LOSS OF RIPARIAN HABITAT AND INSTREAM COVER

Only about eight to ten percent of riparian forests in the San Joaquin Valley still remain; most were converted to agricultural land. At present, urbanization, recreational development, aggregate mining and road construction are considered to be the main stressors, in addition to continuing agricultural encroachment in the floodplain, to the remaining riparian vegetation (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999; USDI *et al.* 1999).

LOSS OF NATURAL RIVER MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

Confining flood flows in reservoirs and between levees has caused the loss of natural hydrologic and geomorphic processes. Habitat for fish and wildlife has been lost or severely degraded as a result of loss of natural processes (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999; USDI *et al.* 1999).

LOSS OF FLOODPLAIN HABITAT

The combination of controlled flow regimes and agricultural encroachment has severed most of the connection between the San Joaquin River and its historical floodplain (USACE and Reclamation Board 1999; USDI *et al.* 1999).

ENTRAINMENT

The level of entrainment of juvenile steelhead in the San Joaquin River is not documented.

PREDATION

The San Joaquin River supports a variety of introduced warmwater fish including black bass species known to prey on juvenile salmonids. Additionally, in-river gravel mining and other disturbances have likely altered habitat and affected predator-prey dynamics likely favoring predators. Brown (2000) suggests that introduced species found in the lower reaches of tributaries to the San Joaquin River and the lower mainstem San Joaquin River likely compete with and predate upon downstream migrants.

HATCHERY EFFECTS

Hatchery production of steelhead likely does not affect juveniles in the San Joaquin River.

4.4 STRESSOR PRIORITIZATION

4.4.1 STRESSOR MATRIX DEVELOPMENT

4.4.1.1 STRESSOR MATRIX OVERVIEW

Stressor matrices, in the form of Microsoft Excel spreadsheets, were developed to structure the steelhead diversity group, population, life stage, and stressor information into hierarchically related tiers so that stressors within each diversity group and population in the DPS could be prioritized. The individual tiers within the matrices, from highest to lowest, are: (1) diversity group; (2) population; (3) life stage; (4) primary stressor category; and (5) specific stressor. These individual tiers were related hierarchically so that each variable within a tier had several associated variables at the next lower tier, except at the lowest tier. The four diversity groups were equally weighted in order to be consistent with the recovery criteria described in this recovery plan, which were, in-part, based on the "representation and redundancy" rule described in Lindley *et al*. (2007). This rule reflects the importance of having multiple diversity groups comprised of multiple independent populations in order to recover the ESU (Lindley *et al.* 2007).

The general steps required to develop and utilize the steelhead matrices are identical to those of spring-run Chinook salmon. Please see Section 3.4.1.1 for a description of those steps.

The completed stressor matrix sorted by normalized weight is a prioritized list of the life stage-specific stressors affecting the DPS. For steelhead, threats were prioritized within each diversity group as well as within each population. Specific information explaining the individual steps taken to generate these prioritized lists is provided in the following sections.

4.4.1.2 POPULATION IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

The threats assessments for the Central Valley steelhead DPS included rivers that both historically supported, and currently support steelhead populations. For the Central Valley steelhead threats assessment, 26 individual rivers/watersheds that historically supported and currently support populations of steelhead were identified using literature describing the historical population structure of steelhead in the Central Valley (Lindley *et al.* 2006) and by using the best professional knowledge of biologists on the current distribution of steelhead. These 26 steelhead populations were categorized into four diversity groups based on the geographical structure described in Lindley *et al.* (2007) (**Table 4-4**).

Table 4-4. Extant Central Valley Steelhead Populations Included in the Threats Assessment Categorized by Diversity Group

Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group	Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group	Northwestern California Diversity Group	Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group
American River Auburn/Coon Creek Dry Creek Feather River Bear River Yuba River Butte Creek Big Chico Creek Deer Creek Mill Creek Antelope Creek	Battle Creek Cow Creek Upper Sacramento River Tributaries[11] Upper Sacramento River (mainstem)	Stony Creek Thomes Creek Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Clear Creek Putah Creek	Mokelumne River Calaveras River Stanislaus River Tuolumne River Merced River San Joaquin River (mainstem)

Source: (Lindley *et al.* 2007)

It is recognized that more than 26 rivers/watersheds that historically supported and currently support steelhead exist in the Central Valley, however it is assumed that recovery of the Central Valley steelhead DPS is primarily dependent on the 26 populations included in the threats assessment.

The steelhead population ranking procedure was identical to that of spring-run Chinook salmon. Please see Section 3.4.1.2 for a description of the population ranking procedure. The population weight is intended to reflect the relative importance of a population to the viability of the diversity group to which it is categorized. The weighting characteristic scores and population weights for each steelhead population in each of the four diversity groups are presented in **Tables 4-5, 4-6, 4-7, and 4-8**.

Table 4-5. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Steelhead Population in the Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group

Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group	American River	Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Dry Creek Drainage (Sac Region)	Feather River	Bear River	Yuba River	Butte Creek	Big Chico Creek	Deer Creek	Mill Creek	Antelope Creek
Abundance	2	2	1	4	1	4	2	2	3	3	3
Genetic Integrity	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	3	4	4	4
Source/Sink	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	4	4	4
Natural Historic Population	1	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	4	4	4
Habitat Quantity and Quality	2	2	1	2	1	4	2	2	4	4	3
Restoration Potential	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3
Distinct Steelhead Life History	1	3	1	2	1	2	3	4	4	4	4
Spatial Consideration	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	2	2	2
Sum	14	16	15	23	14	24	16	17	28	28	27
Population Weight (Sum to 1)	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.08	0.13	0.13	0.12

[11] Includes steelhead utilizing small tributaries in the Redding area including Stillwater, Churn, Sulphur, Salt, Olney, and Paynes creeks.

Table 4-6. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Steelhead Population in the Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group

Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group	Battle Creek	Cow Creek	Upper Sacramento Tributaries (Stillwater, Churn, Sulphur, Salt, Olney, Paynes etc.)	Upper Sacramento River
Abundance	4	3	2	4
Genetic Integrity	2	3	2	2
Source/Sink	4	4	1	4
Natural History Population	3	4	2	4
Habitat Quantity and Quality	2	3	2	3
Restoration Potential	4	3	3	3
Distinct Steelhead Life History	2	4	2	2
Spatial Consideration	2	2	2	1
Sum	23	26	16	23
Population Weight (Sum to 1)	0.26	0.30	0.18	0.26

Table 4-7. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Steelhead Population in the Northwestern California Diversity Group

Northwestern California Diversity Group	Stony Creek	Thomes Creek	Cottonwood/Beegum Creeks	Clear Creek	Putah Creek
Abundance	1	1	3	3	1
Genetic Integrity	2	3	4	2	1
Source/Sink	1	1	4	1	1
Natural Historic Population	1	3	3	1	1
Habitat Quantity and Quality	1	2	3	3	1
Restoration Potential	3	2	2	2	2
Distinct Steelhead Life History	1	3	4	3	1
Spatial Consideration	4	4	4	4	3
Sum	14	19	27	19	11
Population Weight (Sum to 1)	0.16	0.21	0.30	0.21	0.12

Table 4-8. Weighting Characteristic Scores and Population Weights for Each Steelhead Population in the Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group

Southern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group	Calaveras River	Stanislaus River	Tuolumne River	Merced River	San Joaquin River	Mokelumne River
Abundance	1	1	1	1	1	2
Genetic Integrity	3	4	4	4	1	1
Source/Sink	1	1	1	1	1	1
Natural Historic Population	1	1	1	1	1	1
Habitat Quantity and Quality	2	2	1	1	1	1
Restoration Potential	3	2	2	2	4	3
Distinct Steelhead Life History	3	2	1	1	1	1
Spatial Consideration	4	4	4	4	4	4
Sum	18	17	15	15	14	14
Population Weight (Sum to 1)	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03

4.4.1.3 LIFE STAGE IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

The life stage identification and ranking procedures for steelhead were identical to that of winter-run Chinook salmon. Please see Section 2.4.1.3 for a description of those procedures. The life stage weightings for each steelhead population are presented in Attachment C.

4.4.1.4 STRESSOR IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING

The stressor identification and ranking procedures for steelhead were identical to that of winter-run Chinook salmon. Please see Section 2.4.1.4 for a description of those procedures.

4.4.2 STRESSOR MATRIX RESULTS

4.4.2.1 NORTHERN SIERRA NEVADA DIVERSITY GROUP

The northern Sierra Nevada diversity group is comprised of the American, Feather, Bear, and Yuba rivers, and Auburn/Coon, Dry, Butte, Big Chico, Deer, Mill, and Antelope creeks. Stressors of very high importance were identified for all populations and life stages in this diversity group including:

- Passage impediments and/or barriers affecting adult immigration in all of the rivers and creeks, except for Bear River[12] and Big Chico Creek;
- High water temperatures during the adult immigration and holding life stage in Bear River, and Antelope, Deer, Mill, Big Chico, Butte, and Dry creeks;
- The Nimbus and Folsom dams on the American River, the Fish Barrier Dam and Oroville Dam on the Feather River, and Englebright Dam on the Yuba River as barriers blocking access to historic holding and spawning habitats;
- The existence trout fisheries supplemented through stocking in the upper sections of Deer, Mill, and Antelope creeks, which likely affects the genetic integrity of anadromous steelhead;

[12] Camp Far West Dam on the Bear River was built at the site of a natural barrier that historically blocked access to upstream habitats.

- Sedimentation in Mill and Deer creeks, and the potential for hazardous spills in Deer Creek[13] affecting the embryo incubation life stage;
- Entrainment of juvenile steelhead in Antelope and Auburn/Coon creeks, and in the Yuba and Bear rivers; and
- Numerous factors affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage in the Delta and lower Sacramento River such as loss of floodplain habitat, loss of natural river morphology and function, loss of riparian habitat and instream cover, and predation.

Additional stressors were identified as having a very high importance to the northern Sierra Nevada steelhead diversity group. The complete prioritized list of life-stage specific stressors to this diversity group is displayed in Attachment C.

4.4.2.2 BASALT AND POROUS LAVA DIVERSITY GROUP

For the purposes of this threats assessment, the basalt and porous lava diversity group is comprised of four populations: Battle and Cow creeks, the mainstem Upper Sacramento River, and the Upper Sacramento River tributaries including Stillwater, Churn, Sulphur, Salt, Olney, and Paynes creeks. Stressors of very high importance were identified for all populations and life stages in this diversity group including:

- Passage impediments and/or barriers affecting adult immigration in all of the rivers and creeks;
- High water temperatures during the adult immigration and holding life stage in all of the rivers and creeks;
- Keswick Dam as a barrier blocking access of the mainstem Sacramento River population to historic holding and spawning habitats;
- CNFH-origin steelhead spawning with natural-origin steelhead, potentially affecting the genetic and biological diversity of the Battle Creek population;
- The existence of a trout fishery supplemented through stocking in the upper sections of Cow Creek, which likely affects the genetic integrity of anadromous steelhead;
- Releases of yearling steelhead produced at CNFH competing with and preying on naturally spawned juvenile steelhead in Battle Creek;
- High water temperatures in and poor water quality during the embryo incubation life stage in Cow Creek;
- Entrainment of juvenile steelhead in Cow Creek and the upper Sacramento River tributaries, and entrainment in the Delta, lower Sacramento River, and middle Sacramento River; and
- Numerous factors affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage in the Delta and lower Sacramento River such as loss of floodplain habitat, loss of natural river morphology and function, loss of riparian habitat and instream cover, and predation.

Additional stressors were identified as having a very high importance to the basalt and porous lava steelhead diversity group. The complete prioritized list of life-stage specific stressors to this diversity group is displayed in Attachment C.

4.4.2.3 NORTHWESTERN CALIFORNIA DIVERSITY GROUP

For the purposes of this threats assessment, the Northwestern California steelhead diversity group is comprised of Stony, Thomes, Beegum, Clear, and Putah creeks. Stressors of very high importance were identified for all populations and life stages in this diversity group including:

[13] Highway 32, a major truck route for petroleum distribution, runs parallel and adjacent to Deer Creek for several miles. During winter, road conditions along this section of the highway are poor and accidents are common.

- Passage impediments and/or barriers affecting adult immigration in all of the creeks, including Black Butte Dam on Stony Creek, Solano and Monticello dams on Putah Creek, Whiskeytown Dam on Clear Creek, and Red Bluff Diversion Dam on the Sacramento River;
- High water temperatures during the adult immigration and holding life stage in all of the creeks, except for Putah Creek;
- Limited spawning habitat availability in all of the creeks, except for Putah Creek;
- Sedimentation, flow fluctuations, and high water temperatures affecting embryo incubation in Clear Creek, sedimentation affecting this life stage in Beegum Creek, and high water temperatures affecting this life stage in Thomes Creek;
- Numerous factors affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage in the Delta and Sacramento River such as entrainment, loss of floodplain habitat, loss of natural river morphology and function, loss of riparian habitat and instream cover, and predation.

Additional stressors were identified as having a very high importance to the Northwestern California diversity group. The complete prioritized list of life stage-specific stressors to this diversity group is displayed in Attachment C.

4.4.2.4 SOUTHERN SIERRA NEVADA DIVERSITY GROUP

For the purposes of this threats assessment, the Southern Sierra Nevada steelhead diversity group is comprised of the Mokelumne, Calaveras, Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Merced, and San Joaquin rivers. Stressors of very high importance were identified for all populations and life stages in this diversity group including:

- Passage impediments and/or barriers affecting adult immigration in all of the rivers, including Sack Dam, Mendota Pool, and Friant Dam on the San Joaquin River, Bellota Weir and flashboard dams on the Calaveras River, Don Pedro and La Grange dams on the Tuolumne River, Tulloch, Goodwin and New Melones dams on the Stanislaus River, Camanche and Pardee dams on the Mokelumne River, and Crocker Huffman, McSwain, and New Exchequer dams on the Merced River;
- High water temperatures and low-flow conditions during the adult immigration and holding life stage in all of the rivers;
- Limited spawning habitat availability in all of the rivers and limited instream gravel supply in all of the rivers except for the San Joaquin River;
- Flow fluctuations affecting the embryo incubation life stage in the Calaveras, Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Mokelumne, and Merced rivers;
- Low flows limiting juvenile rearing habitat availability in the San Joaquin, Calaveras, Merced, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne rivers; and
- Numerous factors affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage in the Delta and San Joaquin River such as entrainment, loss of floodplain habitat, loss of natural river morphology and function, loss of riparian habitat and instream cover, predation, and poor water quality.

Additional stressors were identified as having a very high importance to the Southern Sierra Nevada steelhead diversity group. The complete prioritized list of life stage-specific stressors to this diversity group is displayed in Attachment C.

5.0 LITERATURE CITED

ADFG. 2002. Run Forecasts and Harvest Projections for 2002 Alaska Salmon Fisheries and Review of the 2001 Season. Alaska Department of Fish and Game Reg. Int. Rep. No. 5J02-01. Edited by D.M. Eggers.

Allen, M. A. and T. J. Hassler. 1986. Species Profiles: Life Histories and Environmental Requirements of Coast Fishes and Invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) -- Chinook Salmon. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biology Report 82(11.49). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, TR EL-82-4.

Allendorf, F. W., D. Bayles, D. L. Bottom, K. P. Currens, C. A. Frissell, D. G. Hankin, J. A. Lichatowich, W. Nehlsen, P. C. Trotter, and T. H. Williams. 1997. Prioritizing Pacific Salmon Stocks for Conservation. Conservation Biology Volume 11: 140-152.

Arkush, K. D., M. A. Banks, D. Hedgecock, P. D. Siri, and S. Hamelberg. 1997. Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program: Progress Report Through April 1996. Technical Report 49. Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary.

Arkush, K. D., A. R. Giese, H. L. Mendonca, A. M. McBride, G. D. Marty, and P. W. Hedrick. 2007. Resistance to Three Pathogens in the Endangered Winter-run Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*): Effects of Inbreeding and Major Histocompatibility Complex Genotypes. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences Volume 59(6): 966-975.

Armour, C. L. 1991. Guidance for Evaluating and Recommending Temperature Regimes to Protect Fish. Biological Report 90(22). United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Bacey, J., Spurlock.F., K. Starner, H. Feng, J. Hsu, J. White, and D. M. Tran. 2005. Residues and Toxicity of Esfenvalerate and Permethrin in Water and Sediment, in Tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, California, USA. Environmental Contamination and Toxicology Volume 74: 864-871.

Banks, M. A., V. K. Rashbrook, M. J. Calavetta, C. A. Dean, and D. Hedgecock. 2000. Analysis of Microsatellite DNA Resolves Genetic Structure and Diversity of Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in California's Central Valley. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 57: 915-927.

Barnett, T. P., J. C. Adam, and D. P. Lettenmaier. 2005. Potential Impacts of a Warming Climate on Water Availability in Snow-dominated Regions. Nature Volume 438: 303-309. Nature Publishing Group.

Barnhart, R. A. 1986. Species Profiles: Life Histories and Environmental Requirements of Coastal Fishes and Invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) - Steelhead. Biological Report 82 [11.60], TR EL-82-4.

Bartley, D., M. Bagley, G. Gall, and B. Bentley. 1992. Use of Linkage Disequilibrium Data to Estimate Effective Size of Hatchery and Natural Fish Populations. Conservation Biology Volume 6: 365-375.

Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy. 2004. Battle Creek Watershed Assessment: Characterization of Stream Conditions and an Investigation of Sediment Source Factors in 2001 and 2002. Prepared by Terraqua Inc.

Battle Creek Working Group. 1999. Maximizing Compatibility Between Coleman National Fish Hatchery Operations, Management of Lower Battle Creek, and Salmon and Steelhead Restoration. Prepared by Kier Associates.

Butte Creek Watershed. Butte Creek Watershed Existing Conditions Report. Available at http://www.buttecreekwatershed.org. Accessed on 2004.

Beamish, R. J. and C. Mahnken. 2001. A Critical Size and Period Hypothesis to Explain Natural Regulation of Salmon Abundance and Linage to Climate and Climate Change. Progress in Oceanography 423-437.

Bell, M. C. 1986. Fisheries Handbook of Engineering Requirements and Biological Criteria. Sacramento, CA: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fish Passage Development and Evaluation Program.

Bennett, W. A., D. J. Ostrach, and D. E. Hinton. 1995. Larval Striped Bass Condition in a Drought-Stricken Estuary: Evaluating Pelagic Food-Web Limitation. Ecological Applications Volume 5: 680-692.

Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance. Big Chico Creek Existing Conditions Report. Available at http://www.bigchicocreek.org. Accessed on 2007.

Bisson, P. A., K. Sullivan, and J. L. Nielsen. 1988. Channel Hydraulics, Habitat Use, and Body Form of Juvenile Coho Salmon, Steelhead, and Cutthroat Trout in Streams. Transaction of the American Fisheries Society Volume 117: 262-273.

Bjornn, T. C. 1971. Trout and Salmon Movements in Two Idaho Streams as Related to Temperature, Food, Stream Flow, Cover, and Population Density. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society Volume 100: 423-438.

Boles, G. L., S. M. Turek, C. C. Maxwell, and D. M. McGill. 1988. Water Temperature Effects on Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*) With Emphasis on the Sacramento River: A Literature Review. California Department of Water Resources.

Botsford, L. W. and J. G. Brittnacher. 1998. Viability of Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Conservation Biology Volume 12: 65-79.

Bottom, D. L., K. K. Jones, T. J. Cornwell, A. Gray, and C. A. Simenstad. February 2005. Patterns of Chinook Salmon Migration and Residency in the Salmon River Estuary (Oregon). Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science Volume 64: 79-93.

Bovee, K. D. 1978. Probability of Use Criteria for the Family Salmonidae. Report No. FWS/OBS-78/07. Instream Flow Information Paper No. 4. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Brandes, P. L. and J. S. McLain. 2001. Juvenile Chinook Salmon Abundance, Distribution, and Survival in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp **39-**136.

Brekke, L. D., N. L. Miller, K. E. Bashford, N. W. T. Quinn, and J. A. Dracup. 2004. Climate Change Impacts Uncertainty for Water Resources in the San Joaquin River Basin, California. Journal of the American Water Resources Association Volume 02103: 149-164.

Brodeur, R. D., J. P. Fisher, D. J. Teel, E. Casillas, R. L. Emmett, and R. M. Miller. 2003. Distribution, Growth, Condition, Origin and Associations of Juvenile Salmonids in the Northern California Current. Fisheries Bulletin Volume 101: 4-.

Brodeur, R. D. and W. G. Pearcy. 1992a. Effects of Environmental Variability on Trophic Interactions and Food Web Structure in a Pelagic Upwelling Ecosystem. Marine Ecology Progress Series Volume 84: 101-119.

Brodeur, R. D. and W. G. Pearcy. 1992b. Effects of Environmental Variability on Trophic Interactions and Food Web Structure in a Pelagic Upwelling Ecosystem. Marine Ecology Progress Series Volume 84: 101-119.

Brown, L.R. 2000. Fish Communities and their Associations with Environmental Variables, Lower San Joaquin River Drainage, California. Environmental Biology of Fishes 57:251-269.

Brown, R. and W. Kimmerer. 2004. A Summary of the October 2003 Battle Creek Workshop. for the Science and Ecosystem Restoration Programs of the California Bay-Delta Authority.

Brown, R. and F. Nichols. 2003. The 2003 CALFED Science Conference: A Summary of Key Points and Findings. Submitted to CALFED Science Program, Sam Luoma, Lead Scientist, May 2003.

Brown, L. and M. Bauer. 2008. Stream Flow Characteristics of California's Central Valley Rivers: Implications for Native and Invasive Species. Presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the Cal-Neva Chapter of the American Fisheries Society. April 3-5, 2008.

Burgner, R. L., J. T. Light, L. Margolis, T. Okazaki, A. Tautz, and S. Ito. 1992. Distribution and Origins of Steelhead Trout in Offshore Waters of the North Pacific Ocean. International North Pacific Fisheries Comission Bulletin Volume 51.

Busack, C. A. and K. P. Currens. 1995. Genetic Risks and Hazards in Hatchery Operations: Fundamental Concepts and Issues. American Fisheries Society Symposium Volume 15: 71-80.

CALFED. 2000a. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix.

CALFED. 2000b. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix.

CALFED. 2000c. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Volume 1 Ecological Attributes of the San Francisco Bay-Delta Watershed Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix.

CALFED. 2000d. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Volume 2 Ecological Management Zone Visions Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix.

CALFED. 2000e. Final Programmatic EIS/EIR for CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

CALFED. CALFED's Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment, and Research Program for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Central Valley Rivers. Available at http://calwater.ca.gov. Accessed on

CALFED. 2006. Ecosystem Restoration: Spring-Run Chinook Salmon in Butte Creek.

CALFED and YCWA. 2005. Draft Implementation Plan for Lower Yuba River Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration. Prepared on Behalf of the Lower Yuba River Fisheries Technical Working Group by SWRI.

CALFED Bay-Delta Program. 2004. Compatibility of Coleman National Fish Hatchery Operations and Restoration of Anadromous Salmonids in Battle Creek. Technical Review Panel.

California Energy Commission. 2003. Climate Change and California Staff Report. Prepared in Support of the 2003 Integrated Energy Policy Report Proceeding (Docket # 02-IEO-01).

Campbell, E. A. and P. B. Moyle. 1992. Effects of Temperature, Flow, and Disturbance on Adult Spring-Run Chinook Salmon. University of California. Water Resources Center. Technical Completion Report.

Campton, D. E. 1995. Genetic Effects of Hatchery Fish on Wild Populations of Pacific Salmon and Steelhead: What Do We Really Know? American Fisheries Society Symposium Volume 15: 337-353.

Carl Mesick Consultants and S.P. Cramer & Associates. 2002. Initial Working Document - A Plan to Restore Anadromous Fish Habitat in the Lower Stanislaus River.

Carlton, J. T., J. K. Thompson, L. E. Schemel, and F. H. Nichols. 1990. Remarkable Invasion of San Francisco Bay (California, USA) by the Asian Clam *Potamocorbula amurensis*. Marine Ecology Progress Series Volume 66: 81-94.

Castleberry, D. T., J. J. Cech, M. K. Saiki, and B. A. Martin. 1991. Growth, Condition, and Physiological Performance of Juvenile Salmonids From the Lower American River: February Through June, 1991.

Cavallo, B. 2003. Feather River Juvenile Fish Studies As They Relate to Instream Flow Studies-Unpublished Work.

CDFG. 1965. California Fish and Wildlife Plan, Volume III, Supporting Data: Part A - Inventory (Wildlife and Inland Fish), Part B - Inventory (Salmon-Steelhead and Marine Resources), and Part C - Land and Water Use Habitat & Resource 1980 Human Use.

CDFG. 1983. Salmon Fingerlings in Streams Planted With Fry.

CDFG. 1986. Instream Flow Requirements Anadromous Salmonids Spawning and Rearing Lagunitas Creek, Marin County. Stream Evaluation Report 86-2.

CDFG. 1991a. Lower Mokelumne River Fisheries Management Plan.

CDFG. 1991b. Lower Yuba River Fisheries Management Plan.

CDFG. 1991c. Steelhead Restoration Plan for the American River. Prepared by D. McEwan and J. Nelson.

CDFG. 1996a. Adult Salmon Migration Monitoring, Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Gates, September - November 1994. Technical Report 50, November 1996. Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary. Prepared by G.W. Edwards, K. Urquhart, and T. Tillman.

CDFG. 1996b. Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California. Prepared by D. McEwan and T.A. Jackson. California Department of Fish and Game.

CDFG. 1998. Report to the Fish and Game Commission: Report to the Fish and Game Commission: A Status Review of the Spring-Run Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*) in the Sacramento River Drainage. Candidate Species Status Report 98-01. Sacramento, CA: Department of Fish and Game.

CDFG. 1999a. Butte Creek Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*, Juvenile Outmigration and Life History 1995-1998. Inland Fisheries Administrative Report No. 99-5. Prepared by Katherine A. Hill and Jason D. Webber, Sacramento Valley and Central Sierra Region.

CDFG. 1999b. Juvenile Spring-Run Chinook Salmon Emergence, Bearing and Outmigration Patterns in Deer and Mill Creeks, Tehama County, for the 1997 Brood Year.

CDFG. 1999c. Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project, 1999 Angler Sorvey. Prepared by K. Murphy, L. Hanson, M. Harris and T. Schroyer.

CDFG. 2000a. Butte Creek, Big Chico, and Sutter Bypass Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Evaluation.

CDFG. 2000b. Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project, 2000 Angler Sorvey. Prepared by K. Murphy, L. Hanson, M. Harris and T. Schroyer.

CDFG. 2001a. An Evaluation of Big Chico Creek, Lindo Channel, and Mud Creek As Salmonid Nonnatal Rearing Habitats.

CDFG. 2001b. Lower American River Flow Fluctuation Study 1997-2000: Evaluation of the Effects of Flow Fluctuations on the Anadromous Fish Populations in the Lower American River. Stream Evaluation Program Technical Report No. 01-2. Prepared for U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

CDFG. 2001c. Preliminary Draft Evaluation of Effects of Flow Fluctuations on the Anadromous Fish Populations in the Lower American River. Stream Evaluation Program Technical Report No. 01-2. Prepared for U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

CDFG. 2001d. Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project, 2001 Angler Sorvey. Prepared by K. Murphy, L. Hanson, M. Harris and T. Schroyer.

CDFG. 2002a. Sacramento River Spring-Run Chinook Salmon - 2001 Annual Report. 2001 Annual Report for the Fish and Game Commission.

CDFG. 2002b. Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project, 2002 Angler Sorvey. Prepared by K. Murphy, L. Hanson, M. Harris and T. Schroyer.

CDFG. 2004. Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Biennial Report (2002-2003). Prepared for the Fish and Game Commission.

CDFG. 2004. Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. Available at http://www.delta.dfg.ca.gov.afrp. Accessed on May 27, 2004.

CDFG. 2004a. Butte and Big Chico Creeks Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha* Life History Investigation 2002-2003. Inland Fisheries Administrative Report No. 2004-6. Prepared by Paul D. Ward, Tracy R. McReynolds and Clint E. Garman, Sacramento Valley - Central Sierra Region.

CDFG. 2004b. Sacramento River Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, Biennial Report 2002 - 2003. Prepared for the Fish and Game Commission.

CDFG. 2004c. Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Biennial Report (2002-2003). Prepared for the Fish and Game Commission.

CDFG. Phase II - Final Engineering, Construction Design and Cost Estimate for Iron Canyon Fish Ladder. Available at www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/AFRP/Project.asp?code=2005-02. Accessed on June 28, 2007.

CDFG. 2007. Grandtab, Unpublished Data, Summaries of Salmon and Steelhead Populations in the Central Valley of California.

CDFG and NMFS. 2001. Joint Hatchery Review Committee Final Report on Anadromous Salmonid Fish Hatcheries in California.

CDFG, NMFS, and Joint Hatchery Review Committee. 2001. Appendix I. Report of the Subcommittee on Off-Site Release and Straying of Hatchery Produced Chinook Salmon *in* Final Report on Anadromous Salmonid Fish Hatcheries in California.

Cech, J. J. and C. A. Myrick. 1999. Steelhead and Chinook Salmon Bioenergetics: Temperature, Ration, and Genetic Effects. Technical Completion Report- Project No. UCAL-WRC-W-885. University of California Water Resources Center.

Chambers, J. S. 1956. Research Relating to Study of Spawning Grounds in Natural Areas 1953-54. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, North Pacific Division, Fisheries Engineering Research Program.

Choe, K., G. A. Gill, and R. Lehman. 2003. Distribution of Particulate, Colloidal, and Dissolved Mercury in San Francisco Bay Estuary. 1. Total Mercury. Limnology and Oceanography Volume 48: 1535-1546.

Churn Creek Task Force. 1991. Report to the City Council. August 1991. Available at http://sacriver.org. Accessed 4/17/2008.

City of Auburn. 1997. Final Environmental Impact Report for the Auburn Wastewater Facility Plan. SCH No. 95082040.

City of Roseville. 2003. Dry Creek Waste Water Treatment Plant Notice of Violation - Technical Report.

Clark, G. H. 1929. Sacramento-San Joaquin Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tschawytscha*) Fishery of California. Fish Bulletin Volume 17: 1-73.

Clifford, M. A., K. J. Eder, I. Werner, and R. P. Hedrick. 2005. Synergistic Effects of Esfenvalerate and Infectious Hematopoietic Necrosis Virus on Juvenile Chinook Salmon Mortality. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry Volume 24: 1766-1772.

Cooper, R. and T. H. Johnson. 1992. Trends in Steelhead Abundance in Washington and Along the Pacific Coast of North America. Washington Department of Wildlife, Fish Management Division, Report 92-20, 90 p.

County of Butte. Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan: Section 5 Conservation Strategies. Available at http://www.buttecounty.net. Accessed on November 7, 2007.

Cramer, S. P., M. Daigneault, M. Teply, and R2 Resource Consultants Inc. 2003. Step 1 Report: Conceptual Framework for an Integrated Life Cycle Model of Winter-Run Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River. Draft Report.

Cramer, S. P. and D. B. Demko. 1997. The Status of Late-Fall and Spring Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River Basin Regarding the Endangered Species Act. Special Report submitted to National Marine Fisheries Service on behalf of Association of California Water Agencies and California Urban Water Agencies. Sacramento CA.

CUWA and SWC. 2004. Responses to Interagency Project Work Team Comments On the Integrated Modeling Framework for Winter-Run Chinook. Prepared by S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc. June 2004.

Deer Creek Conservancy. Deer Creek Watershed Existing Conditions Report. Available at http://deercreekconservancy.org. Accessed on June 28, 2007.

DeHaven, R. W. 1989. Distribution, Extent, Replaceability and Relative Values to Fish and Wildlife of Shaded Riverine Aquatic Cover of the Lower Sacramento River, California, Part I: 1987-88 Study Results and Recommendations.

Doyle, R. w., C. Herbinger, C. T. Taggart, and S. Lochmann. 1995. Use of DNA Micorsatellite Polymorphism to Analyze Genetic Correlations between Hatchery and Natural Fitness. AFS Symposium 205-211.

Dugdale R. C., Wilkerson F. P, Hogue V. E., Marchi A. 2007. The role of ammonium and nitrate in spring bloom development in San Francisco Bay. Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, Vol 73, 17-29.

DWR. 1983. Agreement Concerning the Operation of the Oroville Division of the State Water Project for Management of Fish and Wildlife.

DWR. 1996. Feather River Gravel Study - Fish Diversion Dam to Honcut Creek.

DWR. 2001. Initial Information Package Relicensing of the Oroville Facilities January, 2001. FERC License Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2002a. Emigration of Juvenile Chinook Salmon in the Feather River, 1998-2001. Department of Water Resources, Division of Environmental Services.

DWR. 2002b. Evaluation of the Feather River Hatchery Effects on Naturally Spawning Salmonids. SP-F9. Oroville Facilities Relicensing FERC Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2002c. Miners Ravine Habitat Assessment.

DWR. 2003. Timing, Thermal Tolerance Ranges, and Potential Water Temperature Effects on Emigrating Juvenile Salmonids in the Lower Feather River. SP-F10, Task 4B. Oroville Facilities Relicensing FERC Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2004a. Evaluation of the Feather River Hatchery Effects on Naturally Spawning Salmonids.

DWR. 2004b. Final Report, Distribution and Habitat Use of Juvenile Steelhead and Other Fishes of the Lower Feather River. SP-F10, Task 3A. Oroville Facilities Relicensing FERC Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2004c. Final Report, Juvenile Steelhead and Chinook Salmon Stranding in the Lower Feather River, 2001-2003. SP-F10, Task 3C. Oroville Facilities Relicensing FERC Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2004d. Final Report, Project Effects on Predation of Feather River Juvenile Anadromous Salmonids. SP-F21 Task 3. Oroville Facilities Relicensing FERC Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2004e. Phase 2 Report, Evaluation of Project Effects on Instream Flows and Fish Habitat. SP-F16. Oroville Facilities Relicensing FERC Project No. 2100.

DWR. 2005a. Bulletin 250 Fish Passage Improvement 2005 An Element of CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration Program.

DWR. 2005b. Fish Passage Improvement: An Element of CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration Program. DWR Bulletin 250. Prepared with the assistance of CDFG, NMFS, Reclamation, USFWS and USFS. June 2005.

DWR. 2006. Progress of Incorporating Climate Change into Management of California's Water Resources. Available at http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/climatechange.

DWR. Findings of the Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Gate Steering Group Technical Team. January 2001. Available at http://iep.water.ca.gov. Accessed on April 28, 2007a.

DWR. Thomes Creek. Available at http://www.nd.water.ca.gov. Accessed on June 26, 2007b.

DWR and CDFG. 2002. Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Gates Salmon Passage Evaluation Report 2001.

DWR and Reclamation. 2005. Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Gates - Proposal to Improve Fish Passage. September 2005.

DWR and Reclamation. 1999. Biological Assessment: Effects of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations From October 1998 Through March 2000 on Steelhead and Spring-Run Chinook Salmon.

DWR and Reclamation. 1996. Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, Interim South Delta Program (ISDP), Volume I. Prepared by Entrix, Inc. and Resource Insights, Inc.

DWR and Reclamation. 2000. Biological Assessment: Effects of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations From October 1998 Through March 2000 Steelhead and Spring-Run Chinook Salmon - Appendices A Through I.

DWR. 2007. Calaveras River Fish Migration Barriers Assessment Report.

EBMUD. 1992. Updated WSMP EIS/EIR Appendix B1 Lower Mokelumne River Management Plan. Prepared by BioSystems Analysis, Inc.

EBMUD. Lower Mokelumne River Redd Surveys. Available at http://www.ebmud.com. Accessed on June 25, 2007.

ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2003. Dry Creek Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Plan Placer and Sacramento Counties, California Public Review Draft.

EDAW. 2005. Campus WWTP Expansion Draft EIR. University of California, Davis.

EIP Associates. 1993. Dry Creek - West Placer Community Facilities District Draft Environmental Impact Report With Revisions From June 28, 1993 Final EIR.

EPA. 2006. Abandoned Mine Lands Case Study Iron Mountain Mine Success Through Planning, Partnerships, and Perseverance.

Everest, F. H., R. L. Beschta, J. C. Scrivener, K. V. Koski, J. R. Sedell, and C. J. Cederholm. 1986. Fine Sediment and Salmonid Production: A Paradox. Chapter 4 in Streamside Management: Forestry and Fishery Interactions.

Federal Register. 1989. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Critical Habitat; Winter-run Chinook Salmon. Vol 54:32085-32068. August 4, 1989.

Federal Register. 1990. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Final Rule. Vol 55:46515-46523. November 5, 1990.

Federal Register. 1992. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Endangered Status for Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Vol 57:27416-27423. June 19, 1992.

Federal Register. 1992. NMFS. Designated Critical Habitat; Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Proposed Rule. Vol 57:36626-36632. August 13, 1992.

Federal Register. 1993. NMFS. Designated Critical Habitat; Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Vol 58:33212-33219. June 16, 1993.

Federal Register. 1994. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Status of Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Final Rule. Vol 59:440-450. January 4, 1994.

Federal Register. 1996. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Proposed Endangered Status for Five ESUs of Steelhead and Proposed Threatened Status for Five ESUs of Steelhead in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California. Vol 61:41541-41561. August 1996.

Federal Register. 1998. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Proposed Endangered Status for Two Chinook Salmon ESUs and Proposed Threatened Status for Five Chinook Salmon ESUs; Proposed Redefinition, Threatened Status, and Revision of Critical Habitat for One Chinook Salmon ESU; Proposed Designation of Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat in California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho. Vol 63:11482-11520. March 9, 1998.

Federal Register. 1998. NMFS. Final Rule: Notice of Determination. Endangered and Threatened Species: Threatened Status for Two ESUs of Steelhead in Washington, Oregon, and California. Vol 63:13347-13371. March 19, 1998.

Federal Register. 1999. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Threatened Status for Two Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) in California; Final Rule. Vol 64:50394-50415. September 16, 1999.

Federal Register. 2000. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Salmon and Steelhead; Final Rule. Vol 65:42421-42481. July 10, 2000.

Federal Register. 2002. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Final Rule Governing Take of Four Threatened Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) of West Coast Salmonids. Vol 67:1116-1133. January 9, 2002.

Federal Register. 2004. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Extension of Public Comment Period and Notice of Rescheduled Public Hearing on Proposed Listing Determinations for West Coast Salmonids. Vol 69:61348-61349. October 18, 2004.

Federal Register. 2004. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Proposed Listing Determinations for 27 ESUs of West Coast Salmonids. Vol 69:33102-33179. June 14, 2004.

Federal Register. 2005. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Listing Determinations for 16 ESUs of West Coast Salmon, and Final 4(d) Protective Regulations for Threatened Salmonid ESUs. Final Rule. Vol 70:37160. June 28, 2005.

Federal Register. 2005. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for Seven Evolutionarily Significant Units of Pacific Salmon and Steelhead in California; Final Rule. Vol 70:52488-52627. September 2, 2005.

Federal Register. 2006. NMFS. Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Listing Determinations for 10 Distinct Population Segments of West Coast Steelhead, Final Rule. Vol 71:834-862. January 5, 2006.

Fisher, F. W. 1994. Past and Present Status of Central Valley Chinook Salmon. Conservation Biology Volume 8: 870-873.

Fishery Foundation of California. 2004. Lower Calaveras River Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Limiting Factors Analysis. Prepared by Stillwater Sciences.

Fleming, I. A. and M. R. Gross. 1992. Reproductive Behavior of Hatchery and Wild Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*): Does it Differ? Aquaculture Volume 103: 101-121.

FERC. 2007. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Oroville Facilities, California (FERC Project No. 2100). FERC/FEIS-0202F, Final Environmental Impact Statement for Hydropower License. May 18, 2007.

Foothill Associates. July 2003. Roseville Creek and Riparian Management and Restoration Plan, Notes From Public Forum No. 1.

Fry, D. H. 1961. King Salmon Spawning Stocks of the California Central Valley, 1940-1959. Calif.Fish and Game Volume 47: 55-71.

Fukushima, M., T. P. Quinn, and W. W. Smoker. 1998. Estimation of Eggs Lost from Superimposed Pink Salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) Redds. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 55: 618-625.

Gangmark, H. A. and R. G. Bakkala. 1960. A Comparative Study of Unstable and Stable (Artificial Channel) Spawning Streams for Incubating King Salmon at Mill Creek. California Fish and Game Volume 46: 151-164.

Gauthier, A. J., Hoover, K. A. 2005. Sediment Delivery from Chronic Slope Failures, Thomes Creek, California. American Geophysical Union, Fall Meeting 2005, abstract #H51C-0382.

Good, T. P., R. S. Waples, and P. Adams. 2005. Updated Status of Federally Listed ESUs of West Coast Salmon and Steelhead. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-66.

Grover, A., A. Low, P. Ward, J. Smith, M. Mohr, D. Viele, C. Tracy. 2004. Recommendations for Developing Fishery Management Plan Conservation Objectives for Sacramento River Winter Chinook and Sacramento River Spring Chinook. Progress Report, March 2004.

Hallock, R. J. 1989. Upper Sacramento River Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus Mykiss*) 1952 - 1988.

Hallock, R. J. and F. W. Fisher. 1985. Status of Winter-Run Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*) in the Sacramento River.

Hallock, R. J., W. F. Van Woert, and L. Shapovalov. 1961. An Evaluation of Stocking Hatchery-Reared Steelhead Rainbow Trout (*Salmo Gairdnerii Gairdnerii*) in the Sacramento River System. Fish Bulletin No. 114. Sacramento, CA: Department of Fish and Game.

Hamilton, S. J. 2003. Review of Residue-Based Selenium Toxicity Thresholds for Freshwater Fish. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety (2003) 201-210Elsevier Inc.

Hannaford, M. J. 2000. Final Report, Preliminary Water Quality Assessment of Cow Creek Tributaries.

Hannon, J. and B. Deason. 2005. American River Steelhead *(Onchorhynchus mykiss*) Spawning 2001-2005. Central Valley Project, American River, California Mid-Pacific Region. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Hare, S. R. and N. J. Martua. 2001. An Historical Narrative on the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, Interdecadal Climate Variability and Ecosystem Impacts. Proceedings of the 20th Northeast Pacific Pink and Chum Salmon Workshop, Seattle Washington. 20-36.

Harvey-Arrison, C., DFG, Sacramento, CA; meeting notes taken by B.Cavallo, Environmental Scientist, DWR, Sacramento, CA; Salmon Escapement Project Work Team Meeting, March 30, 2004.

Heady, W. 2008. Ecological Effects of Engineering two side channels in the Mokelumne River, California. Presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the Cal-Neva Chapter of the American Fisheries Society. April 3-5, 2008.

Healey, M. C. 1980. Utilization of the Nanaimo River Estuary by Juvenile Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*. U.S. Fisheries Bulletin 653-668.

Healey, M. C. 1983. Coastwide Distribution and Ocean Migration Patterns of Stream- and Ocean-Type Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*. Canadian Field-Naturalist 427-433.

Healey, M. C. 1991. Life History of Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*) *in* Pacific Salmon Life Histories. Groot, C. and Margolis, L. (ed.), Vancouver B.C.: UBC Press, pp 311-393.

Hedgecock, D., M. A. Banks, V. K. Rashbrook, C. A. Dean, and S. M. Blankenship. 2001. Applications of Population Genetics to Conservation of Chinook Salmon Diversity in the Central Valley *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp 45-70.

Hilborn, R. 1992. Hatcheries and the Future of Salmon in the Northwest. Fisheries Volume 17: 5-8.

Hindar, K., N. Ryman, and F. Utter. 1991. Genetic Effects of Cultured Fish on Natural Populations. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 48: 945-957.

Hollowed, A. B., S. R. Hare, and W. S. Wooster. 2001. Pacific Basin Climate Variability and Patterns of Northeast Pacific Marine Fish Production. Prog. Oceanography Volume 49: 257-282.

Humpesch, U. H. 1985. Inter- and Intra-Specific Variation in Hatching Success and Embryonic Development of Five Species of Salmonids and *Thymallus thymallus*. Archiwum Hydrobiologia Volume 104: 129-144.

IEP Website. 2007. Steelhead Project Work Team Meeting Notes. January 24, 2007. Available at: www.iep.ca.gov/central_valley_salmon/sh/STH_PWT_mtg_Notes_1-24-07.doc. Accessed 04/18/2008.

Interagency Ecological Program Steelhead Project Work Team. Monitoring, Assessment, and Research on Central Valley Steelhead: Status of Knowledge, Review of Existing Programs, and Assessment of Needs. Available at http://calfed.ca.gov. Accessed on October 3, 2001.

Johnson, R. R., D. C. Weigand, and F. W. Fisher. 1992. Use of Growth Data to Determine the Spatial and Temporal Distribution of Four Runs of Juvenile Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento River, California. USFWS Report No. AFF1-FRO-92-15. Red Bluff, CA: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

JSA. 1999a. City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility Draft Environmental Impact Report. SCN #98122071.

JSA. 1999b. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion to 2.4 Million Gallons Per Day. State Clearinghouse Number 98102027. City of Lincoln.

JSA. 2004. Bear River and Western Pacific Interceptor Canal Levee Improvements Project Environmental Impact Report. Draft. Prepared for Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority. Sacramento, CA. State Clearinghouse No. 2004032118.

Kamler, E. and T. Kato. 1983. Efficiency of Yolk Utilization by *Salmo gairdneri* in Relation to Incubation Temperature and Egg Size. Polskie Archiwum Hydrobiologii Volume 30: 271-306.

Kastner, A. 2003. Feather River Hatchery- Draft Annual Report 2002-2003. Wildlife and Inland Fisheries Division Administrative Report. California Department of Fish and Game.

Kier Associates. 1999. CALFED Upper Yuba River Studies Stakeholder Process Workgroup - Comments on Restoring Anadromous Fish Habitat Above Englebright Dam.

Kimmerer, W. 2006. Losses of Winter-Run Chinook Salmon and Delta Smelt to Export Entrainment in the Southern Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Kimmerer, W. J., E. Gartside, and J. J. Orsi. 1994. Predation by an Introduced Clam as the Likely Cause of Substantial Declines in Zooplankton of San Francisco Bay. Marine Ecology Progress Series Volume 113: 81-93.

Kiparsky, M. and P. H. Gleick. 2003. Climate Change and California Water Resources: A Survey and Summary of the Literature. The California Water Plan, Volume 4 - Reference Guide. Oakland, California.: Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security.

Kjelson, M. A., P. F. Raquel, and F. W. Fisher. 1981. The Life History of Juvenile Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary of California. Estuaries Volume 4: 285.

Kjelson, M. A., P. F. Raquel, and F. W. Fisher. 1982. Life History of Fall-Run Juvenile Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary, California Kennedy, V. S. (ed.), New York: Academic Press, pp 393-411.

Klamath Resource Information System (KRIS). 2007. Watershed Analysis for Mill, Deer, and Antelope Creeks. Available at http://www.krisweb.com. Accessed on April 30, 2007.

KRIS. Wecome to KRIS Web. Available at http://www.krisweb.com/index.htm. Accessed on November 7, 2007.

Knowles, N., M. Dettinger, and D. Cayan. 2006. Trends in Snowfall Versus Rainfall in the Western United States. Journal of Climate Volume 19: 4545-4559.

Kruse, G. H. 1998. Salmon Run Failures in 1997-1998: A Link to Anadromous Ocean Conditions? Alaska Fish Research Bulletin Volume 5: 55-63.

Kuivla, K. M. and G. E. Moon. 2004. Potential Exposure of Larval and Juvenile Delta Smelt to Dissolved Pesticides in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California. American Fisheries Society Symposium Volume 39: 229-241.

Leary, R. F., F. W. Allendorf, and G. K. Sage. 1995. Hybridization and Introgression Between Introduced and Native Fish. American Fisheries Society Symposium Volume 15: 91-101.

Lee, D.P. 2008. Fifty Years of Steelhead Planting and Monitoring at Nimbus Fish Hatchery. Presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the Cal-Neva Chapter of the American Fisheries Society. April 3-5, 2008.

Levings, C. D. and D. Bouillon. 2005. Criteria for Evaluating the Survival Value of Estuaries for Salmonids. NOAA-NMFS-NWFSC TM-29.

Levy, D. A. and T. G. Northcote. 1981. The Distribution and Abundance of Juvenile Salmon in Marsh Habitats of the Fraser River Estuary. Technical Report No. 25. Vancouver: Westwater Research Centre, University of British Columbia.

Lindley, S. T. and M. S. Mohr. 2003. Modeling the Effects of Striped Bass (*Morone saxatilis*) on the Population Viability of Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). Fishery Bulletin Volume 101: 321-331.

Lindley, S. T., R. Schick, B. P. May, C. Hanson, A. Low, D. McEwan, R. B. MacFarlane, C. Swanson, and J. G. Williams. 2004. Population Structure of Threatened and Endangered Chinook Salmon ESU's in California's Central Valley Basin. SWFSC-370.

Lindley, S. T., R. S. Schick, A. Agrawal, M. Goslin, T. E. Pearson, E. Mora, J. Anderson, B. May, S. Greene, C. Hanson, A. Low, D. McEwan, R. B. MacFarlane, C. Swanson, and J. G. Williams. 2006. Historical Population Structure of Central Valley Steelhead and its Alteration by Dams. San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science Volume 4, Issue 1. February 2006.

Lindley, S., R. Schick, E. Mora, P. B. Adams, J. J. Anderson, S. Greene, C. Hanson, B. P. May, D. McEwan, R. B. MacFarlane, C. Swanson, and J. G. Williams. 2007. Framework for Assessing Viability of Threatened and Endangered Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. San Francisco Estuary & Watershed Science Volume 5, Issue 1. Article 4: California Bay-Delta Authority Science Program and the John Muir Institute of the Environment.

Lindsay, R. B. 1985. Wild Spring Chinook Salmon in the John Day River System. Portland, Oregon: Bonneville Power Administration, Division of Fish and Wildlife.

Lufkin, A. (ed.). 1996. California's Salmon and Steelhead, The Struggle to Restore an Imperiled Resource. Berkeley: University of California Press.

MacFarlane, R. B. and E. C. Norton. 2002. Physiological Ecology of Juvenile Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) at the Southern End of Their Distribution, the San Francisco Estuary and Gulf of the Farallones, California. Fisheries Bulletin Volume 100: 244-257.

MacWilliams, M. L., R. L. Street, and P. K. Kitanidis. 2004. Modeling Floodplain Flow on Lower Deer Creek, CA.

Marine, K. R. 1992. A Background Investigation and Review of the Effects of Elevated Water Temperature on Reproductive Performance of Adult Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*) With Suggestions for Approaches to the Assessment of Temperature Induced Reproductive Impairment of Chinook Salmon Stocks in the American River, California. Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, University of California Davis.

Marine, K. R. 1997. Effects of Elevated Water Temperature on Some Aspects of the Physiological and Ecological Performance of Juvenile Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*): Implications for Management of California's Central Valley Salmon Stocks. University of California, Davis.

Marine, K. R. and J. J. Cech. 2004. Effects of High Water Temperature on Growth, Smoltification, and Predator Avoidance in Juvenile Sacramento River Chinook Salmon. North American Journal of Fisheries Management Volume 24: 198-210. Bethesda, Maryland: American Fisheries Society.

Marsh, G. D. 2007. Historic and Present Distribution of Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Calaveras River. San Francisco Estuary & Watershed Science Volume 5, Issue 3.

Martin, C. D., P. D. Gaines, and R. R. Johnson. 2001. Estimating the Abundance of Sacramento River Juvenile Winter Chinook Salmon With Comparisons to Adult Escapement. Red Bluff Research Pumping Plant Report Series, Volume 5. Red Bluff, CA: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Maslin, P., M. Lennox, J. Kindrop, and C. Storm. 1999. Intermittent Streams As Rearing Habitat for Sacramento River Chinook Salmon. Department of Biological Sciences. CSU Chico.

Mayfield, R. 2008. Death from Above? Bird Predation and Juvenile Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in Clifton Court Forebay. Presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the Cal-Neva Chapter of the American Fisheries Society. April 3-5, 2008.

McBain & Trush. 1998. Draft Tuolumne River Corridor Restoration Plan, Stanislaus County, CA. Prepared for Tuolumne River Technical Advisory Committee (Don Pedro Project, FERC License No. 2299).

McBain and Trush. 2000. Habitat Restoration Plan for the lower Tuolumne River Corridor. Prepared for the Tuolumne River Technical Adviosory Committee. Available at: http://www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/AFRP/documents/tuolplan2.pdf. Accessed 04/17/2008.

McElhany, P., M. H. Rucklelshaus, M. J. Ford, T. C. Wainwright, and E. P. Bjorkstedt. 2000. Viable Salmonid Populations and the Recovery of Evolutionarily Significant Units. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-42.

McEwan, D. 2001. Central Valley Steelhead *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp 1-43.

McReynolds, T.R., C. E. Garman, P. D. Ward, and S. L. Plemons. 2007. Butte and Big Chico Creeks Spring-run Chinook Salmon Life History Investigation, 2005-2006. Administrative Report No. 2007-2.

Mesick, C. McLain, J. Marston, D. and Heyne, T. 2007. Limiting Fact Analyses and Recommended Studies for Fall-run Chinook Salmon and Rainbow Trout in the Tuolumne River. February 27, 2007.

Meyer, J. H. 1979. A Review of the Literature on the Value of Estuarine and Shoreline Areas to Juvenile Salmonids in Puget Sound, Washington.

Moffett, J. A. 1949. The First Four Years of King Salmon Maintenance Below Shasta Dam, Sacramento River, California. California Fish and Game Volume 35.

Moyle, P. B. 2002. Inland Fishes of California. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press,

Moyle, P. B., R. M. Yoshiyama, J. E. Williams, and E. D. Wikramanayake. 1995. Fish Species of Special Concern in California. 2nd. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game.

Myers, J. M., R. G. Kope, G. J. Bryant, D. Teel, L. J. Lierheimer, T. C. Wainwright, W. S. Grant, F. W. Waknitz, K. Neely, S. T. Lindley, and R. S. Waples. 1998. Status Review of Chinook Salmon From Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. Report No. NMFS-NWFSC-35. NOAA Tech. Memo. U.S. Department of Commerce.

Myers, K. W., D. E. Rogers, C. K. Harris, C. M. Knidsen, R. V. Walker, and N. D. Davis. 1984. Origins of Chinook Salmon in the Area of the Japanese Motherships and Landbased Driftnet Salmon Fisheries 1975-1981.

Myers, K. W., R. V. Walker, H. R. Carlson, and J. H. Helle. 2000. Synthesis and Review of U.S. Research on the Physical and Biological Factors Affecting Ocean Production of Salmon. Anadromous Fish Bulletin Volume 2: 1-9.

Myrick, C. A. and J. J. Cech. 2001. Temperature Effects on Chinook Salmon and Steelhead: A Review Focusing on California's Central Valley Populations. Bay-Delta Modeling Forum Technical Publication 01-1.

Nickelson, T. E. 1986. Influences of Upwelling, Ocean Temperature, and Smolt Abundance on Marine Survival of Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) in the Oregon Production Area. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 43: 527-535.

Nielsen, J. L., S. Pavey, T. Wiacek, G. K. Sage, and I. Williams. 2003. Genetic Analyses of Central Valley Trout Populations, 1999-2003. Final Technical Report. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game.

Niemela, K., Ardren,W. Matala, A., Hamelberg, S. Null, R. 2008. Relative reproductive success of hatchery and natural steelhead from an intermingled population in Battle Creek, California. Presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the Cal-Neva Chapter of the American Fisheries Society. April 3-5, 2008.

NMFS. 1996a. Coastal Upwelling Indices West Coast of North America 1946-95. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-231.

NMFS. 1996b. Factors For Decline: A Supplement to the Notice of Determination for West Coast Steelhead Under the Endangered Species Act.

NMFS. 1996c. Biological Assessment for The Fishery Management Plan for Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries Off the Coasts of Washington, Oregon and California As It Affects the Sacramento River Winter Chinook Salmon. National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Region, Fisheries Management Division, February 23, 1996.

NMFS. 1997. Proposed Recovery Plan for the Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Long Beach, CA: National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region.

NMFS. 1998. Factors Contributing to the Decline of Chinook Salmon: An Addendum to the 1996 West Coast Steelhead Factors for Decline Report. Portland, Oregon: Protected Resources Division, National Marine Fisheries Service.

NMFS. 2000. Biological Opinion for the Proposed Operation of the Federal Central Valley Project and the State Water Project for December 1, 1999 Through March 31, 2000.

NMFS. 2001. Biological Opinion on Interim Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project Between January 1, 2001, and March 31, 2002 on Federally Listed Threatened Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and Threatened Central Valley Steelhead in Accordance With Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), As Amended. Report No. SWR-01-SA-5667:BFO. Long Beach: National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region.

NMFS. 2002a. Biological Opinion on Interim Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project Between April 1, 2002 and March 31, 2004, on Federally Listed Threatened Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and Threatened Central Valley Steelhead in Accordance With Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, As Amended. Long Beach: National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region.

NMFS. 2002b. Final Biological Opinion on Lower Stony Creek Water Management Operations.

NMFS. 2003. Preliminary Conclusions Regarding the Updated Status of Listed ESUs of West Coast Salmon and Steelhead. Draft Report February 2003. West Coast Salmon Biological Review Team. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service-Northwest Fisheries Science Center.

NMFS. 2004a. Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan. Prepared by National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region.

NMFS. 2004b. Supplemental Biological Opinion on Authorization of Ocean Salmon Fisheries Developed in Accordance with the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan and Proposed Protective Measures During 2004 through 2009 Fishing Seasons as it Affects Sacramento Winter Chinook Salmon. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Protected Resources Division. 22p.

NMFS. 2005. Central Valley Chinook Salmon Historic Stream Habitat Distribution Table. Available at http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov. Accessed on April 13, 2005.

NMFS. 2005. The NMFS Review Process for the California Central Valley and State Water Projects' Biological Opinion Deviated From the Region's Normal Practice. Final Audit Report No. STL - 17242-5-0001/July 2005.

NMFS. 2006a. Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance.

NMFS 2006b. Biological and Conference Opinion for the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel Dredging and Levee Stabilization Project. Southwest Region, National Marine Fisheries Service. File No. 151422SWR2004SA9121:JSS.

NMFS. 2007. California Coastal Salmon and Steelhead Current Stream Habitat Distribution Table. Available at http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov. Accessed on June, 2007.

NMFS. 2007a. Monitoring and Research Needed to Manage the Recovery of Threatened and Endangered Chinook and Steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. Prepared by J.G. Williams, J.J. Anderson, S. Greene, C. Hanson, S.T. Lindley, A. Low, B.P. May, D. McEwan, M.S. Mohr, R. B MacFarlane, C. Swanson. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-399.

NMFS. 2007b. Summary of Threats and Recovery Actions for Spring-Run and Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Notes from Sacramento Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Workshop, May 22, 2007.

NMFS. 2007c. Biological Opinion: Operation of Englebright and Daguerre Point Dams on the Yuba River, California, for a 1-year period. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, April 27, 2007.

Olson, D. E., B. C. Cates, and D. H. Diggs. 1995. Use of a National Fish Hatchery to Complement Wild Salmon and Steelhead Production in an Oregon Stream. American Fisheries Society Symposium Volume 15: 317-328.

Ordal, E. J. and R. E. Pacha. 1963. The Effects of Temperature on Disease in Fish *in* Proceedings of the 12th Pacific Northwest Symposium on Water Pollution Research. pp 39-56.

Oros, D. R. and I. Werner. 2005. Pyrethroid Insecticides: An Analysis of Use Patterns, Distributions, Potential Toxicity and Fate in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Central Valley. White Paper for the Interagency Ecological Program. SFEI Contribution 415. San Francisco Estuary Institute, Oakland, CA.

Orsi, J. J. 1967. Predation Study Report - 1966-1967. DFG.

Painter, R. E., L. H. Wixom, and S. N. Taylor. 1977. An Evaluation of Fish Populations and Fisheries in the Post-Oroville Project Feather River.

Pearcy, W. G. 1992. Ocean Ecology of North Pacific Salmonids. University of Washington Press, Seattle, Washington.

Pearcy, W. G. 1997. Salmon Production in Changing Ocean Regimes. In Pacific Salmon and Their Ecosystems, Status and Future Options Stouder, D. J., Bisson, P. A., and Nuiman, R. J. (ed.), Chapman and Hall, New York.

PFMC. 2000. Amendment 14 to the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan (1997). Incorporating the Regulatory Impact Review/Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Approval and implementation of Amendment 14 to the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan (1997). Available at www.pcouncil.org.

PFMC. 2003. Review of 2002 Ocean Salmon Fisheries. Portland, OR: Pacific Fishery Management Council. Available at www.pcouncil.org.

PFMC. 2007. Pacific Fishery Management Council. Available at http://www.pcouncil.org. Accessed on November 8, 2007.

PG&E. 2005. DeSabla-Centerville Project FERC No. 803 Biological Assessment: Spring-Run Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*).

Quinn, T. P. 2005. The Behavior and Ecology of Pacific Salmon and Trout. University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Raleigh, R. F., W. J. Miller, and P. C. Nelson. 1986. Habitat Suitability Index Models and Instream Flow Suitability Curves: Chinook Salmon. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Reclamation. 1992. Biological Assessment for USBR Long-Term Central Valley Project Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP).

Reclamation. 1996. American River Water Resources Investigation Planning Report and Draft Environmental Impact Statement Report/Environmental Impact Statement Appendices Volume 1.

Reclamation. 1997. Central Valley Improvement Act Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Technical Appendix Volume III. Sacramento, CA: U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Reclamation. 2003. Long-Term Central Valley Project OCAP BA, CVP-OCAP. Draft- Preliminary Working Draft.

Reclamation, PG&E, NMFS, USFWS, and CDFG. 2004. Draft Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project Adaptive Management Plan.

Reclamation. 2007. Hamilton City Pumping Plant Fish Facility CVPIA Section 3406 (b)(20). Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2007. Lead - Lauren Carly, Co-Lead - Aondrea Leigh-Bartoo.

Reclamation and SWRCB. 2005. Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Revised Environmental Impact Report.

Reclamation, PG&E, NMFS, USFWS, and CDFG. 2004. Draft Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project Adaptive Management Plan.

Redding, J. M. and C. B. Schreck. 1979. Possible Adaptive Significance of Certain Enzyme Polymorphisms in Steelhead Trout (*Salmo gairdneri*). Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada Volume 36: 544-551.

Reiser, D. W. and T. C. Bjornn. 1979. Influence of Forest and Rangeland Management of Anadromous Fish Habitat in Western North America - Habitat Requirements of Anadromous Salmonids. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report PNW-96.

Reiser, D. W., C. M. Huang, S. Beck, M. Gagner, and E. Jeanes. 2006. Defining Flow Windows for Upstream Passage of Adult Anadromous Salmonids at Cascades and Falls. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society Volume 135: 668-679.

Reynolds, F. L., T. Mills, R. Benthin, and A. Low. 1993. Central Valley Anadromous Fisheries and Associated Riparian and Wetlands Areas Protection and Restoration Action Plan. Draft.

Rich, A. A. 1987. Water Temperatures Which Optimize Growth and Survival of the Anadromous Fishery Resources of the Lower American River.

Rombough, P. J. 1988. Growth, Aerobic Metabolism, and Dissolved Oxygen Requirements of Embryos and Alevins of Steelhead, *Salmo gairdneri*. Canadian Journal of Zoology Volume 66: 651-660.

Roos, M. 2003. Accounting for Climate Change. The California Water Plan, Volume 4 - Reference Guide. Oakland, California.: Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security.

RWQCB. 2005. Waste Discharge Requirements for City of Auburn Wastewater Treatment Plant, Placer County Order No. R5-2005-0030, NPDES No. CA0077712.

Ryman, N. and L. Laikre. 1991. Effects of Supportive Breeding on the Genetically Effective Population Size. Conservation Biology Volume 5: 325-329.

Sacramento Watersheds Action Group. 1998. Sulphur Creek Watershed Analysis and Action Plan. Prepared for the Cantara Trustee Council. Available at: http://sacriver.org. Accessed 04/17/2008.

Seesholtz, A., B. Cavallo, J. Kindopp, R. Kurth, and M. Perrone. 2003. Lower Feather River Juvenile Communities: Distribution, Emigration Patterns, and Association With Environmental Variables. *In* Early Life History of Fishes in the San Francisco Estuary and Watershed: Symposium and Proceedings Volume American Fisheries Society, Larval Fish Conference, August 20-23, 2003, Santa Cruz, California.

SFEI. 2007. The Pulse of the Estuary: Monitoring and Managing Water Quality in the San Francisco Estuary. SFEI Contribution 532. San Francisco Estuary Institute, Oakland, CA.

SFEP. March 1999. San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary. San Francisco Estuary Project.

SFEP and CALFED. 2006. State of the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary 2006 Science & Stewardship. State of the Estuary Proceedings. October 2005.

Shapovalov, L. and A. C. Taft. 1954. The Life Histories of the Steelhead Rainbow Trout (*Salmo Gairdneri Gairdneri*) and Silver Salmon (*Oncorhynchus Kisutch*). Fish Bulletin No. 98. State of California Department of Fish and Game.

Shelton, J. M. 1955. The Hatching of Chinook Salmon Eggs Under Simulated Stream Conditions. The Progressive Fish-Culturist 20-35.

SHN Consulting Engineering & Geologists, Inc. 2001. Cow Creek Watershed Assessment. Prepared for the Western Shasta Resource Conservation District and Cow Creek Watershed Management Group.

Sierra Business Council. 2003. Streams of Western Placer County: Aquatic Habitat and Biological Resources Literature Review.

Sierra Club. 2007. Bear River Watershed Assessment. Available at http://motherlod.sierraclub.org/4-BearRiver.htm. Accessed on November 9, 2007.

Snider, B., B. Reavis, and S. Hill. 2001. Upper Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Escapement Survey May-August 2000. Stream Evaluation Program Technical Report No. 01-1.

Snider, B. and R. Titus. 2000. Timing, Composition, and Abundance of Juvenile Anadromous Salmonid Emigration in the Sacramento River Near Knights Landing October 1996 - September 1997.

Sommer, T., B. Harrell, M. Nobiga, R. Brown, W. Kimmerer, and L. Schemel. 2001a. California's Yolo Bypass: Evidence That Flood Control Can Be Compatible With Fisheries, Wetlands, Wildlife, and Agriculture. Fisheries 26:(8) 6-16.

Sommer, T., D. McEwan, and R. Brown. 2001b. Factors Affecting Chinook Salmon Spawning in the Lower Feather River *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp 269-297.

Sommer, T. R., M. L. Nobriga, W. C. Harrell, W. Batham, and W. J. Kimmerer. 2001c. Floodplain Rearing of Juvenile Chinook Salmon: Evidence of Enhanced Growth and Survival. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 58: 325-333.

Stillwater Sciences. 2001. Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Baseline Studies Volume I: Identification of Social, Institutional, and Infrastructural Opportunities and Constraints.

Stillwater Sciences. 2007. Sacramento River Ecological Flows Study State of the System Report. Available at http://sacramentoflowstudy.stillwatersci.com. Accessed on 2007.

SWRCB. 2001. SWRCB Decision 1644 In the Matter of Fishery Resources and Water Right Issues of the Lower Yuba River: Decision Regarding Protection of Fishery Resources and Other Issues Relating to Diversion and Use of Water From the Lower Yuba River.

SWRCB. 2003. The Augmentation of the Administrative Record and Reconsideration of Water Right Decision 1644 in Light of Additional Specified Evidence As Directed by the Yuba County Superior Court. Yuba County Superior Court Case No. YCSCCVPT 03-0000589 (Lead File).

SWRI. 2001. Aquatic Resources of the Lower American River: Baseline Report Draft. Prepared for Lower American River Fisheries And Instream Habitat (FISH) Working Group. February 2001. Available at March 2001.

SWRI. 2002. Implementation Plan for Lower Yuba River: Anadromous Fish Habitat Restoration (Draft - Unpublished Report).

SWRI. 2004. Aquatic Resources of the Lower American River: Draft Baseline Report. Sacramento, CA: Surface Water Resources, Inc.

Taylor, E. B. 1991. A Review of Local Adaptation in Salmonidae, with Particular Reference to Pacific and Atlantic Salmon. Aquaculture Volume 98: 185-207.

Teh, W. J., D. Deng, I. Werner, F. Teh, and S. S. O. Hung. 2005. Sublethal Toxicity of Orchard Stormwater Runoff in Sacramento Splittail (*Pogonichthys macrolepidotus*) Larvae. Marine Environmental Research Volume 59: 203-216.

The Nature Conservancy. 2006. State of the System Report. Prepared for CALFED. November 22, 2006.

Thompson, B., T. Adelsbach, C. Brown, J. Hunt, J. Kuwabara, J. Neale, H. Ohlendorf, S. Schwarzbach, R. Spies, and K. Taberski. 2006. Biological Effects of Anthropogenic Contaminants in the San Francisco Estuary. Environmental Research.Available online at www.sciencedirect. com. December 12, 2006. Volume 105: 156-174.

Thompson, F., A. Melwani, S. Lowe, B. Greenfield, A. Robinson. 2007. Indicators of Anthropogenic Contamination in the Estuary. San Francisco Estuary Institute.

Thompson, K. 1972. Determining Stream Flows for Fish Life *in* Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission Instream Flow Requirement Workshop, March 15-16, 1972.

Timoshina, L. A. 1972. Embryonic Development of the Rainbow Trout (*Salmo gairdneri irideus* (Gibb.)) at Different Temperatures. Journal of Ichthyology Volume 12: 425-432.

USACE and Reclamation Board. 1999. Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study Interim Report.

USACE, SAFCA, and DWR. 2001. Volume I: Integrated Document, American River Watershed, California, Long-Term Study, Draft Supplemental Formulation Report / Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Impact Report.

USDI, Reclamation, San Joaquin River Group Authority, USFWS, NMFS, and DWR. 1999. Meeting Flow Objectives for the San Joaquin River Agreement 1999-2010 Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report.

USFWS. 1980. Impacts of Level Changes on Woody Riparian and Wetland Communities Volume VII Mediterranean Region, Western Arid and Semi-Arid Region. FWS/OBS-78/93. U.S. Department of the Interior.

USFWS. 1987. The Needs of Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha,* in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary- Exhibit 31.

USFWS. 1995a. Draft Anadromous Fish Restoration Plan, A Plan to Increase Natural Production of Anadromous Fish in the Central Valley of California. Prepared for the Secretary of the Interior by the USFWS with assistance from the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Core Group under authority of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

USFWS. 1995b. Working Paper on Restoration Needs: Habitat Restoration Actions to Double Natural Production of Anadromous Fish in the Central Valley of California. Volume 1. May 9, 1995. Prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services under the direction of the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Core Group. Stockton, CA.

USFWS. 1995c. Working Paper on Restoration Needs: Habitat Restoration Actions to Double Natural Production of Anadromous Fish in the Central Valley of California. Volume 2. May 9, 1995. Prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the direction of the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Core Group. Stockton, CA.

USFWS. 1995d. Working Paper on Restoration Needs: Habitat Restoration Actions to Double Natural Production of Anadromous Fish in the Central Valley of California. Volume 3. May 9, 1995. Prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services under the direction of the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Core Group. Stockton, CA.

USFWS. 1997. Abundance and Survival of Juvenile Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary. 1994 Annual Progress Report.

USFWS. 1999. Draft Programmatic Environmental Assessment Anadromous Fish Restoration Actions in Lower Deer Creek Tehama County, California.

USFWS. 2000. Anadromous Fish Restoration Actions in the Butte Creek Watershed. Draft Programmatic Environmental Assessment.

USFWS. 2001. Abundance and Survival of Juvenile Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary: 1997 and 1998. Annual Progress Report Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary.

USFWS. 2003a. Flow-Habitat Relationships for Spring-Run Chinook Salmon Spawning in Butte Creek.

USFWS. 2003b. Juvenile Salmonid Monitoring in Clear Creek, California, From July 2001 to July 2002.

USFWS. 2004. Adult Spring Chinook Salmon Monitoring in Clear Creek, California, 1999-2002.

USGS. 2000. 1999 California Hydrologic Data Report - 11455820 Carquinez Strait at Carquinez Bridge, Near Crockett, CA. Available at http://ca.water.usgs.gov/archive/waterdata/99. Accessed on November 10, 2007.

USGS. 2007. Linking Selenium Sources to Ecosystems: San Francisco Bay-Delta Model. Available at http://pubs.usgs.gov. Accessed on April 30, 2007.

Vanicek, C. D. 1993. Fisheries Habitat Evaluation, Dry Creek, Antelope Creek, Secret Ravine, and Miners Ravine (Task 1).

Vanrheenen, N. T., A. W. Wood, R. N. Palmer, and D. P. Lettenmaier. 2004. Potential Implications of PCM Climate Change Scenarios for Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin Hydrology and Water Resources. Climatic Change Volume 62: 257-281. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vestra Resources Inc. 2006. Shasta West Watershed Assessment. Prepared for Western Shasta Resource Conservation District. Available at: http://sacriver.org. Accessed 04/17/2008.

Vogel, D. A. and K. R. Marine. 1991. Guide to Upper Sacramento River Chinook Salmon Life History. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Central Valley Project. Redding, CA: CH2M Hill.

Vogel, D. A. and K. R. Marine. 1995. 1995 Evaluation of Juvenile Chinook Salmon Transport Timing in the Vicinity of the New Fish Screens at the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation Districts Sacramento River Pump Station.

Wagner, H. H. 1974. Photoperiod and Temperature Regulation of Smolting in Steelhead Trout (*Salmo gairdneri*). Canadian Journal of Zoology Volume 52: 219-234.

Waples, R. S. 1991. Genetic Interactions Between Hatchery and Wild Salmonids: Lessons from the Pacific Northwest. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science Volume 48: 124-133.

Ward, M. B. and W. M. Kier. 1999b. Maximizing Compatibility Between Coleman National Fish Hatchery Operations, Management of Lower Battle Creek, and Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Restoration. Available at www.battle-creek.net.

Ward, M. B. and W. M. Kier. 1999a. Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Plan.

Ward, P. D. and T. R. McReynolds. 2001. Butte and Big Chico Creeks Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, *Oncoryhnchus Tshawytscha*, Life History Investigation 1998-2000.

Ward, P., T. McReynolds, and C. Garman. 2003a. Butte and Big Chico Creeks Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, *Oncoryhnchus Tshawytscha*, Life History Investigations 2001-2002. Prepared for CDFG.

Ward, P. D., T. R. McReynolds, and C. E. Garman. 2003b. Butte Creek Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, *Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha*, Pre-Spawn Mortality Evaluation 2003. CDFG Inland Fisheries Administrative Report No. 2004-5.

Ward, P. D., T. R. McReynolds, and C. E. Garman. 2004. Butte and Big Chico Creeks Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, *Oncoryhnchus Tshawytscha*, Life History Investigation 2002-2003. CDFG Inland Fisheries Administrative Report No. 2004-6.

Warner, G. H. 1954. The Relationship Between Flow and Available Salmon Spawning Gravel on the Feather River Below Sutter Butte Dam.

Washington, P. M. and A. M. Koziol. 1993. Overview of the Interactions and Environmental Impacts of Hatchery Practices on Natural and Artificial Stocks of Salmonids. Fisheries Research Volume 18: 105-122.

Water Forum. 1996. Steelhead in the Lower American River. Prepared by Hydrologic Consultants, Inc.

Water Forum. 2001. Initial Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat Management and Restoration Plan for the Lower American River. A Product of the Lower American Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat (FISH) Working Group. Prepared by SWRI. Available at http://www.waterforum.org.

Western Shasta Resource Conservation District and Cow Creek Watershed Management Group. 2001. Cow Creek Watershed Assessment. Prepared by SHN Consulting Engineers and Geologists and Vestra Resources, Inc., 501062, November 2001.

Weston, D. P., J. You, and M. J. Lydy. 2004. Distribution and Toxicity of Sediment-Associated Pesticides in Agriculture-Dominated Water Bodies of California's Central Valley. Environmental Science & Technology Volume 38: 2752-2759.

Williams, J. G. 2006. Central Valley Salmon: A Perspective on Chinook and Steelhead in the Central Valley of California. San Francisco Estuary & Watershed Science Volume 4, Issue 3, Article 2.

Williamson, K. and B. May. 2003. Homogenization of Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Gene Pools in the Central Valley. Lower American River Science Conference, June 5-6, 2003, Sacramento, CA.

Yates, G. 2003. Gravel and Temperature Surveys of Lower Putah Creek. Prepared for Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee.

YCWA. 1998. Assessment of Potential Fish Stranding Impacts Associated With April 1998 Flow Reductions on the Yuba River. Prepared by Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.

YCWA. 1999. An Evaluation of Fish Stranding and Entrapment on the Lower Yuba River During a Controlled, Short-Term Flow Reduction. Prepared by Jones & Stokes Associates.

YCWA. 2000. Biological Assessment of the Effects of Operations of Englebright Dam/Engebright Lake and Daguerre Point Dam on Central Valley ESU Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout. Prepared by SWRI.

YCWA, Reclamation, and DWR. 2007. Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord. Prepared by HDR|Surface Water Resources, Inc., June 2007.

Yoshiyama, R. M., F. W. Fisher, and P. B. Moyle. 1998. Historical Abundance and Decline of Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley Region of California. North American Journal of Fisheries Management Volume 18: 487-521.

Yoshiyama, R. M., E. R. Gerstung, and F. W. Fisher. 2001. Historical and Present Distribution of Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley Drainage of California *in* Contributions to the Biology of Central Valley Salmonids. Brown, R. L. (ed.), Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game, pp 71-176.

Yoshiyama, R. M., E. R. Gerstung, F. W. Fisher, and P. B. Moyle. 1996. Historical and Present Distribution of Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley Drainage of California. Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project: Final Report to Congress, vol. III. Davis, CA: University of California, Centers for Water and Wildland Resources.

Personal Communications

Cavallo, B., Environmental Scientist, DWR, Sacramento, CA; verbal communication with B. Ellrott, Fisheries Biologist, SWRI, Sacramento, CA; Establishment of Instream Flow and Water Temperature Targets for the Feather River, February 4, 2004.

Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	Number of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.425	Keswick/Shasta Dam	0.650	2.763	6	16.58	VH
Sacramento River	1	Spawning	0.325	Barrier	0.350	Keswick/Shasta Dam	1.000	11.375	1	11.38	VH
Sacramento River	1	Embryo Incubation	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.250	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	6.250	1.00	6.25	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.150	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the Delta	0.300	1.463	4	5.85	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.150	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	1.463	4	5.85	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.125	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the Delta	0.350	1.422	4	5.69	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.125	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the lower Sacramento River	0.350	1.422	4	5.69	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.225	1.097	5	5.48	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.225	1.097	5	5.48	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Predation	0.150	Predation in the middle Sacramento River with emphasis on anthropogenically-created predation opportunities at GCID, RBDD and other structures	0.225	1.097	5	5.48	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Predation	0.150	Predation in the upper Sacramento River with emphasis on anthropogenically-created predation opportunities at ACID and other structures	0.225	1.097	5	5.48	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Flow Conditions	0.125	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.250	1.016	5	5.08	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Flow Conditions	0.125	Diversion into Central Delta	0.250	1.016	5	5.08	VH
Sacramento River	1	Embryo Incubation	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.200	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	5.000	1.00	5.00	VH
Sacramento River	1	Embryo Incubation	0.25	Water Quality	0.200	Water Pollution in upper Sacramento River	1.000	5.000	1.00	5.00	VH
Sacramento River	1	Embryo Incubation	0.25	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in upper Sacramento River	1.000	5.000	1.00	5.00	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.150	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the upper Sacramento River	0.250	1.219	4	4.88	VH
Sacramento River	1	Spawning	0.325	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability in in upper Sacramento River	1.000	4.875	1	4.88	VH
Sacramento River	1	Spawning	0.325	Water Temperature	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	4.875	1	4.88	VH
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.700	0.700	6	4.20	VH

Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	Number of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.813	5	4.06	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.225	0.548	7	3.84	VH
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Entrainment	0.075	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.225	0.548	7	3.84	VH
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.425	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.150	0.638	6	3.83	VH
Sacramento River	1	Embryo Incubation	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance in upper Sacramento River	1.000	3.750	1.00	3.75	H
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.600	1.200	3	3.60	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the Delta	0.350	0.853	4	3.41	H
Sacramento River	1	Spawning	0.325	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	3.250	1	3.25	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.125	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.813	4	3.25	H
Sacramento River	1	Spawning	0.325	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.100	Limited Instream Gravel Supply in upper Sacramento River	1.000	3.250	1	3.25	H
Sacramento River	1	Spawning	0.325	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in upper Sacramento River	1.000	3.250	1	3.25	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.150	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.731	4	2.93	H
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.350	0.525	5	2.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.650	4	2.60	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.366	7	2.56	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.366	7	2.56	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.366	7	2.56	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.508	5	2.54	H

Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	Number of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.125	0.508	5	2.54	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bay	0.100	0.488	5	2.44	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.609	4	2.44	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.609	4	2.44	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.488	5	2.44	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.488	5	2.44	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Delta	0.700	1.138	2	2.28	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Delta	0.600	0.975	2	1.95	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.488	4	1.95	H
Sacramento River	1	Spawning	0.325	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.625	1	1.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.125	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.406	4	1.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.325	5	1.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.325	5	1.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.325	5	1.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.325	5	1.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.200	0.325	5	1.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.325	5	1.63	H
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Water Temperature	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.400	0.400	4	1.60	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.300	5	1.50	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.300	5	1.50	M

Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	Number of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.366	4	1.46	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Competition, Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.350	0.284	5	1.42	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Bays	0.400	0.650	2	1.30	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.325	4	1.30	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.425	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.213	6	1.28	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.425	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.213	6	1.28	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.425	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.213	6	1.28	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.425	Yolo Bypass-Freemont Weir	0.050	0.213	6	1.28	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.244	5	1.22	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Upstream Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Tributary Barriers	0.500	0.406	3	1.22	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.400	3	1.20	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.400	3	1.20	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.200	6	1.20	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Water Temperature	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.300	4	1.20	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.150	0.225	5	1.13	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Flow Conditions	0.125	Reverse Flow Conditions in the Delta	0.050	0.203	5	1.02	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Competition, Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.203	5	1.02	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Upstream Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Keswick Dam	0.400	0.325	3	0.98	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.488	2	0.98	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Entrainment	0.075	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.122	7	0.85	M
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Entrainment	0.075	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.122	7	0.85	M

Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	Number of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Competition, Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.163	5	0.81	M
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Water Temperature	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.200	4	0.80	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.150	5	0.75	L
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.163	4	0.65	L
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Competition, Predation in the Delta	0.150	0.122	5	0.61	L
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.081	5	0.41	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Water Quality	0.025	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.400	0.100	4	0.40	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.100	0.100	4	0.40	L
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Upstream Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	ACID Dam	0.100	0.081	3	0.24	L
Sacramento River	1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.325	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Competition, Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.041	5	0.20	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.050	4	0.20	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.050	4	0.20	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.200	0.050	4	0.20	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.025	0.025	6	0.15	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.025	0.025	6	0.15	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.025	0.025	6	0.15	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.025	0.025	6	0.15	L
Sacramento River	1	Adult Immigration and holding	0.1	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.425	ACID Dam	0.000	0.000	6	0.00	L

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Deer Creek	0.600	0.64	5	**3.19**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Mill Creek	0.600	0.64	5	**3.19**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Deer Creek	0.700	0.74	4	**2.98**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Mill Creek	0.700	0.74	4	**2.98**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Englebright Dam	0.650	0.55	5	**2.73**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Fish Barrier/Oroville Dam	0.850	0.66	4	**2.65**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Antelope Creek	0.700	0.63	4	**2.50**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Butte Creek	0.800	0.83	3	**2.48**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.49	5	**2.44**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual or Terminal Diversions and loss of channel connectivity in Antelope Creek	0.500	0.34	7	**2.39**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Iron Canyon, City of Chico Swimming Holes and Associated Dams	0.750	0.47	5	**2.34**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Big Chico Creek	0.700	0.53	4	**2.10**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Butte Creek Diversion Dams and Weirs	0.600	0.34	6	**2.03**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.450	Turbidity and Sedimentation in Mill Creek	1.000	1.91	1	**1.91**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.665	Turbidity and sedimentation in Mill Creek	1.000	1.70	1.00	**1.70**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.665	Turbidity, sedimentation, hazardous spills (HWY 32) in Deer Creek	1.000	1.70	1.00	**1.70**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Barrier	0.300	Fish Barrier Dam/Oroville Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.37	1	**1.37**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.525	0.22	6	**1.34**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.525	0.22	6	**1.34**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Deer Creek	0.400	0.26	5	**1.28**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Yuba River	0.350	0.31	4	**1.25**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Yuba River	0.350	0.31	4	**1.25**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.39	3	**1.17**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Barrier	0.300	Englebright Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.16	1	**1.16**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Deer Creek	0.600	0.38	3	**1.15**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Mill Creek	0.600	0.38	3	**1.15**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.29	4	**1.14**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.29	4	**1.14**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Delta	0.375	0.28	4	**1.12**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.525	Flow Fluctuations, Flood Events	1.000	1.10	1.00	**1.10**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.350	0.28	4	**1.10**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.575	0.22	5	**1.08**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.27	4	**1.07**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.425	0.36	3	**1.07**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.250	Habitat Availability	1.000	1.06	1	**1.06**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.250	Turbidity, Sedimentation, Hazardous Spills (Hwy 32) in Deer Creek	1.000	1.06	1	**1.06**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.400	0.34	3	**1.01**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.425	0.33	3	**1.00**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.00	1	**1.00**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Ocean	0.525	0.17	6	**0.99**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.500	0.16	6	**0.98**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.225	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.96	1	**0.96**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.225	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.96	1	**0.96**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.24	4	**0.95**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.250	Habitat Availability/Suitability	1.000	0.94	1	**0.94**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Yuba River	0.250	0.19	5	**0.93**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.19	5	**0.93**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.19	5	**0.93**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Ocean	0.625	0.18	5	**0.91**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.91	1	**0.91**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.91	1	**0.91**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.22	4	**0.89**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.22	4	**0.89**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Hazardous Spills (Hwy 32) in Deer Creek	0.600	0.18	5	**0.89**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.575	0.14	6	**0.86**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Daguerre Point Dam	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.27	3	**0.82**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.400	0.27	3	**0.82**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.27	3	**0.82**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.250	Habitat Availability	1.000	0.81	1	**0.81**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.250	Turbidity, Sedimentation in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.81	1	**0.81**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.13	6	**0.80**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.13	6	**0.80**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.350	0.20	4	**0.80**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in Butte Creek	0.250	0.20	4	**0.79**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Yuba River and DPD	0.250	0.11	7	**0.78**	**VH**

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.400	Turbidity, sedimentation in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.78	1.00	**0.78**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	0.77	1	**0.77**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.77	1	**0.77**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.26	3	**0.77**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.75	1	**0.75**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Recreational Impacts (Summer inner tubing)	0.200	Summer inner tubing and swimming in Butte Creek	1.000	0.75	1	**0.75**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Feather River	0.200	0.15	5	**0.74**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	5	**0.74**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.19	4	**0.74**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.18	4	**0.74**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.18	4	**0.74**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.225	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.73	1	**0.73**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Delta	0.425	0.24	3	**0.73**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.350	0.24	3	**0.72**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	3	**0.72**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	4	**0.71**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.14	5	**0.71**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Butte Creek	0.275	0.23	3	**0.69**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Feather River	0.300	0.17	4	**0.68**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.68	1.00	**0.68**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.22	3	**0.67**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.090	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.17	4	**0.66**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.13	5	**0.64**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Butte Creek	0.250	0.21	3	**0.63**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.16	4	**0.63**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	4	**0.63**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.16	4	**0.63**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	4	**0.63**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.09	7	**0.62**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	7	**0.62**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.09	7	**0.62**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.275	Water Quality, Turbidity in Butte Creek	1.000	0.62	1.00	**0.62**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.275	Water Temperature in Butte Creek	1.000	0.62	1.00	**0.62**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.10	6	**0.61**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Feather River	0.300	0.20	3	**0.61**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.09	7	**0.61**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Yuba River	0.200	0.15	4	**0.60**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Butte Creek	0.250	0.20	3	**0.59**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.300	Sedimentation, turbidity, physical disturbance	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**VH**

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.58	1	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Deer Creek	0.150	0.14	4	**0.57**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Mill Creek	0.150	0.14	4	**0.57**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.14	4	**0.57**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Feather River	0.275	0.19	3	**0.56**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.56	1	**0.56**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.150	Water Temperature in Butte Creek	1.000	0.56	1	**0.56**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.18	3	**0.55**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.250	0.09	6	**0.55**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.09	6	**0.55**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.09	6	**0.55**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Feather River	0.150	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Feather River	0.150	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Feather River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.09	6	**0.54**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.09	6	**0.54**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.09	6	**0.54**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.09	6	**0.54**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.250	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Feather River	0.175	0.13	4	**0.52**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.350	0.10	5	**0.52**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.10	5	**0.52**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.150	0.08	6	**0.51**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.50	1	**0.50**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.07	7	**0.48**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	7	**0.48**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	7	**0.48**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.100	0.07	7	**0.48**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.12	4	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.24	2	**0.48**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.24	2	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.12	4	**0.48**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.12	4	**0.48**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.090	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.12	4	**0.47**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.090	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.12	4	**0.47**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in Butte Creek	0.333	0.16	3	**0.47**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.16	3	**0.47**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.333	0.16	3	**0.47**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.100	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.46	1	**0.46**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature	1.000	0.46	1	**0.46**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in the lower Sacramento River	0.600	0.23	2	**0.45**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.45	1.00	**0.45**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.09	5	**0.45**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.09	5	**0.45**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.09	5	**0.45**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.09	5	**0.45**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Butte Creek	0.200	0.07	6	**0.44**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Feather River	0.500	0.15	3	**0.44**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.09	5	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Feather River	0.250	0.14	3	**0.43**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.43	1	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.43	1	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.09	5	**0.43**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Deer Creek	1.000	0.43	1	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Mill Creek	1.000	0.43	1	**0.43**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Butte Creek	0.225	0.08	5	**0.42**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Feather River	0.400	0.14	3	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Yuba River	0.225	0.07	6	**0.40**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.375	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.39**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.39**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Deer Creek	0.150	0.06	6	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Mill Creek	0.150	0.06	6	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Deer Creek	0.100	0.10	4	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Mill Creek	0.100	0.10	4	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Deer Creek	0.100	0.10	4	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Mill Creek	0.100	0.10	4	**0.38**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.08	5	**0.38**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	5	**0.38**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Water Quality, Turbidity in Butte Creek	1.000	0.38	1	**0.38**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.250	Sedimentation	1.000	0.38	1.00	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.050	Delta	0.350	0.09	4	**0.37**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.09	4	**0.37**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.18	2	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Delta	0.100	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.06	6	**0.36**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.06	6	**0.36**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.18	2	**0.36**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.18	2	**0.36**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.250	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Flow Conditions	0.125	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Feather River	0.700	0.17	2	**0.34**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Antelope Creek	0.175	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.375	0.09	4	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.09	4	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.09	4	**0.34**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Centerville Head Dam	0.100	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Yuba River	0.175	0.06	6	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations, Flooding	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.200	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.200	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Water Quality	0.200	Water Pollution	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in the Feather River	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.165	Water Temperature in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.32	1.00	**0.32**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.32	1.00	**0.32**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.32	1.00	**0.32**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.06	5	**0.32**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.06	5	**0.32**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.16	2	**0.32**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.08	4	**0.32**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.32**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Feather River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.32**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.32**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.16	2	**0.32**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.16	2	**0.32**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.06	5	**0.31**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Feather River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.31**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Delta	0.100	0.10	3	**0.31**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.10	3	**0.31**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.10	3	**0.31**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.10	3	**0.31**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.10	3	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.10	3	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.08	4	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.30	1.00	**0.30**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Butte Creek	0.400	0.15	2	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.200	Water Quality in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.30	1.00	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.100	0.08	4	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.30**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.30**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Mill Creek	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.225	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.225	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Feather River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.29**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Deer Creek	0.100	0.04	7	**0.29**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Mill Creek	0.100	0.04	7	**0.29**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.29	1	**0.29**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.275	0.07	4	**0.29**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.06	5	**0.28**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Yuba River	0.450	0.09	3	**0.28**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.090	Ag, Urban in Butte Creek	0.150	0.07	4	**0.28**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Feather River	0.200	0.05	6	**0.27**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.14	2	**0.27**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.14	2	**0.27**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	4	**0.27**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	4	**0.27**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.150	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Deer Creek	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Mill Creek	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.125	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Yuba River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Water Pollution above Daguerre Point Dam	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Feather River	0.350	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.225	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Feather River	0.225	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.225	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Deer Creek	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Mill Creek	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Feather River	0.400	0.08	3	**0.25**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.25	1	**0.25**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.25	1	**0.25**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.05	5	**0.25**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.05	5	**0.24**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.24	1.00	**0.24**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.03	7	**0.24**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.03	7	**0.24**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.12	2	**0.24**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.12	2	**0.24**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Deer Creek	0.200	0.06	4	**0.24**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Mill Creek	0.200	0.06	4	**0.24**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Fish Barrier/Oroville Dam	1.000	0.11	2	**0.23**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.06	4	**0.23**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.23	1.00	**0.23**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	6	**0.22**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.22**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Yuba River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.22**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.07	3	**0.22**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.07	3	**0.22**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.21	1	**0.21**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.21	1	**0.21**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Mill Creek	0.100	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.050	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.21	1	**0.21**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Mill Creek	0.100	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.11	2	**0.21**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Butte Creek	0.200	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.250	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.250	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Yuba River	0.250	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature above Daguerre Point Dam	1.000	0.21	1.00	**0.21**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.11	2	**0.21**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.11	2	**0.21**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.150	0.05	4	**0.20**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.175	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.333	0.06	3	**0.19**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.06	3	**0.19**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.333	0.06	3	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Water Temperature	0.050	Water Temperature in the Yuba River	1.000	0.19	1	**0.19**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Delta	0.100	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.050	Centerville Head Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.19	1	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.19	1	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.19	1	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.250	0.05	4	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.04	5	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Yuba River	0.250	0.04	5	**0.19**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Deer Creek	0.050	0.04	5	**0.19**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Mill Creek	0.050	0.04	5	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bay	0.050	0.04	5	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.050	Butte Creek	0.175	0.05	4	**0.18**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.09	2	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.09	2	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.200	0.05	4	**0.18**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.05	4	**0.18**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Feather River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.18**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Daguerre Point Dam	0.600	0.09	2	**0.18**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Yuba River	0.100	0.04	4	**0.18**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.18	1	**0.18**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.04	5	**0.18**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.18**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Big Chico Creek	0.500	0.04	4	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Feather River	0.375	0.04	4	**0.17**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.04	4	**0.16**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.04	4	**0.16**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Butte Creek	0.400	0.05	3	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.03	6	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.04	4	**0.16**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.04	4	**0.16**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.04	4	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Butte Creek	0.200	0.04	4	**0.15**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Deer Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Mill Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.04	4	**0.15**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.225	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Butte Creek	0.225	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.225	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Flow Conditions	0.125	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	2	**0.15**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.02	6	**0.15**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.250	0.04	4	**0.15**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.15**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.15**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.15**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.15**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Antelope Creek	0.050	0.03	5	**0.14**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.03	5	**0.14**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.075	0.03	5	**0.14**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.050	Bays	0.125	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.125	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Yuba River	0.125	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.13	1	**0.13**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.13	1	**0.13**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.13	1	**0.13**	**L**

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.12**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Big Chico Creek	0.050	0.02	7	**0.12**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.12**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.12**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.06	2	**0.12**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.06	2	**0.12**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Englebright Dam	0.400	0.06	2	**0.12**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.04	3	**0.12**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.04	3	**0.12**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.200	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.175	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.125	0.03	4	**0.11**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.02	6	**0.11**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.11	1.00	**0.11**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.075	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.11	1	**0.11**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.11	1	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Deer Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.02	6	**0.11**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.02	6	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.10**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.03	4	**0.10**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.10**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.025	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.10	1	**0.10**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	3	**0.09**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Feather River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.05	2	**0.09**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Deer Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Mill Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Agricultural, Wildlife and Terminal Diversions	0.800	0.04	2	**0.08**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.08	1	**0.08**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.175	0.02	4	**0.08**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.01	6	**0.08**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.08	1.00	**0.08**	**L**

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Yuba River	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Delta	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.04	2	**0.07**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.04	2	**0.07**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.04	2	**0.07**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.04	2	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.07**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Antelope Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.06**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.06	1	**0.06**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.125	0.01	4	**0.06**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.01	6	**0.06**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.01	6	**0.06**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.01	6	**0.05**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.05**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.05**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.05**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.05**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.05**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.05**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	4	**0.04**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.01	6	**0.03**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.01	6	**0.03**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.03	1.00	**0.03**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.03	1.00	**0.03**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.01	2	**0.02**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.02	1.00	**0.02**	**L**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	North Fork Dams	0.325	1.62	7	**11.35**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	South Fork Dams	0.325	1.62	7	**11.35**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Keswick Dam	0.525	1.35	7	**9.48**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Battle Creek	0.550	1.37	5	**6.86**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Barrier/Genetics	0.450	Keswick/Shasta Dam	1.000	5.81	1	**5.81**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.300	0.77	7	**5.42**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.150	0.75	7	**5.24**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Battle Creek	0.350	0.87	6	**5.24**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Battle Creek	0.400	1.14	4	**4.56**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.75	6	**4.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low instream flows per FERC license	1.000	4.28	1	**4.28**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Battle Creek	0.250	0.50	8	**3.99**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.96	4	**3.85**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.70	5	**3.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.70	5	**3.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.70	5	**3.49**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the Delta	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the Delta	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the Delta	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.65	5	**3.23**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.65	5	**3.23**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.40	8	**3.19**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.400	0.62	5	**3.10**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.50	6	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.50	6	**2.99**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure (GCID, RBDD) related in the middle Sacramento River	0.225	0.58	5	**2.90**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Barriers	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	2.85	1	**2.85**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.71	4	**2.85**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.725	0.47	6	**2.81**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Battle Creek	0.400	0.40	7	**2.79**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.45	6	**2.69**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.45	6	**2.69**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.375	0.53	5	**2.67**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.52	5	**2.62**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.44	6	**2.62**	**VH**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply in upper Sacramento River	1.000	2.58	1	**2.58**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.175	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	2.49	1	**2.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.500	0.36	7	**2.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.150	0.30	8	**2.39**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.30	8	**2.39**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.30	8	**2.39**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.275	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	2.35	1.00	**2.35**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.275	Water Temperature in Battle Creek	1.000	2.35	1.00	**2.35**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.46	5	**2.32**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.57	4	**2.28**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure (ACID) related in the upper Sacramento River	0.175	0.45	5	**2.26**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.37	6	**2.24**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.37	6	**2.24**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.45	5	**2.24**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Battle Creek	0.200	0.36	6	**2.14**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.36	6	**2.14**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.36	6	**2.14**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.14	1	**2.14**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.40	5	**2.00**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.40	5	**2.00**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.39	5	**1.96**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in Battle Creek	0.125	0.31	6	**1.87**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.30	6	**1.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.25	7	**1.75**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.25	7	**1.75**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.25	7	**1.75**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.25	7	**1.75**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.43	4	**1.71**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.24	7	**1.69**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	7	**1.69**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	7	**1.69**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.24	7	**1.69**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.41	4	**1.65**	**H**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.27	6	**1.60**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.27	6	**1.60**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.31	5	**1.56**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.31	5	**1.56**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.30	5	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Battle Creek	0.200	0.30	5	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Delta	0.100	0.25	6	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.25	6	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.25	6	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.25	6	**1.50**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.225	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.45	1	**1.45**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Quality	0.225	Water Pollution in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.45	1	**1.45**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.20	7	**1.40**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.34	4	**1.38**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.22	6	**1.35**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.29	1	**1.29**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.29	1	**1.29**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.29	1	**1.29**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bay	0.100	0.26	5	**1.29**	**H**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	5	**1.29**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	5	**1.29**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	5	**1.29**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.150	Water Quality in Battle Creek	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Delta	0.100	0.25	5	**1.25**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.25	5	**1.25**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.25	5	**1.25**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.250	0.24	5	**1.21**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.24	5	**1.21**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.24	5	**1.21**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	North Fork Dams	0.400	0.40	3	**1.20**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	South Fork Dams	0.400	0.40	3	**1.20**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.24	5	**1.18**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.24	5	**1.18**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.275	0.24	5	**1.18**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.175	Redd disturbance in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.13	1.00	**1.13**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.175	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	1.13	1	**1.13**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.18	6	**1.07**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.21	5	**1.07**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	4	**1.03**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Battle Creek	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.32	3	**0.97**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.32	3	**0.97**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.075	Habitat Suitability in in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.97	1	**0.97**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.24	4	**0.97**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.300	0.15	6	**0.93**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Reverse Flow Conditions in the Delta	0.300	0.15	6	**0.93**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass-Freemont Weir	0.050	0.13	7	**0.90**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.15	6	**0.90**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.15	6	**0.90**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	6	**0.90**	**M**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	6	**0.90**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.12	7	**0.84**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.10	8	**0.80**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.15	5	**0.77**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the Delta	0.100	0.15	5	**0.77**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	5	**0.77**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Diversion into Central Delta	0.250	0.13	6	**0.77**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	5	**0.75**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Battle Creek	0.150	0.11	7	**0.75**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Bays	0.050	0.12	6	**0.75**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.15	5	**0.73**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.71	1	**0.71**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.71	1	**0.71**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Water Temperature in Battle Creek	1.000	0.71	1	**0.71**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Hydrology	0.100	0.10	7	**0.70**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.10	7	**0.70**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.35	2	**0.70**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.17	4	**0.69**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.16	4	**0.65**	**M**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.16	4	**0.65**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.16	4	**0.65**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.21	3	**0.64**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Middle Sacramento River	0.333	0.21	3	**0.64**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Upper Sacramento River	0.333	0.21	3	**0.64**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.035	0.09	7	**0.63**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.035	0.09	7	**0.63**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.035	0.09	7	**0.63**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.30	2	**0.60**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.20	3	**0.60**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.10	6	**0.60**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.07	7	**0.52**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.075	0.07	7	**0.52**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	7	**0.50**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Battle Creek	0.050	0.10	5	**0.50**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Battle Creek	0.050	0.10	5	**0.50**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.10	5	**0.48**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in Battle Creek	0.050	0.07	6	**0.45**	**L**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.09	5	**0.43**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.06	7	**0.42**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.06	7	**0.42**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.05	8	**0.40**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.05	8	**0.40**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.20	2	**0.40**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	6	**0.39**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.090	0.08	5	**0.39**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.07	5	**0.37**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.075	0.05	7	**0.37**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.05	7	**0.37**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	ACID Dam	0.020	0.05	7	**0.36**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Water Quality	0.025	Water Quality in Battle Creek	1.000	0.36	1	**0.36**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.050	0.05	7	**0.35**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	4	**0.34**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Water Temperature	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.32	1	**0.32**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.06	5	**0.32**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.15	2	**0.30**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Battle Creek	0.050	0.05	6	**0.30**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.05	6	**0.29**	**L**

Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Delta	0.800	0.14	2	**0.28**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Delta	0.800	0.14	2	**0.28**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.050	0.04	7	**0.25**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.050	0.04	7	**0.25**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.100	0.08	3	**0.24**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	3	**0.24**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Keswick Dam	0.400	0.07	3	**0.21**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.19**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Battle Creek	0.025	0.04	5	**0.18**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	ACID Dam	0.300	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.300	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.025	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.025	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Bays	0.200	0.03	2	**0.07**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Bays	0.200	0.03	2	**0.07**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.010	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Beegum Creek	0.600	1.43	5	**7.13**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Ag Diversion Dams, Braiding, Natural Channel Gradient	0.750	1.17	5	**5.86**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Thomes Creek	0.700	1.31	4	**5.25**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	RBDD	0.550	1.05	5	**5.23**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.250	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	3.80	1	**3.80**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.410	0.62	6	**3.74**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Clear Creek	0.400	0.91	4	**3.65**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Whiskeytown Dam	0.355	0.54	6	**3.24**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	3.04	1	**3.04**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Clear Creek	1.000	3.04	1	**3.04**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.300	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.85	1	**2.85**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.275	0.55	5	**2.74**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.55	5	**2.74**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.53	5	**2.66**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.50	1	**2.50**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.250	0.50	5	**2.49**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	2.28	1	**2.28**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Clear Creek	0.400	0.76	3	**2.28**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.46	5	**2.28**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.27	8	**2.13**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.27	8	**2.13**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.27	8	**2.13**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.27	8	**2.13**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.53	4	**2.13**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.29	7	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.40	5	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.200	0.40	5	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.33	6	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.33	6	**2.00**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.350	Sedimentation in Clear Creek	1.000	2.00	1.00	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.350	Sedimentation	1.000	2.00	1.00	**2.00**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Clear Creek	0.450	0.32	6	**1.92**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.90	1	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.48	4	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Beegum Creek	0.250	0.48	4	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.48	4	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.48	4	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Beegum Creek	1.000	1.90	1	**1.90**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.38	5	**1.90**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.46	4	**1.84**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.46	4	**1.84**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.30	6	**1.78**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.71	1.00	**1.71**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.27	6	**1.60**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.39	4	**1.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.39	4	**1.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.39	4	**1.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.39	4	**1.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.22	7	**1.53**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Barriers	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.52	1	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.30	5	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.30	5	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.30	5	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.30	5	**1.52**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.150	0.29	5	**1.43**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	6	**1.43**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	6	**1.43**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	6	**1.43**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.24	6	**1.43**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in Clear Creek	1.000	1.43	1.00	**1.43**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Clear Creek	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.150	0.34	4	**1.37**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.34	4	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.34	4	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.34	4	**1.37**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.26	5	**1.31**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	5	**1.31**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.225	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.225	Water Quality in Beegum Creek	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Thomes Creek	1.000	1.25	1	**1.25**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.18	7	**1.23**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	7	**1.23**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	7	**1.23**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.30	4	**1.22**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.30	4	**1.22**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.30	4	**1.22**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.20	6	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.20	6	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	6	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.60	2	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.60	2	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.24	5	**1.19**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.24	5	**1.19**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.24	5	**1.19**	**H**

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.24	5	**1.19**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.38	3	**1.14**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.38	3	**1.14**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.38	3	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.23	5	**1.14**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.19	6	**1.13**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Thomes Creek	1.000	1.13	1.00	**1.13**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.22	5	**1.09**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**H**

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.17	6	**1.03**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.17	6	**1.03**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.95	1	**0.95**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.19	5	**0.95**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.19	5	**0.95**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.19	5	**0.95**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.19	5	**0.94**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.19	5	**0.94**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.250	Sedimentation	1.000	0.94	1.00	**0.94**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.350	0.13	7	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.175	0.12	8	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.175	0.12	8	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.12	8	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.175	0.12	8	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.15	6	**0.91**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.14	6	**0.86**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.14	6	**0.86**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.14	6	**0.86**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.14	6	**0.86**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.125	0.12	7	**0.83**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.12	7	**0.83**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.12	7	**0.83**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.125	0.12	7	**0.83**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.17	5	**0.83**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Beegum Creek	0.500	0.17	5	**0.83**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.13	6	**0.80**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.80**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.40	2	**0.80**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.40	2	**0.80**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.39	2	**0.79**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.39	2	**0.79**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Clear Creek	1.000	0.76	1	**0.76**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	5	**0.76**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.25	3	**0.75**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.25	3	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.75	1.00	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.200	Water Quality in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.75	1.00	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.100	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in Clear Creek	0.100	0.12	6	**0.71**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.14	5	**0.71**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.125	Water Temperature in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.71	1.00	**0.71**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.100	0.11	6	**0.68**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.100	0.10	7	**0.67**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Beegum Creek	0.100	0.10	7	**0.67**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.700	0.33	2	**0.67**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.67	1	**0.67**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.13	5	**0.66**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.13	5	**0.66**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.13	5	**0.63**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.63	1	**0.63**	**M**

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.63	1	**0.63**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.10	6	**0.57**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.10	6	**0.57**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Bay	0.100	0.10	6	**0.57**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.150	0.09	6	**0.56**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.150	0.09	6	**0.56**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	6	**0.56**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	6	**0.56**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Clear Creek	0.100	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Clear Creek	0.200	0.08	7	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Beegum Creek	0.050	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.26	2	**0.53**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.13	4	**0.53**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.26	2	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.250	0.08	6	**0.50**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	6	**0.50**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.48	1	**0.48**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.48	1	**0.48**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Clear Creek	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Clear Creek	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.48	1	**0.48**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Clear Creek	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.07	7	**0.47**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.07	7	**0.47**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.07	7	**0.47**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.08	6	**0.46**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.08	6	**0.46**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.030	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.46	1	**0.46**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.09	5	**0.44**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	5	**0.44**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.44	1	**0.44**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Thomes Creek	0.500	0.11	4	**0.44**	**M**

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.100	0.07	6	**0.43**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.100	0.07	6	**0.43**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.09	5	**0.43**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.43	1.00	**0.43**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.07	6	**0.40**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.07	6	**0.40**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.07	6	**0.39**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.08	5	**0.39**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.08	5	**0.39**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.08	5	**0.39**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.08	5	**0.38**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	5	**0.38**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	5	**0.38**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.08	5	**0.38**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Thomes Creek	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.06	6	**0.38**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.06	6	**0.36**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	5	**0.36**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.33**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	5	**0.33**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.035	0.05	6	**0.32**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	5	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.06	5	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.31	1	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.31	1	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.31	1	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.04	7	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Thomes Creek	0.050	0.04	7	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.04	7	**0.31**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.020	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.30	1	**0.30**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.08	4	**0.30**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.05	6	**0.30**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.29	1.00	**0.29**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.29**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.29**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.29**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Whiskeytown Dam	0.300	0.14	2	**0.29**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Clear Creek	0.150	0.06	5	**0.29**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.06	5	**0.29**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.29	1.00	**0.29**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.03	8	**0.27**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.03	8	**0.27**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.04	7	**0.27**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.27**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.27**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.27**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.04	6	**0.26**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.04	6	**0.26**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.06	4	**0.25**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	5	**0.25**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.24	1	**0.24**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.05	5	**0.24**	**L**

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.05	5	**0.24**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.05	5	**0.24**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Thomes Creek	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	6	**0.21**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	6	**0.21**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	6	**0.21**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Beegum Creek	0.050	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.04	5	**0.19**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.19	1.00	**0.19**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	4	**0.18**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	4	**0.18**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.03	5	**0.17**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.16**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.050	0.02	7	**0.13**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.050	0.02	5	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	5	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.06	2	**0.11**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.06	2	**0.11**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Beegum Creek	0.050	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	5	**0.08**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.04	2	**0.08**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.04	2	**0.08**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Clear Creek	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Feather River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Fish Barrier/Oroville Dam	0.850	0.66	4	**2.65**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Barrier	0.300	Fish Barrier Dam/Oroville Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.37	1	**1.37**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Ocean	0.625	0.18	5	**0.91**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.91	1	**0.91**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.91	1	**0.91**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.400	0.27	3	**0.82**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.350	0.20	4	**0.80**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Delta	0.425	0.24	3	**0.73**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.350	0.24	3	**0.72**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	3	**0.72**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Feather River	0.300	0.17	4	**0.68**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.22	3	**0.67**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Feather River	0.300	0.20	3	**0.61**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.14	4	**0.57**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Feather River	0.275	0.19	3	**0.56**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.18	3	**0.55**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.12	4	**0.48**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.100	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.46	1	**0.46**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature	1.000	0.46	1	**0.46**	**VH**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Feather River	0.500	0.15	3	**0.44**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Feather River	0.250	0.14	3	**0.43**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Feather River	0.400	0.14	3	**0.41**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Feather River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.250	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Flow Conditions	0.125	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Feather River	0.700	0.17	2	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.375	0.09	4	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.09	4	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.09	4	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations, Flooding	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.200	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.200	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Water Quality	0.200	Water Pollution	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in the Feather River	1.000	0.33	1.00	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.10	3	**0.31**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.10	3	**0.31**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Feather River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.29**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Feather River	0.200	0.05	6	**0.27**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.14	2	**0.27**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.14	2	**0.27**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	4	**0.27**	**H**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.225	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Feather River	0.225	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.225	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Feather River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Spawning	0.350	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Fish Barrier/Oroville Dam	1.000	0.11	2	**0.23**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.06	4	**0.23**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.07	3	**0.22**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.07	3	**0.22**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.150	0.05	4	**0.20**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.175	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.333	0.06	3	**0.19**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.06	3	**0.19**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.333	0.06	3	**0.19**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.09	2	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.09	2	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.200	0.05	4	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.17**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Feather River	0.375	0.04	4	**0.17**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.04	4	**0.16**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.04	4	**0.16**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.04	4	**0.16**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.04	4	**0.16**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.04	4	**0.16**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Feather River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.04	4	**0.15**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Flow Conditions	0.125	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	2	**0.15**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.250	0.04	4	**0.15**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.200	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.125	0.03	4	**0.11**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.075	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.175	0.02	4	**0.08**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Delta	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.125	0.01	4	**0.06**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.01	6	**0.03**	**L**
Feather River	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.01	6	**0.03**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Yuba River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Englebright Dam	0.650	0.55	5	**2.73**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Yuba River	0.350	0.31	4	**1.25**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Yuba River	0.350	0.31	4	**1.25**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Barrier	0.300	Englebright Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.16	1	**1.16**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Delta	0.375	0.28	4	**1.12**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.525	Flow Fluctuations, Flood Events	1.000	1.10	1.00	**1.10**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.27	4	**1.07**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Ocean	0.525	0.17	6	**0.99**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Yuba River	0.250	0.19	5	**0.93**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.22	4	**0.89**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.22	4	**0.89**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Daguerre Point Dam	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Yuba River and DPD	0.250	0.11	7	**0.78**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	0.77	1	**0.77**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.77	1	**0.77**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Feather River	0.200	0.15	5	**0.74**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	5	**0.74**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.19	4	**0.74**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	4	**0.71**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.09	7	**0.62**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	7	**0.62**	**VH**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Yuba River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.09	7	**0.62**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Yuba River	0.200	0.15	4	**0.60**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.58	1	**0.58**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Feather River	0.150	0.13	4	**0.54**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Feather River	0.150	0.13	4	**0.54**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.13	4	**0.54**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Feather River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.54**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.54**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Feather River	0.175	0.13	4	**0.52**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.350	0.10	5	**0.52**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.10	5	**0.52**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Yuba River	0.225	0.07	6	**0.40**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.06	6	**0.36**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.06	6	**0.36**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.18	2	**0.36**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.18	2	**0.36**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Yuba River	0.175	0.06	6	**0.33**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Feather River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.32**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Yuba River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.32**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Feather River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.31**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.225	0.06	5	**0.30**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.225	0.06	5	**0.30**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.29	1	**0.29**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.275	0.07	4	**0.29**	**H**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Yuba River	0.450	0.09	3	**0.28**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.150	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.125	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Yuba River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Water Pollution above Daguerre Point Dam	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Feather River	0.350	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Feather River	0.400	0.08	3	**0.25**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.12	2	**0.24**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.12	2	**0.24**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	6	**0.22**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Yuba River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.22**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Yuba River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.22**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.250	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.250	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Yuba River	0.250	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature above Daguerre Point Dam	1.000	0.21	1.00	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.20**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Water Temperature	0.050	Water Temperature in the Yuba River	1.000	0.19	1	**0.19**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Delta	0.100	0.03	6	**0.19**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.19**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.04	5	**0.19**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Yuba River	0.250	0.04	5	**0.19**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bay	0.050	0.04	5	**0.19**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Feather River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.18**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Daguerre Point Dam	0.600	0.09	2	**0.18**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Yuba River	0.100	0.04	4	**0.18**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Yuba River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Yuba River	0.125	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Englebright Dam	0.400	0.06	2	**0.12**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Spawning	0.275	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.025	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.10	1	**0.10**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	3	**0.09**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Feather River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Yuba River	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Yuba River	0.14	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Butte Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.275	Butte Creek	0.800	0.83	3	2.48	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Butte Creek Diversion Dams and Weirs	0.600	0.34	6	2.03	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.350	0.28	4	1.10	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.575	0.22	5	1.08	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.425	0.36	3	1.07	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.400	0.34	3	1.01	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.425	0.33	3	1.00	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.24	4	0.95	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	0.25	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.250	Habitat Availability/Suitability	1.000	0.94	1	0.94	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.27	3	0.82	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.27	3	0.82	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.150	Predation in Butte Creek	0.250	0.20	4	0.79	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.26	3	0.77	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.75	1	0.75	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Recreational Impacts (Summer inner tubing)	0.200	Summer inner tubing and swimming in Butte Creek	1.000	0.75	1	0.75	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Butte Creek	0.275	0.23	3	0.69	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.68	1.00	0.68	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.090	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.17	4	0.66	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Butte Creek	0.250	0.21	3	0.63	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Quality	0.275	Water Quality, Turbidity in Butte Creek	1.000	0.62	1.00	0.62	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Temperature	0.275	Water Temperature in Butte Creek	1.000	0.62	1.00	0.62	VH
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Butte Creek	0.250	0.20	3	0.59	H
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.56	1	0.56	H
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Water Temperature in Butte Creek	1.000	0.56	1	0.56	H

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Butte Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.250	0.09	6	**0.55**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.09	6	**0.55**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.09	6	**0.55**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.150	0.08	6	**0.51**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.090	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.12	4	**0.47**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.090	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.12	4	**0.47**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in Butte Creek	0.333	0.16	3	**0.47**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.16	3	**0.47**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.333	0.16	3	**0.47**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in the lower Sacramento River	0.600	0.23	2	**0.45**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Butte Creek	0.200	0.07	6	**0.44**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Butte Creek	0.225	0.08	5	**0.42**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.375	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Water Quality, Turbidity in Butte Creek	1.000	0.38	1	**0.38**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.050	Delta	0.350	0.09	4	**0.37**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.09	4	**0.37**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Centerville Head Dam	0.100	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.16	2	**0.32**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.08	4	**0.32**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Butte Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.32**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Delta	0.100	0.10	3	**0.31**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.10	3	**0.31**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Butte Creek	0.400	0.15	2	**0.30**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.090	Ag, Urban in Butte Creek	0.150	0.07	4	**0.28**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.23	1.00	**0.23**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.11	2	**0.21**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Butte Creek	0.200	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.050	Centerville Head Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.19	1	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.19	1	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.19	1	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.250	0.05	4	**0.19**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.050	Butte Creek	0.175	0.05	4	**0.18**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Butte Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Butte Creek	0.400	0.05	3	**0.16**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Butte Creek	0.200	0.04	4	**0.15**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.225	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Butte Creek	0.225	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.225	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.03	5	**0.14**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.075	0.03	5	**0.14**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.050	Bays	0.125	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.125	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.04	3	**0.12**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.04	3	**0.12**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.175	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.11	1.00	**0.11**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.10**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Agricultural, Wildlife and Terminal Diversions	0.800	0.04	2	**0.08**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.06**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.01	6	**0.06**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.01	6	**0.06**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.01	2	**0.02**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Big Chico Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Iron Canyon, City of Chico Swimming Holes and Associated Dams	0.750	0.47	5	**2.34**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Big Chico Creek	0.700	0.53	4	**2.10**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.00	1	**1.00**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.575	0.14	6	**0.86**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.18	4	**0.74**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.18	4	**0.74**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.16	4	**0.63**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	4	**0.63**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.16	4	**0.63**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	4	**0.63**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.09	7	**0.61**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.11	5	**0.53**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.11	5	**0.53**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.50	1	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.45	1.00	**0.45**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.09	5	**0.44**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Big Chico Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.08	5	**0.38**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	5	**0.38**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.250	Sedimentation	1.000	0.38	1.00	**0.38**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.16	2	**0.32**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.16	2	**0.32**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.06	5	**0.31**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.10	3	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.10	3	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	4	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.08	4	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.30	1.00	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.200	Water Quality in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.30	1.00	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.100	0.08	4	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Big Chico Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.25	1	**0.25**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.25	1	**0.25**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.05	5	**0.25**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.11	2	**0.21**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.11	2	**0.21**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.18	1	**0.18**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.04	5	**0.18**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.18**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Big Chico Creek	0.500	0.04	4	**0.18**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.03	6	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.05	3	**0.15**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.15**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.15**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.15**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.03	5	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.03	5	**0.13**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Big Chico Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.13	1	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.13	1	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.13	1	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.12**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Big Chico Creek	0.050	0.02	7	**0.12**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.12**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.02	6	**0.11**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.02	6	**0.11**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.02	6	**0.11**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.03	4	**0.10**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.01	6	**0.08**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Big Chico Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.08	1.00	**0.08**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.06	1	**0.06**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.01	6	**0.05**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.05**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.05**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.1	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	4	**0.04**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Deer Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Deer Creek	0.600	0.64	5	**3.19**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Deer Creek	0.700	0.74	4	**2.98**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.665	Turbidity, sedimentation, hazardous spills (HWY 32) in Deer Creek	1.000	1.70	1.00	**1.70**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.525	0.22	6	**1.34**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Deer Creek	0.400	0.26	5	**1.28**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Deer Creek	0.600	0.38	3	**1.15**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.29	4	**1.14**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.250	Habitat Availability	1.000	1.06	1	**1.06**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.250	Turbidity, Sedimentation, Hazardous Spills (Hwy 32) in Deer Creek	1.000	1.06	1	**1.06**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.225	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.96	1	**0.96**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.19	5	**0.93**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Hazardous Spills (Hwy 32) in Deer Creek	0.600	0.18	5	**0.89**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.13	6	**0.80**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Deer Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Deer Creek	0.150	0.14	4	**0.57**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.09	6	**0.54**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.09	6	**0.54**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.24	2	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.12	4	**0.48**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.09	5	**0.45**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.09	5	**0.45**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.43	1	**0.43**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Deer Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Deer Creek	1.000	0.43	1	**0.43**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Deer Creek	0.150	0.06	6	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Deer Creek	0.100	0.10	4	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Deer Creek	0.100	0.10	4	**0.38**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.07	5	**0.37**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.09	4	**0.36**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.32	1.00	**0.32**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.06	5	**0.32**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Deer Creek	0.100	0.04	7	**0.29**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Deer Creek	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Deer Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Deer Creek	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Deer Creek	0.200	0.06	4	**0.24**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.21	1	**0.21**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Deer Creek	0.050	0.04	5	**0.19**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Deer Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Deer Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.06	2	**0.12**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.11	1	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Deer Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Deer Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.04	2	**0.07**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.04	2	**0.07**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.05**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.05**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.03	1.00	**0.03**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Mill Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Mill Creek	0.600	0.64	5	**3.19**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Mill Creek	0.700	0.74	4	**2.98**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.450	Turbidity and Sedimentation in Mill Creek	1.000	1.91	1	**1.91**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.665	Turbidity and sedimentation in Mill Creek	1.000	1.70	1.00	**1.70**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.525	0.22	6	**1.34**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Mill Creek	0.600	0.38	3	**1.15**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.29	4	**1.14**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.22	5	**1.12**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.225	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.96	1	**0.96**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.19	5	**0.93**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.13	6	**0.80**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.13	5	**0.64**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Mill Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.08	7	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Mill Creek	0.150	0.14	4	**0.57**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.09	6	**0.54**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.09	6	**0.54**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.250	0.11	5	**0.53**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.150	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.24	2	**0.48**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.12	4	**0.48**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.09	5	**0.45**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.09	5	**0.45**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.43	1	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.09	5	**0.43**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Mill Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	4	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Mill Creek	1.000	0.43	1	**0.43**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Mill Creek	0.150	0.06	6	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Mill Creek	0.100	0.10	4	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Mill Creek	0.100	0.10	4	**0.38**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.07	5	**0.37**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.09	4	**0.36**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.32	1.00	**0.32**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.06	5	**0.32**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Mill Creek	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Mill Creek	0.100	0.04	7	**0.29**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Mill Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Mill Creek	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.05	5	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Mill Creek	1.000	0.26	1.00	**0.26**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Mill Creek	0.200	0.06	4	**0.24**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.21	1	**0.21**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Mill Creek	0.100	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.050	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.21	1	**0.21**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Mill Creek	0.100	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Mill Creek	0.050	0.04	5	**0.19**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Mill Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.15**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.15**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Mill Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.06	2	**0.12**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.11	1	**0.11**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Mill Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.04	2	**0.07**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.04	2	**0.07**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.05**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.05**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.17	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.03	1.00	**0.03**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Antelope Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Antelope Creek	0.700	0.63	4	**2.50**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.49	5	**2.44**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual or Terminal Diversions and loss of channel connectivity in Antelope Creek	0.500	0.34	7	**2.39**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.39	3	**1.17**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.500	0.16	6	**0.98**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.250	Habitat Availability	1.000	0.81	1	**0.81**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.250	Turbidity, Sedimentation in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.81	1	**0.81**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.400	Turbidity, sedimentation in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.78	1.00	**0.78**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.225	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.73	1	**0.73**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.14	5	**0.71**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.10	6	**0.61**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.300	Sedimentation, turbidity, physical disturbance	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Antelope Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.07	7	**0.48**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	7	**0.48**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	7	**0.48**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.100	0.07	7	**0.48**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.39**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	3	**0.39**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.18	2	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Delta	0.100	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Antelope Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Antelope Creek	0.175	0.06	6	**0.34**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.165	Water Temperature in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.32	1.00	**0.32**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.06	5	**0.28**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	4	**0.27**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.05	5	**0.24**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.24	1.00	**0.24**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.03	7	**0.24**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.03	7	**0.24**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Antelope Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.18**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.05	4	**0.18**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.075	0.02	6	**0.15**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Antelope Creek	0.050	0.03	5	**0.14**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.12**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Antelope Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.10**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.10**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.05	2	**0.09**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.08	1	**0.08**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Antelope Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.02	1.00	**0.02**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Sacramento River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category	
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Keswick Dam	0.525	1.35	7	**9.48**	**VH**	**1**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Barrier/Genetics	0.450	Keswick/Shasta Dam	1.000	5.81	1	**5.81**	**VH**	**2**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.300	0.77	7	**5.42**	**VH**	**3**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.96	4	**3.85**	**VH**	**4**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the Delta	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**	**5**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**	**6**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the Delta	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**	**7**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the Delta	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**	**8**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.83	4	**3.30**	**VH**	**9**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.65	5	**3.23**	**VH**	**10**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.65	5	**3.23**	**VH**	**11**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.400	0.62	5	**3.10**	**VH**	**12**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure (GCID, RBDD) related in the middle Sacramento River	0.225	0.58	5	**2.90**	**VH**	**13**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.725	0.47	6	**2.81**	**VH**	**14**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply in upper Sacramento River	1.000	2.58	1	**2.58**	**VH**	**15**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.46	5	**2.32**	**VH**	**16**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure (ACID) related in the upper Sacramento River	0.175	0.45	5	**2.26**	**VH**	**17**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**VH**	**18**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**VH**	**19**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**VH**	**20**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**VH**	**21**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Sacramento River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category	
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.55	4	**2.20**	**VH**	**22**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.24	7	**1.69**	**VH**	**23**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	7	**1.69**	**VH**	**24**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	7	**1.69**	**VH**	**25**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.24	7	**1.69**	**VH**	**26**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.41	4	**1.65**	**H**	**1**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.225	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.45	1	**1.45**	**H**	**2**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Quality	0.225	Water Pollution in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.45	1	**1.45**	**H**	**3**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.34	4	**1.38**	**H**	**4**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.29	1	**1.29**	**H**	**5**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.29	1	**1.29**	**H**	**6**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.29	1	**1.29**	**H**	**7**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bay	0.100	0.26	5	**1.29**	**H**	**8**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	5	**1.29**	**H**	**9**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	5	**1.29**	**H**	**10**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	5	**1.29**	**H**	**11**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.250	0.24	5	**1.21**	**H**	**12**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.24	5	**1.21**	**H**	**13**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.24	5	**1.21**	**H**	**14**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.24	5	**1.18**	**H**	**15**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Sacramento River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category	
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.24	5	**1.18**	**H**	**16**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.275	0.24	5	**1.18**	**H**	**17**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.175	Redd disturbance in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.13	1.00	**1.13**	**H**	**18**
Sacramento River	0.43	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.175	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	1.13	1	**1.13**	**H**	**19**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	4	**1.03**	**H**	**20**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.32	3	**0.97**	**H**	**21**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.32	3	**0.97**	**H**	**22**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.075	Habitat Suitability in in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.97	1	**0.97**	**H**	**23**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.24	4	**0.97**	**H**	**24**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.300	0.15	6	**0.93**	**M**	**1**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Reverse Flow Conditions in the Delta	0.300	0.15	6	**0.93**	**M**	**2**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass-Freemont Weir	0.050	0.13	7	**0.90**	**M**	**3**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.12	7	**0.84**	**M**	**4**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.15	5	**0.77**	**M**	**5**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the Delta	0.100	0.15	5	**0.77**	**M**	**6**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	5	**0.77**	**M**	**7**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Diversion into Central Delta	0.250	0.13	6	**0.77**	**M**	**8**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.15	5	**0.73**	**M**	**9**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.17	4	**0.69**	**M**	**10**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**M**	**11**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Sacramento River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category	
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.16	4	**0.65**	**M**	**12**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.16	4	**0.65**	**M**	**13**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.16	4	**0.65**	**M**	**14**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.21	3	**0.64**	**M**	**15**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Middle Sacramento River	0.333	0.21	3	**0.64**	**M**	**16**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Upper Sacramento River	0.333	0.21	3	**0.64**	**M**	**17**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.035	0.09	7	**0.63**	**M**	**18**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.035	0.09	7	**0.63**	**M**	**19**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.035	0.09	7	**0.63**	**M**	**20**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.10	5	**0.48**	**M**	**21**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.09	5	**0.43**	**M**	**22**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.06	7	**0.42**	**M**	**23**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.06	7	**0.42**	**M**	**24**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	6	**0.39**	**L**	**1**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.090	0.08	5	**0.39**	**L**	**2**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	ACID Dam	0.020	0.05	7	**0.36**	**L**	**3**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	4	**0.34**	**L**	**4**
Sacramento River	0.43	Spawning	0.3	Water Temperature	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.32	1	**0.32**	**L**	**5**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.06	5	**0.32**	**L**	**6**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.05	6	**0.29**	**L**	**7**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Sacramento River

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category	
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Delta	0.800	0.14	2	**0.28**	**L**	**8**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Delta	0.800	0.14	2	**0.28**	**L**	**9**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.100	0.08	3	**0.24**	**L**	**10**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	3	**0.24**	**L**	**11**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Keswick Dam	0.400	0.07	3	**0.21**	**L**	**12**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.19**	**L**	**13**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**	**14**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**	**15**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.15**	**L**	**16**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	ACID Dam	0.300	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**	**17**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.300	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**	**18**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.025	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**	**19**
Sacramento River	0.43	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.025	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**	**20**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Bays	0.200	0.03	2	**0.07**	**L**	**21**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Bays	0.200	0.03	2	**0.07**	**L**	**22**
Sacramento River	0.43	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.010	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**	**23**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Battle Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	North Fork Dams	0.325	1.62	7	**11.35**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	South Fork Dams	0.325	1.62	7	**11.35**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Battle Creek	0.550	1.37	5	**6.86**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.150	0.75	7	**5.24**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Battle Creek	0.350	0.87	6	**5.24**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Battle Creek	0.400	1.14	4	**4.56**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.75	6	**4.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low instream flows per FERC license	1.000	4.28	1	**4.28**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Battle Creek	0.250	0.50	8	**3.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.70	5	**3.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.70	5	**3.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.70	5	**3.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.40	8	**3.19**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.50	6	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.50	6	**2.99**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Barriers	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	2.85	1	**2.85**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.71	4	**2.85**	**VH**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Battle Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Battle Creek	0.400	0.40	7	**2.79**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.45	6	**2.69**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.45	6	**2.69**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.375	0.53	5	**2.67**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.52	5	**2.62**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.44	6	**2.62**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.175	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	2.49	1	**2.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.500	0.36	7	**2.49**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.150	0.30	8	**2.39**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.30	8	**2.39**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.30	8	**2.39**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.275	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	2.35	1.00	**2.35**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.275	Water Temperature in Battle Creek	1.000	2.35	1.00	**2.35**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.57	4	**2.28**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.37	6	**2.24**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.37	6	**2.24**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.45	5	**2.24**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Battle Creek	0.200	0.36	6	**2.14**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.36	6	**2.14**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.36	6	**2.14**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Battle Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.14	1	**2.14**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.40	5	**2.00**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.40	5	**2.00**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.39	5	**1.96**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in Battle Creek	0.125	0.31	6	**1.87**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.30	6	**1.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.25	7	**1.75**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.25	7	**1.75**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.25	7	**1.75**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.25	7	**1.75**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.43	4	**1.71**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.27	6	**1.60**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.27	6	**1.60**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.31	5	**1.56**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.31	5	**1.56**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.30	5	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Battle Creek	0.200	0.30	5	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Delta	0.100	0.25	6	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.25	6	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.25	6	**1.50**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Battle Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.25	6	**1.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.20	7	**1.40**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.22	6	**1.35**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.150	Water Quality in Battle Creek	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Delta	0.100	0.25	5	**1.25**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.25	5	**1.25**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.25	5	**1.25**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	North Fork Dams	0.400	0.40	3	**1.20**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	South Fork Dams	0.400	0.40	3	**1.20**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.18	6	**1.07**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.21	5	**1.07**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Battle Creek	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.15	6	**0.90**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.15	6	**0.90**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Battle Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	6	**0.90**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	6	**0.90**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.10	8	**0.80**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	5	**0.75**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Battle Creek	0.150	0.11	7	**0.75**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.125	Bays	0.050	0.12	6	**0.75**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.71	1	**0.71**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.71	1	**0.71**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Water Temperature in Battle Creek	1.000	0.71	1	**0.71**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Hydrology	0.100	0.10	7	**0.70**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.10	7	**0.70**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.35	2	**0.70**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.30	2	**0.60**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.20	3	**0.60**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.10	6	**0.60**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.07	7	**0.52**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.075	0.07	7	**0.52**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	7	**0.50**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Battle Creek	0.050	0.10	5	**0.50**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Battle Creek	0.050	0.10	5	**0.50**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in Battle Creek	0.050	0.07	6	**0.45**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Battle Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.05	8	**0.40**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.05	8	**0.40**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.20	2	**0.40**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.07	5	**0.37**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.075	0.05	7	**0.37**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.05	7	**0.37**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Spawning	0.25	Water Quality	0.025	Water Quality in Battle Creek	1.000	0.36	1	**0.36**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.050	0.05	7	**0.35**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.15	2	**0.30**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Battle Creek	0.050	0.05	6	**0.30**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.050	0.04	7	**0.25**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.050	0.04	7	**0.25**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.57	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Battle Creek	0.025	0.04	5	**0.18**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Beegum Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Beegum Creek	0.600	1.43	5	**7.13**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	RBDD	0.550	1.05	5	**5.23**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.60	5	**2.99**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.300	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.85	1	**2.85**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.275	0.55	5	**2.74**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.55	5	**2.74**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.250	0.50	5	**2.49**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.27	8	**2.13**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.27	8	**2.13**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.27	8	**2.13**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.27	8	**2.13**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.29	7	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.33	6	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.33	6	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.350	Sedimentation	1.000	2.00	1.00	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.40	5	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.200	0.40	5	**2.00**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.90	1	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.48	4	**1.90**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Beegum Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Beegum Creek	0.250	0.48	4	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.48	4	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.48	4	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Beegum Creek	1.000	1.90	1	**1.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.27	6	**1.60**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.150	0.29	5	**1.43**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.24	6	**1.43**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.225	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.225	Water Quality in Beegum Creek	1.000	1.28	1.00	**1.28**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.20	6	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.20	6	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	6	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.60	2	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.60	2	**1.20**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.24	5	**1.19**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.24	5	**1.19**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.24	5	**1.19**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.24	5	**1.19**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Beegum Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.19	6	**1.14**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.20	5	**1.00**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.95	1	**0.95**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.19	5	**0.95**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.19	5	**0.95**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.19	5	**0.95**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.14	6	**0.86**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.14	6	**0.86**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.14	6	**0.86**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.125	0.12	7	**0.83**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.12	7	**0.83**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Beegum Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.12	7	**0.83**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.125	0.12	7	**0.83**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Beegum Creek	0.500	0.17	5	**0.83**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.13	6	**0.80**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.80**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.40	2	**0.80**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.40	2	**0.80**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.125	Water Temperature in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.71	1.00	**0.71**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.100	0.10	7	**0.67**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Beegum Creek	0.100	0.10	7	**0.67**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.67	1	**0.67**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.10	6	**0.57**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.10	6	**0.57**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Bay	0.100	0.10	6	**0.57**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Beegum Creek	0.050	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.07	8	**0.53**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.250	0.08	6	**0.50**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	6	**0.50**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.48	1	**0.48**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Beegum Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.48	1	**0.48**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.48	1	**0.48**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.07	7	**0.47**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.07	7	**0.47**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.07	7	**0.47**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.43	1.00	**0.43**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.07	6	**0.40**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.07	6	**0.40**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.40**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.05	6	**0.30**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	5	**0.25**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.24	1	**0.24**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Beegum Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Beegum Creek	0.050	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.03	5	**0.17**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Beegum Creek	0.050	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	5	**0.08**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Thomes Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Ag Diversion Dams, Braiding, Natural Channel Gradient	0.750	1.17	5	**5.86**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Thomes Creek	0.700	1.31	4	**5.25**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.50	1	**2.50**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.46	4	**1.84**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.46	4	**1.84**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.39	4	**1.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.39	4	**1.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.39	4	**1.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.39	4	**1.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.22	7	**1.53**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.26	5	**1.31**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.26	5	**1.31**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Thomes Creek	1.000	1.25	1	**1.25**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.18	7	**1.23**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	7	**1.23**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	7	**1.23**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Thomes Creek	1.000	1.13	1.00	**1.13**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.19	6	**1.13**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.22	5	**1.09**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**VH**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Thomes Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.26	4	**1.05**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.19	5	**0.94**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.19	5	**0.94**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.250	Sedimentation	1.000	0.94	1.00	**0.94**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.39	2	**0.79**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.39	2	**0.79**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.75	1.00	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.200	Water Quality in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.75	1.00	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.25	3	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.25	3	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.100	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.19	4	**0.75**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.13	5	**0.66**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.13	5	**0.66**	**H**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Thomes Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.63	1	**0.63**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.63	1	**0.63**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.13	5	**0.63**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.150	0.09	6	**0.56**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.150	0.09	6	**0.56**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	6	**0.56**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	6	**0.56**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.26	2	**0.53**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.13	4	**0.53**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.26	2	**0.53**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.09	5	**0.44**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	5	**0.44**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.44	1	**0.44**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Thomes Creek	0.500	0.11	4	**0.44**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.07	6	**0.39**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.08	5	**0.39**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.08	5	**0.39**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.08	5	**0.39**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Thomes Creek	0.200	0.13	3	**0.38**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.06	6	**0.38**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.33**	**M**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Thomes Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	5	**0.33**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.31	1	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.31	1	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.31	1	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.06	5	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	5	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.04	7	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Thomes Creek	0.050	0.04	7	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.04	7	**0.31**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.04	6	**0.26**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.06	4	**0.25**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Thomes Creek	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.04	5	**0.22**	**L**

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Thomes Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.25	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.19	1.00	**0.19**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	4	**0.18**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	4	**0.18**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.16**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	6	**0.13**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.025	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.25	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Clear Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.250	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	3.80	1	**3.80**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.410	0.62	6	**3.74**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Clear Creek	0.400	0.91	4	**3.65**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Whiskeytown Dam	0.355	0.54	6	**3.24**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	3.04	1	**3.04**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Clear Creek	1.000	3.04	1	**3.04**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.53	5	**2.66**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	2.28	1	**2.28**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Clear Creek	0.400	0.76	3	**2.28**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.46	5	**2.28**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.53	4	**2.13**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.350	Sedimentation in Clear Creek	1.000	2.00	1.00	**2.00**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Clear Creek	0.450	0.32	6	**1.92**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.38	5	**1.90**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.30	6	**1.78**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.71	1.00	**1.71**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.30	5	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.30	5	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.30	5	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.30	5	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Barriers	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.52	1	**1.52**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	6	**1.43**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	6	**1.43**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.24	6	**1.43**	**VH**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Clear Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in Clear Creek	1.000	1.43	1.00	**1.43**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Clear Creek	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.150	0.34	4	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.34	4	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.34	4	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.34	4	**1.37**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.30	4	**1.22**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.30	4	**1.22**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.30	4	**1.22**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.38	3	**1.14**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.38	3	**1.14**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.38	3	**1.14**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.23	5	**1.14**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.17	6	**1.03**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.17	6	**1.03**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.175	0.12	8	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.175	0.12	8	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.12	8	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Tracy and Banks Pumping Plants	0.175	0.12	8	**0.93**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Clear Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.350	0.13	7	**0.93**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.15	6	**0.91**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.14	6	**0.86**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.17	5	**0.83**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.15	5	**0.76**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Clear Creek	1.000	0.76	1	**0.76**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in Clear Creek	0.100	0.12	6	**0.71**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.14	5	**0.71**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.100	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.700	0.33	2	**0.67**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Clear Creek	0.100	0.07	8	**0.53**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	8	**0.53**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Clear Creek	0.200	0.08	7	**0.53**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Clear Creek	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Clear Creek	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Clear Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Clear Creek	0.200	0.10	5	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.08	6	**0.46**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.08	6	**0.46**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.030	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.46	1	**0.46**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.100	0.07	6	**0.43**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.100	0.07	6	**0.43**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.09	5	**0.43**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.08	5	**0.38**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.08	5	**0.38**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	5	**0.38**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	5	**0.38**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.06	6	**0.36**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	5	**0.36**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.035	0.05	6	**0.32**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.08	4	**0.30**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Spawning	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.020	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.30	1	**0.30**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.29	1.00	**0.29**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.29**	**M**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Clear Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.29**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.29**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Whiskeytown Dam	0.300	0.14	2	**0.29**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Clear Creek	0.150	0.06	5	**0.29**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.06	5	**0.29**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.29	1.00	**0.29**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.03	8	**0.27**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.03	8	**0.27**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.04	7	**0.27**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.27**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.27**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.27**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.05	5	**0.24**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.05	5	**0.24**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.05	5	**0.24**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	6	**0.21**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	6	**0.21**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	6	**0.21**	**L**

Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmom

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix - Clear Creek

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.04	5	**0.19**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.050	0.02	7	**0.13**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.050	0.02	5	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	5	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.06	2	**0.11**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.06	2	**0.11**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.04	2	**0.08**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.04	2	**0.08**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.38	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects (Competition and Predation)	0.030	Clear Creek	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Impediments/Barriers in Cow Creek	0.86	2.322	6	**13.93**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Cow Creek	0.95	2.565	4	**10.26**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Impediments/Barriers in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.76	1.231	6	**7.39**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Diversions in Cow Creek	0.4	0.900	8	**7.20**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.250**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Cow Creek	0.75	1.688	4	**6.75**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Keswick Dam	0.525	0.82	7	**5.73**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	North Fork Dams	0.325	0.74	7	**5.18**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	South Fork Dams	0.325	0.74	7	**5.18**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.95	1.283	4	**5.13**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.8	0.864	5	**4.32**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Cow Creek	0.6	0.810	5	**4.05**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Cow Creek	0.75	1.013	4	**4.05**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Barriers	0.400	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1	3.600	1	**3.60**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.2	0.450	8	**3.60**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Cow Creek	0.8	0.720	5	**3.60**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Barrier/Genetics	0.450	Keswick/Shasta Dam	1.000	3.51	1	**3.51**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.300	0.47	7	**3.28**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.200**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.75	0.810	4	**3.24**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Cow Creek	0.5	0.450	7	**3.15**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Battle Creek	0.550	0.63	5	**3.13**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.300	Stocked trout fishery in upper Cow Creek - competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1	2.700	1	**2.70**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.4	0.324	8	**2.59**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Battle Creek - Coleman - Competition for habitat and food	0.350	0.40	6	**2.39**	**VH**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.150	0.34	7	**2.39**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.58	4	**2.33**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Barriers	0.400	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1	2.160	1	**2.16**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in Cow Creek	0.4	0.360	6	**2.16**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.4	0.360	6	**2.16**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Battle Creek	0.400	0.52	4	**2.08**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.34	6	**2.05**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.405	5	**2.03**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the Delta	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the Delta	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the Delta	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.39	5	**1.95**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.39	5	**1.95**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.2	0.324	6	**1.94**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.5	0.270	7	**1.89**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.400	0.37	5	**1.87**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Battle Creek	0.250	0.23	8	**1.82**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.1	0.225	8	**1.80**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.225	8	**1.80**	**VH**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure (GCID, RBDD) related in the middle Sacramento River	0.225	0.35	5	**1.76**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Barriers	0.250	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.63	1	**1.63**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low instream flows per FERC license	1.000	1.63	1	**1.63**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.250	Coleman - competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	1.63	1	**1.63**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.75	0.405	4	**1.62**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.32	5	**1.59**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.32	5	**1.59**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.32	5	**1.59**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.56	1	**1.56**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.18	8	**1.46**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.28	5	**1.40**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.27	5	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.27	5	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.27	5	**1.37**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure (ACID) related in the upper Sacramento River	0.175	0.27	5	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Cow Creek	0.2	0.270	5	**1.35**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.2	0.270	5	**1.35**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.270	5	**1.35**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.2	0.270	5	**1.35**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.33	4	**1.30**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.4	0.216	6	**1.30**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.4	0.216	6	**1.30**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.2	0.162	8	**1.30**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Battle Creek	0.400	0.18	7	**1.27**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Changes in Hydrology	0.2	0.180	7	**1.26**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	6	**1.23**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.20	6	**1.23**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.375	0.24	5	**1.22**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.3	0.243	5	**1.22**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.243	5	**1.22**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.20	6	**1.19**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	5	**1.19**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.150	0.14	8	**1.09**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.14	8	**1.09**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.14	8	**1.09**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Impediments/Barriers in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.5	0.540	2	**1.08**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Tributary Barriers	0.5	0.540	2	**1.08**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1	1.080	1	**1.08**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.275	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.07	1.00	**1.07**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.275	Water Temperature in Battle Creek	1.000	1.07	1.00	**1.07**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.26	4	**1.04**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.17	6	**1.02**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.17	6	**1.02**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.146	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.15	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.15	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.25	4	**1.00**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Battle Creek	0.200	0.16	6	**0.98**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.16	6	**0.98**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.16	6	**0.98**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.98	1	**0.98**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.325	Water Quality in Cow Creek	1.00	0.975	1.00	**0.98**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.325	Water Temperature in Cow Creek	1.00	0.975	1	**0.98**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.135	7	**0.95**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	5	**0.91**	**H**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	5	**0.91**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.05	0.113	8	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.113	8	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.05	0.113	8	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.05	0.113	8	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.250**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.225	4	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.250**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.225	4	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.250**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.225	4	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.100	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1	0.900	1	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Cow Creek	0.4	0.180	5	**0.90**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Cow Creek	1	0.900	1	**0.90**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.18	5	**0.89**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.225	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.88	1	**0.88**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Quality	0.225	Water Pollution in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.88	1	**0.88**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in Battle Creek	0.125	0.14	6	**0.85**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Middle Sacramento River	0.25	0.122	7	**0.85**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.21	4	**0.83**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.350	0.14	6	**0.82**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.14	6	**0.82**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.6	0.162	5	**0.81**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.05	0.135	6	**0.81**	**H**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Impediments/Barriers in Cow Creek	0.9	0.405	2	**0.81**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1	0.810	1	**0.81**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.162	5	**0.81**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.11	7	**0.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.11	7	**0.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.11	7	**0.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.11	7	**0.80**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Middle Sacramento River	0.25	0.113	7	**0.79**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bay	0.100	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.78	1	**0.78**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.20	4	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.78	1	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.78	1	**0.78**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Changes in Hydrology	0.2	0.108	7	**0.76**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.12	6	**0.73**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.250	0.15	5	**0.73**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.15	5	**0.73**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.12	6	**0.73**	**H**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.15	5	**0.73**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.14	5	**0.72**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.14	5	**0.72**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.275	0.14	5	**0.72**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.14	5	**0.71**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.14	5	**0.71**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.14	5	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.300	0.10	7	**0.68**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.175	Redd disturbance in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.68	1.00	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Delta	0.100	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.175	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.68	1	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Battle Creek	0.200	0.14	5	**0.68**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.2	0.097	7	**0.68**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.1	0.135	5	**0.68**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.135	5	**0.68**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	Cow Creek	0.3	0.135	5	**0.68**	**H**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.135	5	**0.68**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.375	Water Temperature in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	1.00	0.675	1	**0.68**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.1	0.081	8	**0.65**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.081	8	**0.65**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.09	7	**0.64**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.090	7	**0.63**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Cow Creek	0.2	0.090	7	**0.63**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	4	**0.62**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.10	6	**0.61**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1	0.600	1	**0.60**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.075	Habitat Suitability in in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.59	1	**0.59**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.15	4	**0.59**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.150	Water Quality in Battle Creek	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.20	3	**0.59**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.20	3	**0.59**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.11	5	**0.57**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Delta	0.100	0.11	5	**0.57**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	5	**0.57**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.25	0.113	5	**0.56**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.300	0.09	6	**0.56**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Reverse Flow Conditions in the Delta	0.300	0.09	6	**0.56**	**H**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	North Fork Dams	0.400	0.18	3	**0.55**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	South Fork Dams	0.400	0.18	3	**0.55**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass-Freemont Weir	0.050	0.08	7	**0.55**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.135	4	**0.54**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.135	4	**0.54**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.090	6	**0.54**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.108	5	**0.54**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	1	0.540	1	**0.54**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	7	**0.51**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.275	Water Quality in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	1.00	0.495	1.00	**0.50**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	6	**0.49**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	5	**0.49**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.09	5	**0.47**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the Delta	0.100	0.09	5	**0.47**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	5	**0.47**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Diversion into Central Delta	0.250	0.08	6	**0.47**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	5	**0.46**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	5	**0.46**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Battle Creek	0.100	0.09	5	**0.46**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	5	**0.46**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1	0.450	1	**0.45**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.2	0.090	5	**0.45**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.090	5	**0.45**	**M**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.090	5	**0.45**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.150	0.09	5	**0.44**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.200**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento	0.1	0.108	4	**0.43**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.200**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.108	4	**0.43**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	4	**0.42**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.150	0.07	6	**0.41**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.150	0.07	6	**0.41**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	6	**0.41**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	6	**0.41**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.081	5	**0.41**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.081	5	**0.41**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.1	0.081	5	**0.41**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in upper	1.000	0.39	1	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	4	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	4	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	4	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal	0.333	0.13	3	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Middle Sacramento River	0.333	0.13	3	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Upper Sacramento River	0.333	0.13	3	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.035	0.05	7	**0.38**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.035	0.05	7	**0.38**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.035	0.05	7	**0.38**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.054	7	**0.38**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.05	8	**0.36**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1	0.360	1	**0.36**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.06	6	**0.35**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Battle Creek	0.150	0.05	7	**0.34**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Bays	0.050	0.06	6	**0.34**	**M**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Delta	0.1	0.049	7	**0.34**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.049	7	**0.34**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.068	5	**0.34**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.05	0.068	5	**0.34**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.054	6	**0.32**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.05	0.041	8	**0.32**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.041	8	**0.32**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.05	0.041	8	**0.32**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.05	0.041	8	**0.32**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Middle Sacramento River	0.03	0.081	4	**0.32**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Hydrology	0.100	0.05	7	**0.32**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.05	7	**0.32**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.16	2	**0.32**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Diversion into Central Delta	0.05	0.045	7	**0.32**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.045	7	**0.32**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.05	0.045	7	**0.32**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.05	0.045	7	**0.32**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Delta	0.1	0.045	7	**0.32**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.045	7	**0.32**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.100	0.06	5	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.125	0.05	6	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.125	0.05	6	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.05	6	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.05	6	**0.29**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.14	2	**0.27**	**M**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.09	3	**0.27**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.100	0.05	6	**0.27**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1	0.270	1	**0.27**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.2	0.054	5	**0.27**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.054	5	**0.27**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.2	0.054	5	**0.27**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Delta	0.2	0.054	5	**0.27**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.068	4	**0.27**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.045	6	**0.27**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	1	0.270	1	**0.27**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Upper Sacramento River	0.05	0.054	5	**0.27**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Water Quality	0.030	Water Quality in Cow Creek	1	0.270	1	**0.27**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.100	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.04	7	**0.25**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.04	7	**0.25**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Cow	0.45	0.041	6	**0.24**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.03	7	**0.24**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.075	0.03	7	**0.24**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.090	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Battle Creek	0.050	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Battle Creek	0.050	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.00	0.225	1.00	**0.23**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical	1	0.225	1	**0.23**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.045	5	**0.23**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.1	0.045	5	**0.23**	**M**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.05	0.045	5	**0.23**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	ACID Dam	0.020	0.03	7	**0.22**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Lower Sacramento River	0.04	0.043	5	**0.22**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.200**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal	0.05	0.054	4	**0.22**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.040	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1	0.216	1	**0.22**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.054	4	**0.22**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.054	4	**0.22**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.04	0.036	6	**0.22**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.05	4	**0.21**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in Battle Creek	0.050	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.075	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Water Temperature	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.20	1	**0.20**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Diversion into Central Delta	0.05	0.027	7	**0.19**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.027	7	**0.19**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.05	0.027	7	**0.19**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.05	0.027	7	**0.19**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in Cow Creek	0.35	0.032	6	**0.19**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.09	2	**0.18**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.04	0.036	5	**0.18**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	5	**0.17**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Delta	0.800	0.08	2	**0.17**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Delta	0.800	0.08	2	**0.17**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.025	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.025	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Water Quality	0.025	Water Quality in Battle Creek	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Water Temperature	0.025	Water Temperature in Battle Creek	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.01	0.027	6	**0.16**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.01	0.027	6	**0.16**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.01	0.027	6	**0.16**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.01	0.027	6	**0.16**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.027	6	**0.16**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.027	6	**0.16**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.027	6	**0.16**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Middle Sacramento River	0.03	0.041	4	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.050	0.02	7	**0.16**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.100	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.45	0.024	6	**0.15**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.8	0.072	2	**0.14**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.8	0.072	2	**0.14**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.07	2	**0.14**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Battle	0.050	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Delta	0.3	0.027	5	**0.14**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.027	5	**0.14**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.1	0.027	5	**0.14**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.027	5	**0.14**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.25	0.023	6	**0.14**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.00	0.135	1.00	**0.14**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical	1	0.135	1	**0.14**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.04	0.022	6	**0.13**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Keswick Dam	0.400	0.04	3	**0.12**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.35	0.019	6	**0.11**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.2	0.018	6	**0.11**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.4	0.022	5	**0.11**	**L**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.027	4	**0.11**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Lower Sacramento River	0.01	0.027	4	**0.11**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Upper Sacramento River	0.01	0.027	4	**0.11**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Bays	0.03	0.015	7	**0.10**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Delta	0.3	0.016	6	**0.10**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.016	6	**0.10**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.01	0.016	6	**0.10**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.01	0.016	6	**0.10**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.01	0.016	6	**0.10**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.01	0.016	6	**0.10**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.016	6	**0.10**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.016	6	**0.10**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Bays	0.03	0.014	7	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	ACID Dam	0.300	0.03	3	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.300	0.03	3	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1	0.090	1	**0.09**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.1	0.045	2	**0.09**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.04	0.018	5	**0.09**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.010	Habitat Suitability	1	0.090	1	**0.09**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.8	0.043	2	**0.09**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.8	0.043	2	**0.09**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Battle Creek	0.025	0.02	5	**0.08**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.25	0.014	6	**0.08**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.3	0.016	5	**0.08**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Ocean	0.02	0.010	7	**0.07**	**L**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Lower Sacramento River	0.15	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Upper Sacramento River	0.15	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.05	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.25	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.2	0.011	6	**0.06**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Ocean	0.02	0.009	7	**0.06**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.009	6	**0.05**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.01	0.011	5	**0.05**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1	0.054	1	**0.05**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Lower Sacramento River	0.01	0.014	4	**0.05**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Upper Sacramento River	0.01	0.014	4	**0.05**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.01	0.009	6	**0.05**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Lower Sacramento River	0.15	0.008	6	**0.05**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Upper Sacramento River	0.15	0.008	6	**0.05**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Cow Creek	0.1	0.009	5	**0.05**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.01	0.009	5	**0.05**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Bays	0.200	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	oss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Bay	0.200	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.2	0.018	2	**0.04**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.2	0.018	2	**0.04**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.1	0.005	6	**0.03**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.01	0.005	6	**0.03**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.005	6	**0.03**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.05	0.005	6	**0.03**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.010	0.01	5	**0.03**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.01	0.005	5	**0.02**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.01	0.005	5	**0.02**	**L**

Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.2	0.011	2	**0.02**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.2	0.011	2	**0.02**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.04	0.004	6	**0.02**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.04	0.004	6	**0.02**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.05	0.003	6	**0.02**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.04	0.002	6	**0.01**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.04	0.002	6	**0.01**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.04	0.002	5	**0.01**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.01	0.001	6	**0.01**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.01	0.001	6	**0.01**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.01	0.001	6	**0.00**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.01	0.001	6	**0.00**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the	0.01	0.001	5	**0.00**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Bays	0	0.000	5		
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0	0.000	4		
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Delta	0	0.000	4		

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Friant Dam	0.500	0.900	5	**4.500**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Bellota Weir	0.375	0.748	5	**3.741**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Flash Board Dams	0.375	0.748	5	**3.741**	**VH**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.250	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the San Joaquin River	0.500	0.750	4	**3.000**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.500	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.800	1	**2.800**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Calaveras River	0.500	0.855	3	**2.565**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	La Grange	0.500	0.560	4	**2.240**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.350	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	2.205	1	**2.205**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.350	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.205	1	**2.205**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Don Pedro	0.350	0.392	5	**1.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.920	1	**1.920**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Goodwin Dam	0.350	0.378	5	**1.890**	**VH**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.250	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.450	4	**1.800**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Flow Conditions	0.450	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.710	1	**1.710**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low flows limiting attraction into the Calaveras Rvier	1.000	1.710	1	**1.710**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Merced River	0.350	0.336	5	**1.680**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.300	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	1.680	1	**1.680**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	New Melones	0.300	0.324	5	**1.620**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.513	3	**1.539**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.150	0.299	5	**1.496**	**VH**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.550	0.495	3	**1.485**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Camanche Dam	0.440	0.297	5	**1.485**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Crocker Huffman	0.300	0.288	5	**1.440**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.350	Low flows limiting attraction into the Stanislaus River	0.550	0.693	2	**1.386**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Mendota Pool	0.150	0.270	5	1.350	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sack Dam	0.150	0.270	5	1.350	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.150	0.270	5	1.350	VH
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.600	Flow Fluctuations	0.600	1.296	1	1.296	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.175	Mokelumne River	0.650	0.427	3	1.280	VH
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.260	1	1.260	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.700	0.630	2	1.260	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Temperature	0.150	San Joaquin River	0.700	0.630	2	1.260	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Barrier	0.200	Competition for spawning habitat	1.000	1.200	1	1.200	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	1.200	1	1.200	VH
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	McSwain Dam	0.250	0.240	5	1.200	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.200	1	1.200	VH
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.175	Bellota Weir	0.400	0.399	3	1.197	VH
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.175	New Hogan Dam	0.400	0.399	3	1.197	VH
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the Calaveras River	0.700	0.599	2	1.197	VH
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.600	Flow Fluctuations	0.600	1.152	1	1.152	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Pardee Reservoir Dam	0.340	0.230	5	1.148	VH
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.350	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Stanislaus River	0.450	0.567	2	1.134	VH
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Stanislaus River	0.400	0.225	5	1.125	VH
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.200	San Joaquin River	0.450	0.360	3	1.080	VH
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in San Joaquin River	0.550	0.528	2	1.056	VH
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.342	3	1.026	VH

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	San Joaquin River	0.500	0.338	3	**1.013**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.125	Calaveras River	0.700	0.499	2	**0.998**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Flow Conditions	0.325	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.975	1	**0.975**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Tulloch Dam	0.180	0.194	5	**0.972**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Flow Conditions	0.550	Flow Fluctuations	0.550	0.968	1	**0.968**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.192	5	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.192	5	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.960	1	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	New Exchequer Dam	0.200	0.192	5	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.200	0.192	5	**0.960**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water temperature in the Calaveras River	1.000	0.950	1	**0.950**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Calaveras River	0.550	0.314	3	**0.941**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Mokelumne River	0.400	0.300	3	**0.900**	**VH**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in San Joaquin River	1.000	0.900	1	**0.900**	**VH**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.250	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.150	0.225	4	**0.900**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Tuolumne River	0.350	0.175	5	**0.875**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Merced River	0.450	0.432	2	**0.864**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.225	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.855	1	**0.855**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.169	5	**0.844**	**VH**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.700	0.420	2	**0.840**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.200	Tuolumne River	0.350	0.280	3	**0.840**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.275	Water temperature in the Mokelumne River	1.000	0.825	1	**0.825**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.150	0.162	5	**0.810**	**VH**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.270	3	**0.810**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	Merced River	0.400	0.256	3	**0.768**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	San Joaquin River	0.400	0.256	3	**0.768**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	San Joaquin River	0.400	0.256	3	**0.768**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	Tuolumne River	0.400	0.256	3	**0.768**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Barrier	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.760	1	**0.760**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.760	1	**0.760**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.760	1	**0.760**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.350	0.252	3	**0.756**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.252	3	**0.756**	**VH**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.250	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.750	1	**0.750**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.450	0.243	3	**0.729**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Changes in Hydrology	0.150	0.144	5	**0.720**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.720	1	**0.720**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.180	4	**0.720**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Water Temperature	0.150	Water temperature in the Merced River	1.000	0.720	1	**0.720**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Tuolumne River	0.550	0.352	2	**0.704**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.500	0.141	5	**0.703**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Calaveras River	0.600	0.342	2	**0.684**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Calaveras River	0.600	0.342	2	**0.684**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in the Mokelumne River	1.000	0.675	1	**0.675**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.225	3	0.675	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.300	0.225	3	0.675	VH
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.450	0.108	6	0.648	VH
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.450	0.216	3	0.648	VH
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Merced River	0.300	0.216	3	0.648	VH
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.400	0.216	3	0.648	VH
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Delta	0.500	0.214	3	0.641	VH
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.203	3	0.608	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.400	0.120	5	0.600	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Barrier	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.600	1	0.600	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.600	1	0.600	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.500	0.150	4	0.600	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.500	0.150	4	0.600	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.500	0.150	4	0.600	VH
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.500	0.150	4	0.600	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.100	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.600	1	0.600	VH
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Water Temperature	0.100	Water temperature in the Mokelumne River	1.000	0.600	1	0.600	VH
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.175	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.200	3	0.599	H
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in San Joaquin River	0.450	0.288	2	0.576	H
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.192	3	0.576	H
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.570	1.00	0.570	H
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.560	1	0.560	H
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Water Temperature	0.100	Water temperature in the Tuolumne River	1.000	0.560	1	0.560	H
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.400	0.090	6	0.540	H

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Stanislaus River	0.400	0.180	3	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Delta	0.400	0.180	3	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Predation	0.075	Predation in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.180	3	**0.540**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.135	4	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.270	2	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.270	2	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.600	0.270	2	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.175	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.525	1	**0.525**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Calaveras River	0.450	0.128	4	**0.513**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Calaveras River	0.400	0.171	3	**0.513**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Calaveras River	0.600	0.171	3	**0.513**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.171	3	**0.513**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.257	2	**0.513**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.150	0.101	5	**0.506**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Merced River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the Tuolumne River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Merced River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.100	5	**0.500**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.100	5	**0.500**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.350	0.100	5	**0.499**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	New Hogan Dam	0.050	0.100	5	**0.499**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.100	5	**0.499**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.175	Delta	0.250	0.164	3	**0.492**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Diversion into Central Delta	0.100	0.096	5	**0.480**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Merced River	0.500	0.120	4	**0.480**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.200	0.160	3	**0.480**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Mokelumne River	0.525	0.118	4	**0.473**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.158	3	**0.473**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Stanislaus River	0.350	0.158	3	**0.473**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.228	2	**0.456**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.228	2	**0.456**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.450	1	**0.450**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.450	1.00	**0.450**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.090	5	**0.450**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Stanislaus River	0.500	0.113	4	**0.450**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.500	0.150	3	**0.450**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.150	Water Pollution	1.000	0.450	1.00	**0.450**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.100	Mokelumne River	0.600	0.225	2	**0.450**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.112	4	**0.448**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Crocker Huffman	0.450	0.108	4	**0.432**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.144	3	**0.432**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Merced River	0.300	0.144	3	**0.432**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.144	3	**0.432**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.400	0.144	3	**0.432**	**H**

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Calaveras River	0.300	0.086	5	**0.428**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.300	0.214	2	**0.428**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the San Joaquin River	0.150	0.084	5	**0.422**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.210	2	**0.420**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Friant Dam	0.700	0.210	2	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.350	0.105	4	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.350	0.070	6	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.140	3	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Tuolumne River	0.350	0.140	3	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.140	3	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.140	3	**0.420**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.275	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.413	1	**0.413**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Stanislaus River	0.200	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.350	0.100	4	**0.399**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.096	4	**0.384**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.128	3	**0.384**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.200	0.128	3	**0.384**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.200	0.128	3	**0.384**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.100	Water Pollution	1.000	0.380	1.00	**0.380**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Changes in Hydrology	0.150	0.075	5	**0.375**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.500	0.188	2	**0.375**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Mokelumne River	0.500	0.188	2	**0.375**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.250	Water Pollution	1.000	0.375	1.00	**0.375**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water temperature in the San Joaquin River	1.000	0.375	1	**0.375**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Stanislaus River	0.400	0.072	5	**0.360**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.400	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.120	3	**0.360**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.600	0.180	2	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Tuolumne River	0.300	0.120	3	**0.360**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.180	2	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the San Joaquin River	0.300	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Tuolumne River	0.300	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Stanislaus River	0.200	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.250	0.120	3	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.180	2	**0.360**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	Calaveras River	0.600	0.171	2	**0.342**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.168	2	**0.336**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	McSwain Dam	0.350	0.084	4	**0.336**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.350	0.084	4	**0.336**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.350	0.112	3	**0.336**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.080	4	**0.320**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.315	1	**0.315**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in Stanislaus River	1.000	0.315	1	**0.315**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Water Temperature	0.050	Water temperature in the Stanislaus River	1.000	0.315	1	**0.315**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.079	4	**0.315**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.158	2	**0.315**	**H**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.060	5	**0.300**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the San Joaquin River	0.250	0.050	6	**0.300**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.060	5	**0.300**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Don Pedro	0.500	0.100	3	**0.300**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	La Grange	0.500	0.100	3	**0.300**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.250	Diversion into Central Delta	0.050	0.075	4	**0.300**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.300	1	**0.300**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.300	1	**0.300**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in the Mokelumne River	1.000	0.300	1	**0.300**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.150	2	**0.300**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Goodwin Dam	0.330	0.074	4	**0.297**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	New Melones	0.330	0.074	4	**0.297**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tulloch Dam	0.330	0.074	4	**0.297**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.048	6	**0.288**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.144	2	**0.288**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.072	4	**0.288**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.072	4	**0.288**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.072	4	**0.288**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.200	0.096	3	**0.288**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.057	5	**0.285**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Mokelumne River	0.200	0.056	5	**0.281**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.100	0.056	5	**0.281**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Merced River	0.350	0.056	5	**0.280**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.280	1	**0.280**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Tuolumne River	0.350	0.056	5	**0.280**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.140	2	**0.280**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in Tuolumne River	1.000	0.280	1	**0.280**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.045	6	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Stanislaus River	0.200	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Bays	0.200	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.300	0.068	4	**0.270**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.135	2	**0.270**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.068	4	**0.270**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.100	Mokelumne River	0.600	0.135	2	**0.270**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.131	2	**0.263**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.086	3	**0.257**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.086	3	**0.257**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Delta	0.450	0.084	3	**0.253**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Mokelumne River	0.450	0.084	3	**0.253**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Mokelumne River	0.750	0.084	3	**0.253**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Diversion into Central Delta	0.100	0.050	5	**0.250**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the Stanislaus River	0.150	0.081	3	**0.243**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.240	1	**0.240**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.120	2	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Bays	0.200	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Delta	0.200	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the San Joaquin River	0.250	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the Tuolumne River	0.200	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in Merced River	1.000	0.240	1	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.040	6	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.300	0.048	5	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.120	2	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Merced River	0.250	0.080	3	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.048	5	**0.240**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.350	0.079	3	**0.236**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.800	0.114	2	**0.228**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.114	2	**0.228**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.250	0.045	5	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Mokelumne River	0.600	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Mokelumne River	0.600	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Camanche Dam	0.300	0.056	4	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Woodbridge Dam	0.300	0.056	4	**0.225**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the San Joaquin River	0.250	0.056	4	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the Mokelumne River	0.400	0.075	3	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Mokelumne River	0.500	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.400	0.075	3	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.500	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Water Quality	0.075	Water quality in the San Joaquin River	1.000	0.225	1	**0.225**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Water Temperature	0.075	Water temperature in the San Joaquin River	1.000	0.225	1	**0.225**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in the Stanislaus River	0.250	0.225	1	**0.225**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.056	4	**0.224**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.350	0.056	4	**0.224**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.350	0.056	4	**0.224**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Merced River	0.150	0.036	6	**0.216**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	Stanislaus River	0.200	0.072	3	**0.216**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.054	4	**0.216**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	Delta	0.350	0.070	3	**0.210**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.070	3	**0.210**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.150	0.034	6	**0.203**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Stanislaus River	0.150	0.034	6	**0.203**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.250	0.040	5	**0.200**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water temperature in the Merced River	0.250	0.200	1	**0.200**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in the Tuolumne River	0.250	0.200	1	**0.200**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.100	2	**0.200**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.175	Bays	0.100	0.066	3	**0.197**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.096	2	**0.192**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the Merced River	0.200	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.190	1	**0.190**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.190	1	**0.190**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in the Calaveras River	1.000	0.190	1	**0.190**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Water Temperature	0.050	Water temperature in the Calaveras River	1.000	0.190	1	**0.190**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.036	5	**0.180**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.060	3	**0.180**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Tuolumne River	0.150	0.030	6	**0.180**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.200	0.045	4	**0.180**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.090	2	**0.180**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	Tuolumne River	0.300	0.060	3	**0.180**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.090	2	**0.180**	**M**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.300	0.090	2	**0.180**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.045	4	**0.180**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.045	4	**0.180**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.045	4	**0.180**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.090	2	**0.180**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.400	0.057	3	**0.171**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.150	0.043	4	**0.171**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.086	2	**0.171**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.034	5	**0.169**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.250	0.056	3	**0.169**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Mokelumne River	0.600	0.056	3	**0.169**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.032	5	**0.160**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.032	5	**0.160**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.080	2	**0.160**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.040	4	**0.160**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.030	5	**0.150**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.100	0.030	5	**0.150**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.150	1	**0.150**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.150	1	**0.150**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.075	2	**0.150**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.075	2	**0.150**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.075	2	**0.150**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Pardee Reservoir Dam	0.200	0.038	4	**0.150**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.038	4	**0.150**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.150	1	**0.150**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.024	6	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.072	2	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	New Exchequer Dam	0.150	0.036	4	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Delta	0.150	0.036	4	**0.144**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Stanislaus River	0.200	0.036	4	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.036	4	**0.144**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.029	5	**0.143**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.028	5	**0.141**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.028	5	**0.141**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.100	0.028	5	**0.141**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Diversion into Central Delta	0.050	0.028	5	**0.141**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.068	2	**0.135**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Delta	0.150	0.034	4	**0.135**	**L**

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.043	3	**0.128**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.300	0.043	3	**0.128**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Calaveras River	0.300	0.043	3	**0.128**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Merced River	0.200	0.032	4	**0.128**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Tuolumne River	0.200	0.032	4	**0.128**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.060	2	**0.120**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.057	2	**0.114**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Hatchery Effects	0.075	Density dependent impacts - Redd superimposition, fungus	1.000	0.113	1	**0.113**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.056	2	**0.113**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.038	3	**0.113**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.020	0.022	5	**0.108**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Merced River	0.100	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.095	1	**0.095**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.018	5	**0.090**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.200	0.030	3	**0.090**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.025	San Joaquin River	0.200	0.030	3	**0.090**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.100	0.023	4	**0.090**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
San Joaquin River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.100	0.023	4	**0.090**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.023	4	**0.090**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Stanislaus River	0.100	0.023	4	**0.090**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.029	3	**0.086**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.043	2	**0.086**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.028	3	**0.084**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.016	5	**0.080**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.016	5	**0.080**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.100	0.016	5	**0.080**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.100	0.016	5	**0.080**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Tuolumne River	0.100	0.020	4	**0.080**	**L**
San Joaquin River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.075	1.00	**0.075**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.012	6	**0.072**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.012	6	**0.072**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.018	4	**0.072**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.014	5	**0.071**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.011	6	**0.068**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.011	6	**0.068**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Woodbridge Dam	0.020	0.014	5	**0.068**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.023	3	**0.068**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.010	6	**0.060**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.010	6	**0.060**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.050	0.014	4	**0.057**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.025	Calaveras River	0.200	0.029	2	**0.057**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.019	3	**0.056**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.050	0.012	4	**0.048**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.050	0.009	5	**0.045**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.100	Water Pollution	0.100	0.032	1.00	**0.032**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.009	3	**0.028**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.025	0.006	4	**0.023**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.050	0.006	3	**0.017**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.025	0.003	4	**0.010**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.025	0.003	4	**0.010**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	0.050	0.009	1.00	**0.009**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	0.050	0.009	1	**0.009**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Pollution	0.050	0.009	1.00	**0.009**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	0.050	0.008	1.00	**0.008**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	0.050	0.008	1.00	**0.008**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	0.050	0.008	1	**0.008**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	0.050	0.008	1	**0.008**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Pollution	0.050	0.008	1.00	**0.008**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Barrier	0.000	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.000	1	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Barrier	0.000	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.000	1	**0.000**	

Central Valley Steelhead

Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.000	1	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.000	1	**0.000**	
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Bays	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.000	0.000	3	**0.000**	
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Calaveras River	0.000	0.000	3	**0.000**	
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Delta	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.000	0.000	3	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Merced River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	San Joaquin River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	San Joaquin River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	San Joaquin River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Stanislaus River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Tuolumne River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.000	0.000	3	**0.000**	

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.850	Impediments/Barriers in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.990	2.356	3	**7.07**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Deer Creek	0.600	0.49	5	**2.44**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Mill Creek	0.600	0.49	5	**2.44**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Antelope Creek	0.700	0.58	4	**2.31**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.500	Bear River	0.950	0.570	4	**2.28**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Deer Creek	0.700	0.57	4	**2.28**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Mill Creek	0.700	0.57	4	**2.28**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.45	5	**2.25**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual or Terminal Diversions and loss of channel connectivity in Antelope Creek	0.500	0.32	7	**2.21**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Englebright Dam	0.650	0.43	5	**2.15**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Fish Barrier/Oroville Dam	0.850	0.51	4	**2.04**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Iron Canyon, City of Chico Swimming Holes and Associated Dams	0.750	0.38	5	**1.88**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Bear River	0.550	0.297	6	**1.78**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.450	Impediments/Barriers in the Dry Creek drainage	0.900	0.567	3	**1.70**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Big Chico Creek	0.700	0.42	4	**1.68**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.250	Bear River	0.850	0.383	4	**1.53**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.450	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Bear River	0.850	0.459	3	**1.38**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.665	Turbidity and sedimentation in Mill Creek	1.000	1.30	1.00	**1.30**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.665	Turbidity, sedimentation, hazardous spills (HWY 32) in Deer Creek	1.000	1.30	1.00	**1.30**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	Ag, Urban in the Dry Creek drainage	0.700	0.294	4	**1.18**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Butte Creek	0.800	0.39	3	**1.16**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Barrier	0.450	Historical spawning habitat blocked	1.000	1.080	1	**1.08**	**VH**

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.36	3	**1.08**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Barrier	0.300	Fish Barrier Dam/Oroville Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.05	1	**1.05**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Yuba River	0.350	0.25	4	**0.98**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Yuba River	0.350	0.25	4	**0.98**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Deer Creek	0.400	0.20	5	**0.98**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Butte Creek Diversion Dams and Weirs	0.600	0.16	6	**0.95**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.94**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.94**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.94**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Barrier	0.300	Englebright Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.91	1	**0.91**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.275	Put-and-take rainbow trout fishery in upper Deer Creek, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.89	1	**0.89**	**VH**

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.275	Stocked trout fishery in upper Mill Creek drainage competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.89	1	**0.89**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.275	Turbidity and Sedimentation in Mill Creek	1.000	0.89	1	**0.89**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.500	Nimbus/Folsom Dams	0.980	0.294	3	**0.88**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.200	American River	0.700	0.294	3	**0.88**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Deer Creek	0.600	0.29	3	**0.88**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Mill Creek	0.600	0.29	3	**0.88**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Delta	0.375	0.22	4	**0.88**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the Delta	0.300	0.18	5	**0.88**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.525	Flow Fluctuations, Flood Events	1.000	0.87	1.00	**0.87**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the Delta	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the Delta	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.21	4	**0.84**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.20	4	**0.81**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.300	0.20	4	**0.81**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.20	4	**0.81**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.80	1	**0.80**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the Delta	0.300	0.16	5	**0.79**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	5	**0.79**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.400	0.13	6	**0.78**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.400	0.13	6	**0.78**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.150	Dry Creek drainage	0.800	0.252	3	**0.76**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure related in the American River	0.600	0.189	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Impediments/Barriers in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	1.000	0.735	1	**0.74**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the Yuba River	0.250	0.15	5	**0.73**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.400	Turbidity, sedimentation in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.72	1.00	**0.72**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.14	5	**0.71**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.14	5	**0.71**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	American River	0.750	0.236	3	**0.71**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.18	4	**0.70**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.18	4	**0.70**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.70	1	**0.70**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.70	1	**0.70**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Hazardous Spills (Hwy 32) in Deer Creek	0.600	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.225	Stocked trout fishery in upper Antelope drainage - competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	0.68	1	**0.68**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Daguerre Point Dam	0.200	0.13	5	**0.66**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.13	5	**0.66**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Availability	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.200	Turbidity, Sedimentation, Hazardous Spills (Hwy 32) in Deer Creek	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Entrainment	0.200	Individual Diversions in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.450	0.126	5	**0.63**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.600	0.126	5	**0.63**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Dry Creek drainage	0.600	0.126	5	**0.63**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.400	0.21	3	**0.63**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.350	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.630	1	**0.63**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.13	5	**0.63**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.10	6	**0.61**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.10	6	**0.61**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Yuba River and DPD	0.250	0.09	7	**0.61**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the Delta	0.350	0.15	4	**0.61**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	0.61	1	**0.61**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.61	1	**0.61**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.60	1	**0.60**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.200	Turbidity, Sedimentation in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.60	1	**0.60**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Bear River	0.950	0.086	7	**0.60**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Ocean	0.400	0.10	6	**0.59**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.15	4	**0.59**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.15	4	**0.59**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the Feather River	0.200	0.12	5	**0.58**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.12	5	**0.58**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.175	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.57	1	**0.57**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.175	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.57	1	**0.57**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.09	6	**0.57**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.14	4	**0.56**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Barrier	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.560	1	**0.56**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.560	1	**0.56**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Delta	0.425	0.19	3	**0.56**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.350	0.18	3	**0.55**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.18	3	**0.55**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.09	6	**0.54**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Water Temperature	0.450	Water Temperature in the Bear River	1.000	0.540	1	**0.54**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.300	Sedimentation, turbidity, physical disturbance	1.000	0.54	1.00	**0.54**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	American River	0.500	0.105	5	**0.53**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the Feather River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.53**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.175	Habitat Availability	1.000	0.53	1	**0.53**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure related in the Delta	0.350	0.13	4	**0.51**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Deer Creek	0.450	0.10	5	**0.51**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.17	3	**0.51**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.900	0.252	2	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.13	4	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.13	4	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.50**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.425	0.17	3	**0.50**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.10	5	**0.49**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Bear River	0.600	0.081	6	**0.49**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.400	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.480	1	**0.48**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.150	Dry Creek drainage	0.750	0.158	3	**0.47**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Feather River	0.300	0.16	3	**0.47**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.400	0.16	3	**0.47**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.425	0.16	3	**0.47**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Yuba River	0.200	0.12	4	**0.47**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.45	1	**0.45**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Ocean	0.400	0.09	5	**0.45**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Dry Creek drainage	0.800	0.224	2	**0.45**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.800	0.112	4	**0.45**	**VH**

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.06	7	**0.45**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	7	**0.45**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	7	**0.45**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.06	7	**0.45**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Dry Creek drainage	0.700	0.147	3	**0.44**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Dry Creek drainage	0.700	0.147	3	**0.44**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure related in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.11	4	**0.44**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.06	7	**0.44**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	7	**0.44**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	7	**0.44**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.100	0.06	7	**0.44**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	American River	0.700	0.147	3	**0.44**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Non-site specific and structure related in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	4	**0.44**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Deer Creek	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Mill Creek	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Feather River	0.275	0.14	3	**0.43**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.14	3	**0.43**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Feather River	0.150	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Feather River	0.150	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Feather River	0.300	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.11	4	**0.42**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.420	1	**0.42**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.125	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.800	0.140	3	**0.42**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.125	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.800	0.140	3	**0.42**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.800	0.084	5	**0.42**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.150	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.420	1	**0.42**	**VH**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Water Quality	0.150	Dry Creek drainage	1.000	0.420	1	**0.42**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Non-site specific and structure related in the Delta	0.300	0.08	5	**0.42**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Non-site specific and structure related in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	5	**0.42**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.350	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Feather River	0.175	0.10	4	**0.41**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.250	0.08	5	**0.41**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.150	0.10	4	**0.40**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	4	**0.40**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	4	**0.40**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.40	1	**0.40**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.225	Habitat Availability/Suitability	1.000	0.39	1	**0.39**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.06	7	**0.39**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	7	**0.39**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	7	**0.39**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.080	Butte Creek - stocked rainbow trout fishery - competition for habitat and resources	0.500	0.10	4	**0.39**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Deer Creek	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Mill Creek	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.13	3	**0.38**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.13	3	**0.38**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.900	0.126	3	**0.38**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.06	6	**0.38**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.06	6	**0.38**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.08	5	**0.38**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.08	5	**0.38**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.38**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.38**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure related in Butte Creek	0.250	0.09	4	**0.37**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.09	4	**0.37**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.18	2	**0.36**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.18	2	**0.36**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Predation	0.100	Non-site specific and structure related in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.650	0.091	4	**0.36**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.09	4	**0.36**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.09	4	**0.36**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.12	3	**0.36**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.12	3	**0.36**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.06	6	**0.36**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.06	6	**0.36**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.150	Competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.360	1	**0.36**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.360	1	**0.36**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.360	1	**0.36**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.36	1.00	**0.36**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.12	3	**0.36**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Dry Creek drainage	0.850	0.119	3	**0.36**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Black Butte Dam	0.960	1.382	5	**6.91**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Ag Diversion Dams, Braiding, Natural Channel Gradient	0.750	0.61	5	**3.05**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.300	Stony Creek	0.500	0.720	4	**2.88**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Thomes Creek	0.700	0.68	4	**2.73**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Beegum Creek	0.600	0.49	5	**2.44**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Stony Creek	0.600	0.720	3	**2.16**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.250	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	2.10	1	**2.10**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.410	0.34	6	**2.07**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Clear Creek	0.400	0.50	4	**2.02**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Solano Dam	0.550	0.462	4	**1.85**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Whiskeytown Dam	0.355	0.30	6	**1.79**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	RBDD	0.550	0.36	5	**1.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.68	1	**1.68**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Clear Creek	1.000	1.68	1	**1.68**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Barrier	0.300	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.680	1	**1.68**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.300	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.680	1	**1.68**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Stony Creek	0.450	0.270	6	**1.62**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.29	5	**1.47**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Stony Creek	0.600	0.360	4	**1.44**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Montecello Dam	0.400	0.336	4	**1.34**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.30	1	**1.30**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Clear Creek	0.400	0.42	3	**1.26**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.26	1	**1.26**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.25	5	**1.26**	**VH**

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Putah Creek	0.600	0.297	4	**1.19**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.29	4	**1.18**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.200	0.288	4	**1.15**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.288	4	**1.15**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.350	Sedimentation in Clear Creek	1.000	1.10	1.00	**1.10**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Clear Creek	0.450	0.18	6	**1.06**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.21	5	**1.05**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.16	6	**0.98**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.300	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.98	1	**0.98**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Flow Conditions	0.400	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Putah Creek	1.000	0.960	1	**0.96**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.96**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.96**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.95	1.00	**0.95**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.275	0.19	5	**0.94**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.19	5	**0.94**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Diversion into Central Delta	0.250	0.150	6	**0.90**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.250	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Barriers	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.84	1	**0.84**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.350	0.210	4	**0.84**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.20	4	**0.82**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	4	**0.82**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.20	4	**0.82**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	4	**0.82**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.11	7	**0.80**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in Clear Creek	1.000	0.79	1.00	**0.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Clear Creek	0.200	0.13	6	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.13	6	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.150	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Temperature	0.150	Putah Creek	0.750	0.371	2	**0.74**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.09	8	**0.73**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	8	**0.73**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	8	**0.73**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.09	8	**0.73**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.240	3	**0.72**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.240	3	**0.72**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Putah Creek	0.750	0.180	4	**0.72**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.180	4	**0.72**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Putah Creek	0.700	0.347	2	**0.69**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.10	7	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.11	6	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	6	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.350	Sedimentation	1.000	0.68	1.00	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.200	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.17	4	**0.67**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.17	4	**0.67**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.17	4	**0.67**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.16	4	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Beegum Creek	0.250	0.16	4	**0.65**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.16	4	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.16	4	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.09	7	**0.64**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	7	**0.64**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	7	**0.64**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.21	3	**0.63**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.21	3	**0.63**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.21	3	**0.63**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.13	5	**0.63**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.150	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.149	4	**0.59**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.10	6	**0.59**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.400	0.096	6	**0.58**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.144	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	5	**0.57**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	6	**0.57**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	6	**0.57**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.560	1	**0.56**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.100	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.560	1	**0.56**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	6	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Predation	0.100	Predation in Putah Creek	0.550	0.182	3	**0.54**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Changes in Hydrology	0.150	0.090	6	**0.54**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Delta	0.350	0.105	5	**0.53**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.325	Water Quality in Stony Creek	1.000	0.520	1.00	**0.52**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.325	Water Temperature in Stony Creek	1.000	0.520	1	**0.52**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.175	0.06	8	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.175	0.06	8	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.06	8	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.175	0.06	8	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.350	0.07	7	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	6	**0.50**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.350	0.070	7	**0.49**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.150	0.10	5	**0.49**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.10	5	**0.49**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.10	5	**0.49**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	6	**0.49**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.250	Sedimentation	1.000	0.49	1.00	**0.49**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Stony Creek	0.200	0.120	4	**0.48**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.120	4	**0.48**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.08	6	**0.47**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Putah Creek	0.700	0.231	2	**0.46**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Putah Creek	0.700	0.231	2	**0.46**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.09	5	**0.46**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.075	North Diversion Dam	0.500	0.150	3	**0.45**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.075	Tributary Barriers	0.500	0.150	3	**0.45**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.225	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.44	1.00	**0.44**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.225	Water Quality in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.44	1.00	**0.44**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	5	**0.42**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Clear Creek	1.000	0.42	1	**0.42**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Delta	0.350	0.105	4	**0.42**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Delta	0.350	0.105	4	**0.42**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.20	2	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.20	2	**0.41**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.20	2	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.20	2	**0.41**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.400	0.080	5	**0.40**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in Clear Creek	0.100	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	5	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.39	1.00	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.13	3	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.13	3	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.200	Water Quality in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.39	1.00	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.100	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.400	0.096	4	**0.38**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.100	0.06	6	**0.38**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Flow Conditions	0.550	Flow Fluctuations	0.375	0.371	1	**0.37**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in Putah Creek	0.500	0.124	3	**0.37**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.700	0.18	2	**0.37**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.072	5	**0.36**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.072	5	**0.36**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.090	4	**0.36**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.090	4	**0.36**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the Delta	0.250	0.050	7	**0.35**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.173	2	**0.35**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.083	4	**0.33**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Stony Creek	0.275	0.083	4	**0.33**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.320	1	**0.32**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.150	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.450	0.304	1	**0.30**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.060	5	**0.30**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.060	5	**0.30**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.060	5	**0.30**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.060	5	**0.30**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.099	3	**0.30**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.149	2	**0.30**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Clear Creek	0.100	0.04	8	**0.29**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	8	**0.29**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Clear Creek	0.200	0.04	7	**0.29**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	0.325	0.293	1	**0.29**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.048	6	**0.29**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.072	4	**0.29**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Beegum Creek	0.500	0.06	5	**0.28**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.280	1	**0.28**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.280	1	**0.28**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.140	2	**0.28**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Stony Creek	1.000	0.280	1	**0.28**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Water Temperature	0.050	Water Temperature in Stony Creek	1.000	0.280	1	**0.28**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.05	6	**0.27**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	6	**0.27**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.14	2	**0.27**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.14	2	**0.27**	**H**

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.07	4	**0.27**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.14	2	**0.27**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.14	2	**0.27**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.075	0.045	6	**0.27**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Clear Creek	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Clear Creek	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Clear Creek	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.04	6	**0.25**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.04	6	**0.25**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.030	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.25	1	**0.25**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.124	2	**0.25**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.125	Water Temperature in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.24	1.00	**0.24**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Stony Creek	0.200	0.048	5	**0.24**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Stony Creek	0.200	0.060	4	**0.24**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.060	4	**0.24**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.060	4	**0.24**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.100	0.04	6	**0.24**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.100	0.04	6	**0.24**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.24**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Thomes Creek	0.500	0.06	4	**0.23**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.075	Black Butte Dam	0.250	0.075	3	**0.23**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in Stony Creek	0.150	0.045	5	**0.23**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Bays	0.150	0.045	5	**0.23**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.045	5	**0.23**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.074	3	**0.22**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Unscreened Diversions in Stony Creek	0.150	0.030	7	**0.21**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Stony Creek	0.200	0.040	5	**0.20**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.099	2	**0.20**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.099	2	**0.20**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Thomes Creek	0.200	0.07	3	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Bay	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Putah Creek	0.800	0.096	2	**0.19**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.048	4	**0.19**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.450	0.037	5	**0.19**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Solano Dam	0.750	0.062	3	**0.19**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Beegum Creek	0.050	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.030	6	**0.18**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.045	4	**0.18**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.035	0.03	6	**0.18**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.250	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.020	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.17	1	**0.17**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	4	**0.17**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Thomes Creek	0.050	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.16	1.00	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Whiskeytown Dam	0.300	0.08	2	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Clear Creek	0.150	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.16	1.00	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.150	0.050	3	**0.15**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Putah Creek	0.600	0.050	3	**0.15**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.050	3	**0.15**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.074	2	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	8	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	8	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.15	1.00	**0.15**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.024	6	**0.14**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.024	6	**0.14**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.150	0.036	4	**0.14**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.024	6	**0.14**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Stony Creek	0.100	0.024	6	**0.14**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Putah Creek	0.400	0.048	3	**0.14**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.400	0.048	3	**0.14**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.072	2	**0.14**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.020	7	**0.14**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.500	0.041	3	**0.12**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.024	5	**0.12**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.024	5	**0.12**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.030	4	**0.12**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.120	1.00	**0.12**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.060	2	**0.12**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.060	2	**0.12**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.120	1	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.12**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.700	0.058	2	**0.12**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Thomes Creek	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Putah Creek	0.200	0.108	1	**0.11**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Individual Diversions in Putah Creek	0.250	0.021	5	**0.10**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.200	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.200	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Stony Creek	0.200	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Stony Creek	0.100	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.020	5	**0.10**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.150	Diversion into Central Delta	0.050	0.025	4	**0.10**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.150	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.050	0.025	4	**0.10**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.10	1.00	**0.10**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Stony Creek	0.100	0.024	4	**0.10**	**L**

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Water Temperature	0.050	Putah Creek	0.400	0.048	2	**0.10**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.025	0.015	6	**0.09**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.025	0.021	4	**0.08**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.025	0.021	4	**0.08**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.08	1	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.08	1	**0.08**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.040	2	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.300	0.025	3	**0.07**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.050	0.01	7	**0.07**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.024	3	**0.07**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.010	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.010	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.010	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.010	0.014	5	**0.07**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.010	7	**0.07**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.010	7	**0.07**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.010	7	**0.07**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Beegum Creek	0.050	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.06**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.06**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Putah Creek	0.200	0.017	3	**0.05**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Montecello Dam	0.200	0.017	3	**0.05**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.017	3	**0.05**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.017	3	**0.05**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.300	0.025	2	**0.05**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.012	4	**0.05**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.050	0.012	4	**0.05**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.200	0.024	2	**0.05**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	4	**0.05**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	0.050	0.045	1	**0.05**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.008	5	**0.04**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.008	5	**0.04**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.100	0.008	5	**0.04**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Clear Creek	0.050	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Beegum Creek	0.050	0.01	6	**0.03**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.01	5	**0.03**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Barrier	0.250	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	0.025	0.028	1	**0.03**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	0.275	0.025	1.00	**0.02**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	0.075	0.017	1	**0.02**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Tributary Barriers	0.050	0.004	3	**0.01**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	0.050	0.011	1	**0.01**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Water Temperature	0.050	Putah Creek	0.050	0.011	1	**0.01**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Water Quality	0.050	Putah Creek	0.025	0.006	1	**0.01**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	0.050	0.005	1	**0.00**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Water Quality	0.050	Water Pollution	0.050	0.005	1.00	**0.00**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

American River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Barrier	0.450	Historical spawning habitat blocked	1.000	1.080	1	**1.080**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.500	Nimbus/Folsom Dams	0.980	0.294	3	**0.882**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.200	American River	0.700	0.294	3	**0.882**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.150	Predation in the American River	0.600	0.189	4	**0.756**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	American River	0.750	0.236	3	**0.709**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	American River	0.500	0.105	5	**0.525**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	American River	0.700	0.147	3	**0.441**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.800	0.084	5	**0.420**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.150	Competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.360	1	**0.360**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.375	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.338	1	**0.338**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.250	0.105	3	**0.315**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.063	5	**0.315**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.125	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.300	1	**0.300**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.275	0.058	5	**0.289**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.275	0.058	5	**0.289**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Water Temperature	0.200	American River	0.800	0.096	3	**0.288**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.053	5	**0.263**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.600	0.063	4	**0.252**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.100	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.240	1	**0.240**	**VH**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Hydrology	0.450	0.047	5	**0.236**	**H**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	American River	0.750	0.045	5	**0.225**	**H**
American River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in the American River	1.000	0.225	1	**0.225**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.150	0.047	4	**0.189**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

American River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.047	4	**0.189**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the American River	0.350	0.037	5	**0.184**	**H**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.180	1	**0.180**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.050	American River	0.400	0.042	4	**0.168**	**H**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the American River	0.800	0.072	2	**0.144**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.150	0.047	3	**0.142**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Delta	0.300	0.032	4	**0.126**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.200	0.042	3	**0.126**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.032	4	**0.126**	**H**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Water Temperature	0.050	American River	1.000	0.120	1	**0.120**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.040	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.059	2	**0.118**	**H**
American River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.125	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.113	1.00	**0.113**	**H**
American River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.113	1	**0.113**	**H**
American River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.125	Water Pollution	1.000	0.113	1.00	**0.113**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.021	5	**0.105**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.100	0.021	5	**0.105**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.026	4	**0.105**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.100	0.021	5	**0.105**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.200	0.021	5	**0.105**	**H**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.032	3	**0.095**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the American River	0.200	0.021	4	**0.084**	**M**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.030	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.072	1	**0.072**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.021	3	**0.063**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

American River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.050	0.016	4	**0.063**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.150	0.016	4	**0.063**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.200	Lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.021	3	**0.063**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.650	0.014	4	**0.055**	**M**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Water Temperature	0.200	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.018	3	**0.054**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.100	0.011	5	**0.053**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.040	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.025	2	**0.050**	**M**
American River	0.06	Spawning	0.40	Water Quality	0.020	American River	1.000	0.048	1	**0.048**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Nimbus/Folsom Dam	0.900	0.019	2	**0.038**	**M**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.018	2	**0.036**	**M**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.006	5	**0.030**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.005	5	**0.026**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.050	0.005	5	**0.026**	**M**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Water Quality	0.030	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.007	3	**0.022**	**M**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Bays	0.050	0.005	4	**0.021**	**M**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.020	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the American River	0.400	0.005	4	**0.019**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.050	0.006	3	**0.018**	**L**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.010	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.200	0.004	4	**0.017**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Water Quality	0.030	Ag, Urban in the American River	0.300	0.005	3	**0.016**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Water Quality	0.030	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.005	3	**0.016**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

American River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.003	5	**0.015**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.050	0.003	5	**0.015**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.050	0.003	5	**0.015**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.020	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.004	4	**0.014**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.020	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.002	4	**0.010**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.500	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.010	0.003	3	**0.009**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.500	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.010	0.003	3	**0.009**	**L**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the American River	0.100	0.002	4	**0.008**	**L**
American River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.10	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.020	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.001	4	**0.005**	**L**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.100	0.002	2	**0.004**	**L**
American River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.050	0.001	4	**0.004**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Dry Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.450	Impediments/Barriers in the Dry Creek drainage	0.900	0.567	3	1.701	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	Ag, Urban in the Dry Creek drainage	0.700	0.294	4	1.176	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.150	Dry Creek drainage	0.800	0.252	3	0.756	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Dry Creek drainage	0.600	0.126	5	0.630	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Barrier	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.560	1	0.560	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.560	1	0.560	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.150	Dry Creek drainage	0.750	0.158	3	0.473	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Dry Creek drainage	0.800	0.224	2	0.448	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Dry Creek drainage	0.700	0.147	3	0.441	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Dry Creek drainage	0.700	0.147	3	0.441	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.150	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.420	1	0.420	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Water Quality	0.150	Dry Creek drainage	1.000	0.420	1	0.420	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Dry Creek drainage	0.850	0.119	3	0.357	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.280	1	0.280	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Water Temperature	0.100	Dry Creek drainage	1.000	0.280	1	0.280	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Dry Creek drainage	0.600	0.063	4	0.252	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Embryo Incubation	0.10	Water Quality	0.350	Water Pollution	1.000	0.245	1.00	0.245	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Embryo Incubation	0.10	Water Temperature	0.350	Water Temperature in the Dry Creek drainage	1.000	0.245	1	0.245	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.100	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.042	5	0.210	VH
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Dry Creek drainage	0.700	0.049	4	0.196	VH

Central Valley Steelhead

Dry Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Dry Creek drainage	0.500	0.035	5	**0.175**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.042	4	**0.168**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.042	4	**0.168**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.100	0.042	4	**0.168**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.047	3	**0.142**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.140	1	**0.140**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.140	1	**0.140**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Spawning	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.140	1	**0.140**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.200	0.042	3	**0.126**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.042	3	**0.126**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.042	3	**0.126**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.056	2	**0.112**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.021	5	**0.105**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.020	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.400	0.017	6	**0.101**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.020	Predation in the Dry Creek drainage	0.600	0.025	4	**0.101**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.450	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.032	3	**0.095**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.450	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.032	3	**0.095**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.900	0.019	5	**0.095**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.021	4	**0.084**	**H**

Dry Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.020	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.017	5	**0.084**	**H**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.020	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.300	0.013	6	**0.076**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.014	5	**0.070**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.020	Dry Creek drainage	0.400	0.017	4	**0.067**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.021	3	**0.063**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.100	0.021	3	**0.063**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.020	Delta	0.300	0.013	5	**0.063**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.020	Dry Creek drainage	0.300	0.013	5	**0.063**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.100	Diversion into Central Delta	0.050	0.011	5	**0.053**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.100	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.050	0.011	5	**0.053**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.150	0.011	5	**0.053**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.020	Delta	0.300	0.013	4	**0.050**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.050	0.016	3	**0.047**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.011	4	**0.042**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.100	0.011	4	**0.042**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.014	3	**0.042**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.900	0.019	2	**0.038**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.007	5	**0.035**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.035	1.00	**0.035**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.035	1	**0.035**	**M**

Dry Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.020	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.008	4	**0.034**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.020	Predation in the Delta	0.200	0.008	4	**0.034**	**M**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.007	4	**0.028**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.100	0.007	4	**0.028**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.007	4	**0.028**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.020	Individual Diversions in the Dry Creek drainage	0.100	0.004	6	**0.025**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.020	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.004	6	**0.025**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.050	0.007	3	**0.021**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Impediments/Barriers in the Dry Creek drainage	0.500	0.011	2	**0.021**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.500	0.011	2	**0.021**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.050	0.004	5	**0.018**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.020	Bays	0.100	0.004	4	**0.017**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.020	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.004	4	**0.017**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.020	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.004	4	**0.017**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.020	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.002	6	**0.013**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.020	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.002	6	**0.013**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.050	0.004	3	**0.011**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.100	0.002	5	**0.011**	**L**
Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region)	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.100	0.002	2	**0.004**	**L**

Auburn/Coon Creek Drainage Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.850	Impediments/Barriers in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.990	2.356	3	**7.07**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Impediments/Barriers in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	1.000	0.735	1	**0.74**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Entrainment	0.200	Individual Diversions in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.450	0.126	5	**0.63**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.600	0.126	5	**0.63**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.900	0.252	2	**0.50**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.800	0.112	4	**0.45**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.420	1	**0.42**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.125	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.800	0.140	3	**0.42**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.125	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.800	0.140	3	**0.42**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.900	0.126	3	**0.38**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.650	0.091	4	**0.36**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.450	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.315	1	**0.32**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Entrainment	0.200	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.056	5	**0.28**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Entrainment	0.200	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.056	5	**0.28**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.350	Water Temperature in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	1.000	0.245	1	**0.25**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.210	1	**0.21**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.100	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.210	1	**0.21**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.100	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.210	1	**0.21**	**VH**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Water Temperature	0.020	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.800	0.045	3	**0.13**	**VH**

Auburn/Coon Creek Drainage Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.150	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.125	0.026	5	**0.13**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.150	Diversion into Central Delta	0.125	0.026	5	**0.13**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Impediments/Barriers in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.900	0.063	2	**0.13**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.200	0.028	4	**0.11**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.150	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.100	0.021	5	**0.11**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.105	1	**0.11**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	1.000	0.105	1	**0.11**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Spawning	0.30	Water Temperature	0.050	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	1.000	0.105	1	**0.11**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.650	0.018	5	**0.09**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.125	Delta	0.150	0.026	3	**0.08**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.026	3	**0.08**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.650	0.018	4	**0.07**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Entrainment	0.200	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.014	5	**0.07**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Entrainment	0.200	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.014	5	**0.07**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Entrainment	0.200	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.014	5	**0.07**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.800	0.022	3	**0.07**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.900	0.013	5	**0.06**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.028	2	**0.06**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.014	4	**0.06**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Auburn/Coon Creek Drainage Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.014	4	**0.06**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.100	0.014	4	**0.06**	**H**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.011	5	**0.05**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.053	1.00	**0.05**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.053	1	**0.05**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.010	Lower Sacramento River	0.550	0.008	5	**0.04**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.850	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.005	0.012	3	**0.04**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.850	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.005	0.012	3	**0.04**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Pollution	1.000	0.035	1.00	**0.04**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.600	0.008	4	**0.03**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.010	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.400	0.006	5	**0.03**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.007	4	**0.03**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.009	3	**0.03**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.125	Delta	0.050	0.009	3	**0.03**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.900	0.013	2	**0.03**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.400	0.006	4	**0.02**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Delta	0.400	0.006	4	**0.02**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.006	4	**0.02**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.050	0.007	3	**0.02**	**M**

Auburn/Coon Creek Drainage Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.007	3	**0.02**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.004	4	**0.02**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Water Temperature	0.020	Delta	0.100	0.006	3	**0.02**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Water Temperature	0.020	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.006	3	**0.02**	**M**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Delta	0.100	0.003	5	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.003	5	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Ocean	0.100	0.003	5	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.100	0.007	2	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.003	4	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.100	0.003	4	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.003	3	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Water Quality	0.010	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.100	0.003	3	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Bays	0.050	0.001	5	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.100	0.001	5	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.050	0.001	4	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.100	0.001	4	**0.01**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.050	0.001	5	**0.00**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.100	0.001	2	**0.00**	**L**
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Bays	0.000	0.000	4	**0.00**	

Central Valley Steelhead

Auburn/Coon Creek Drainage Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.000	0.000	4	**0.00**	
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.000	0.000	4	**0.00**	

Central Valley Steelhead

Bear River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.500	Bear River	0.950	0.570	4	**2.280**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Bear River	0.550	0.297	6	**1.782**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.250	Bear River	0.850	0.383	4	**1.530**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.450	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Bear River	0.850	0.459	3	**1.377**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.350	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.630	1	**0.630**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Bear River	0.950	0.086	7	**0.599**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Water Temperature	0.450	Water Temperature in the Bear River	1.000	0.540	1	**0.540**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Bear River	0.600	0.081	6	**0.486**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.400	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.480	1	**0.480**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.360	1	**0.360**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.360	1	**0.360**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.100	0.054	6	**0.324**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Diversion into Central Delta	0.100	0.054	6	**0.324**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.054	6	**0.324**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.100	0.054	6	**0.324**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Bear River	0.600	0.081	4	**0.324**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Bear River	0.600	0.081	4	**0.324**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Water Temperature	0.150	Water Temperature in the Bear River	1.000	0.270	1	**0.270**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Bear River	0.400	0.036	5	**0.180**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.025	Bear River	0.800	0.036	5	**0.180**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.450	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Feather River	0.100	0.054	3	**0.162**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Feather River	0.050	0.027	6	**0.162**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.200	0.027	6	**0.162**	**VH**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.027	6	**0.162**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Bear River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Feather River	0.350	0.032	5	**0.158**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bear River	0.650	0.029	5	**0.146**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.018	6	**0.108**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Delta	0.200	0.027	4	**0.108**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Delta	0.200	0.027	4	**0.108**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.500	Feather River	0.040	0.024	4	**0.096**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.050	0.023	4	**0.090**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.250	Feather River	0.050	0.023	4	**0.090**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.023	4	**0.090**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.020	Bear River	0.900	0.022	4	**0.086**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.450	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.027	3	**0.081**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Feather River	0.100	0.014	6	**0.081**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.014	6	**0.081**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.014	5	**0.068**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.020	Bear River	0.700	0.017	4	**0.067**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Feather River	0.275	0.012	5	**0.062**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.060	1.00	**0.060**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.060	1	**0.060**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Embryo Incubation	0.20	Water Quality	0.050	Water Pollution in the Bear River	1.000	0.060	1.00	**0.060**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.027	2	**0.054**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Feather River	0.100	0.014	4	**0.054**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.014	4	**0.054**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Bear River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Feather River	0.100	0.014	4	**0.054**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.014	4	**0.054**	**H**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bear River	0.200	0.009	5	**0.045**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.009	5	**0.045**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Delta	0.100	0.009	5	**0.045**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.009	5	**0.045**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Barrier	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.045	1	**0.045**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.025	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.045	1	**0.045**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	0.045	1	**0.045**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Spawning	0.30	Water Quality	0.025	Water Quality in the Bear River	1.000	0.045	1	**0.045**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.018	2	**0.036**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.500	Lower Sacramento River	0.010	0.006	4	**0.024**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.005	5	**0.023**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.005	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bear River	0.750	0.005	5	**0.023**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.100	0.005	5	**0.023**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.100	0.005	5	**0.023**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.005	5	**0.023**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.020	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.200	0.005	4	**0.019**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.005	Bear River	0.600	0.004	5	**0.018**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.020	0.002	7	**0.013**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Bear River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.050	0.002	5	**0.011**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.002	5	**0.011**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.050	0.002	5	**0.011**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.050	0.002	5	**0.011**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.050	0.002	5	**0.011**	**M**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.010	0.001	7	**0.006**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.025	0.001	5	**0.006**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.020	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.001	4	**0.005**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.020	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.001	4	**0.005**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.020	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.050	0.001	4	**0.005**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.005	Ocean	0.150	0.001	5	**0.005**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.020	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.040	0.001	4	**0.004**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.005	0.000	7	**0.003**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Feather River	0.005	0.000	7	**0.003**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.005	0.000	7	**0.003**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.005	0.000	7	**0.003**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.005	Delta	0.100	0.001	5	**0.003**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.005	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.001	5	**0.003**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.005	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.001	5	**0.003**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.005	Bays	0.050	0.000	5	**0.002**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.005	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.050	0.000	5	**0.002**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Bear River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.005	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.050	0.000	5	**0.002**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.005	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.050	0.000	5	**0.002**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.020	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.010	0.000	4	**0.001**	**L**
Bear River	0.06	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.500	Delta	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	

Yuba River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Englebright Dam	0.650	0.43	5	**2.15**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Yuba River	0.350	0.25	4	**0.98**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Yuba River	0.350	0.25	4	**0.98**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Barrier	0.300	Englebright Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.91	1	**0.91**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Delta	0.375	0.22	4	**0.88**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.18	5	**0.88**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.525	Flow Fluctuations, Flood Events	1.000	0.87	1.00	**0.87**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.21	4	**0.84**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Yuba River	0.250	0.15	5	**0.73**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.18	4	**0.70**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.18	4	**0.70**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Daguerre Point Dam	0.200	0.13	5	**0.66**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Yuba River and DPD	0.250	0.09	7	**0.61**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	0.61	1	**0.61**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.61	1	**0.61**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Ocean	0.400	0.10	6	**0.59**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Feather River	0.200	0.12	5	**0.58**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.12	5	**0.58**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.14	4	**0.56**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**

Yuba River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Yuba River	0.200	0.12	4	**0.47**	**VH**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.45	1	**0.45**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Feather River	0.150	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Feather River	0.150	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Feather River	0.300	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.11	4	**0.42**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Feather River	0.175	0.10	4	**0.41**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.350	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Yuba River	0.225	0.05	6	**0.32**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Yuba River	0.200	0.05	6	**0.30**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.06	5	**0.29**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.06	5	**0.29**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.06	5	**0.29**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.05	6	**0.28**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.05	6	**0.28**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.14	2	**0.28**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.14	2	**0.28**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Feather River	0.300	0.06	4	**0.25**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.06	4	**0.25**	**H**

Yuba River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Feather River	0.100	0.04	7	**0.25**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.225	0.05	5	**0.23**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.225	0.05	5	**0.23**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.275	0.06	4	**0.23**	**H**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Yuba River	0.450	0.07	3	**0.22**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.150	0.04	6	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.125	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.21	1.00	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Yuba River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.21	1.00	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Water Pollution above Daguerre Point Dam	1.000	0.21	1.00	**0.21**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Feather River	0.350	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Feather River	0.400	0.07	3	**0.20**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.09	2	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.09	2	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Delta	0.125	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.03	6	**0.18**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Yuba River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.18**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Yuba River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.18**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.250	0.04	4	**0.17**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.04	4	**0.17**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.250	0.04	4	**0.17**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Yuba River	0.250	0.04	4	**0.17**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature above Daguerre Point Dam	1.000	0.17	1.00	**0.17**	**M**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Water Temperature	0.050	Water Temperature in the Yuba River	1.000	0.15	1	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Bays	0.100	0.02	6	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Yuba River	0.250	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bay	0.050	0.03	5	**0.15**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Feather River	0.100	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Daguerre Point Dam	0.600	0.07	2	**0.14**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Temperature	0.075	Yuba River	0.100	0.04	4	**0.14**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.12**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.12**	**L**

Yuba River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Yuba River	0.125	0.03	4	**0.10**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Englebright Dam	0.400	0.05	2	**0.09**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Spawning	0.275	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.025	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.08	1	**0.08**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	3	**0.07**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Feather River	0.050	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.01	7	**0.06**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Entrainment	0.075	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.01	7	**0.06**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Water Quality	0.050	Yuba River	0.050	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Yuba River	0.11	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.425	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.03**	**L**

Feather River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Fish Barrier/Oroville Dam	0.850	0.51	4	**2.04**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Barrier	0.300	Fish Barrier Dam/Oroville Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.05	1	**1.05**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.70	1	**0.70**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.70	1	**0.70**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.400	0.21	3	**0.63**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.350	0.15	4	**0.61**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Delta	0.425	0.19	3	**0.56**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.350	0.18	3	**0.55**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.18	3	**0.55**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Feather River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.53**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.17	3	**0.51**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Feather River	0.300	0.16	3	**0.47**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Ocean	0.400	0.09	5	**0.45**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	4	**0.44**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Feather River	0.275	0.14	3	**0.43**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.14	3	**0.43**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.09	4	**0.37**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.100	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.35	1	**0.35**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature	1.000	0.35	1	**0.35**	**VH**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Feather River	0.500	0.11	3	**0.34**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.125	Feather River	0.250	0.11	3	**0.33**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Feather River	0.400	0.11	3	**0.32**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Feather River	0.275	0.06	5	**0.31**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Feather River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.250	0.04	6	**0.26**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.04	6	**0.26**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.04	6	**0.26**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Flow Conditions	0.125	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Feather River	0.700	0.13	2	**0.26**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.375	0.07	4	**0.26**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.07	4	**0.26**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.07	4	**0.26**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations, Flooding	1.000	0.25	1.00	**0.25**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.200	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.25	1.00	**0.25**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.200	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.25	1.00	**0.25**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Water Quality	0.200	Water Pollution	1.000	0.25	1.00	**0.25**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Embryo Incubation	0.125	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in the Feather River	1.000	0.25	1.00	**0.25**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.08	3	**0.24**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	3	**0.24**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.11	2	**0.21**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.11	2	**0.21**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.05	4	**0.21**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Feather River	0.200	0.04	6	**0.21**	**H**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.225	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Feather River	0.225	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.225	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.18	1	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Spawning	0.350	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.18	1	**0.18**	**M**

Feather River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Fish Barrier/Oroville Dam	1.000	0.09	2	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.04	4	**0.18**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.06	3	**0.17**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Temperature	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.06	3	**0.17**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.150	0.04	4	**0.16**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.175	0.03	5	**0.15**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Feather River	0.333	0.05	3	**0.15**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.05	3	**0.15**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.333	0.05	3	**0.15**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Delta	0.125	0.03	5	**0.14**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.03	5	**0.14**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.07	2	**0.14**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.07	2	**0.14**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.200	0.04	4	**0.14**	**M**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Feather River	0.375	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.03	4	**0.12**	**L**

Feather River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.03	4	**0.11**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Flow Conditions	0.125	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.06	2	**0.11**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.250	0.03	4	**0.11**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Feather River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.125	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Bays	0.075	0.02	5	**0.08**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.175	0.02	4	**0.06**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.125	0.01	4	**0.04**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.00	6	**0.03**	**L**
Feather River	0.10	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.350	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.00	6	**0.03**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Butte Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Butte Creek	0.800	0.39	3	**1.16**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Butte Creek Diversion Dams and Weirs	0.600	0.16	6	**0.95**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.350	0.13	4	**0.51**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.425	0.17	3	**0.50**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.400	0.16	3	**0.47**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.425	0.16	3	**0.47**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.11	4	**0.44**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.225	Habitat Availability/Suitability	1.000	0.39	1	**0.39**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.080	Butte Creek - stocked rainbow trout fishery - competition for habitat and resources	0.500	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.13	3	**0.38**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.13	3	**0.38**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in Butte Creek	0.250	0.09	4	**0.37**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.325	0.12	3	**0.36**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.400	0.07	5	**0.35**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Stocked rainbow trout fishery, competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	0.35	1	**0.35**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Recreational Impacts (Summer inner tubing)	0.200	Summer inner tubing and swimming in Butte Creek	1.000	0.35	1	**0.35**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Butte Creek	0.275	0.11	3	**0.32**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.32	1.00	**0.32**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.175	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.31	1	**0.31**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Butte Creek	0.250	0.10	3	**0.29**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.275	Water Quality, Turbidity in Butte Creek	1.000	0.29	1.00	**0.29**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.275	Water Temperature in Butte Creek	1.000	0.29	1.00	**0.29**	**VH**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Butte Creek	0.250	0.09	3	**0.28**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Butte Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.250	0.04	6	**0.26**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.04	6	**0.26**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.04	6	**0.26**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Butte Creek	0.275	0.05	5	**0.24**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.150	0.04	6	**0.24**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.125	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.22	1	**0.22**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.125	Water Temperature in Butte Creek	1.000	0.22	1	**0.22**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in Butte Creek	0.333	0.07	3	**0.22**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.07	3	**0.22**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.125	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.333	0.07	3	**0.22**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in the lower Sacramento River	0.600	0.11	2	**0.21**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Butte Creek	0.200	0.03	6	**0.21**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.060	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.350	0.05	4	**0.21**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.375	0.05	4	**0.18**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Centerville Head Dam	0.100	0.03	6	**0.16**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.080	Delta	0.200	0.04	4	**0.16**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.080	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	4	**0.16**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.07	2	**0.15**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.04	4	**0.15**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.04	4	**0.15**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Butte Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.060	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.04	4	**0.15**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.060	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.250	0.04	4	**0.15**	**H**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Delta	0.100	0.05	3	**0.14**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.05	3	**0.14**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Butte Creek	0.400	0.07	2	**0.14**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.075	Water Quality, Turbidity in Butte Creek	1.000	0.13	1	**0.13**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.125	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.11	1.00	**0.11**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.05	2	**0.10**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Butte Creek	0.200	0.02	4	**0.10**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.02	4	**0.10**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.02	4	**0.10**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.060	Ag, Urban in Butte Creek	0.150	0.02	4	**0.09**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.050	Centerville Head Dam - Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.09	1	**0.09**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.250	0.02	4	**0.09**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.01	6	**0.08**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.01	6	**0.08**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.150	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.01	6	**0.08**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.080	Bays	0.100	0.02	4	**0.08**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Butte Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Butte Creek	0.400	0.02	3	**0.07**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Butte Creek	0.200	0.02	4	**0.07**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.225	0.01	5	**0.07**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Butte Creek	0.225	0.01	5	**0.07**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.225	0.01	5	**0.07**	**M**
Butte Creek	0.07	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.075	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.125	0.02	4	**0.06**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.02	3	**0.06**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.02	3	**0.06**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.175	0.01	5	**0.05**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.05	1.00	**0.05**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.01	5	**0.05**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.025	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.04	1	**0.04**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Agricultural, Wildlife and Terminal Diversions	0.800	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.01	2	**0.03**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.00	6	**0.03**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.00	6	**0.03**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.01	2	**0.02**	**L**
Butte Creek	0.07	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.00	2	**0.01**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Big Chico Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Iron Canyon, City of Chico Swimming Holes and Associated Dams	0.750	0.38	5	**1.88**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Big Chico Creek	0.700	0.42	4	**1.68**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.80	1	**0.80**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.15	4	**0.59**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.15	4	**0.59**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.13	4	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.13	4	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.13	4	**0.50**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.07	7	**0.49**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.08	5	**0.42**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	5	**0.42**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.40	1	**0.40**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.06	7	**0.39**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	7	**0.39**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	7	**0.39**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.06	6	**0.36**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.36	1.00	**0.36**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.07	5	**0.35**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.08	4	**0.34**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	4	**0.34**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.08	4	**0.34**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.08	4	**0.34**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Big Chico Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.08	4	**0.34**	**VH**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.06	5	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.06	5	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.250	Sedimentation	1.000	0.30	1.00	**0.30**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.13	2	**0.25**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.13	2	**0.25**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.05	5	**0.25**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.24	1.00	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.08	3	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.08	3	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.06	4	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.06	4	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.06	4	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.200	Water Quality in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.24	1.00	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.100	0.06	4	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	4	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	4	**0.24**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.04	5	**0.21**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.04	5	**0.21**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Big Chico Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.20	1	**0.20**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.20	1	**0.20**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.04	5	**0.20**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.150	0.03	6	**0.18**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.150	0.03	6	**0.18**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	6	**0.18**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	6	**0.18**	**H**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.08	2	**0.17**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.04	4	**0.17**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.08	2	**0.17**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.14**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.03	5	**0.14**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.14	1	**0.14**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Big Chico Creek	0.500	0.04	4	**0.14**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.02	6	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.03	5	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.03	5	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.03	5	**0.13**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.04	3	**0.12**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.02	6	**0.12**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Big Chico Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.02	5	**0.11**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.10	1	**0.10**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.10	1	**0.10**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.10**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.10**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Big Chico Creek	1.000	0.10	1	**0.10**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.01	7	**0.10**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Big Chico Creek	0.050	0.01	7	**0.10**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.01	7	**0.10**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.01	6	**0.08**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.01	6	**0.08**	**M**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.02	4	**0.08**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Big Chico Creek	0.200	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.06	1.00	**0.06**	**L**

Big Chico Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.01	4	**0.06**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.01	4	**0.06**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.01	5	**0.05**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.05	1	**0.05**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.01	6	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Big Chico Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Big Chico Creek	0.08	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	4	**0.03**	**L**

Mill Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Mill Creek	0.600	0.49	5	**2.44**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Mill Creek	0.700	0.57	4	**2.28**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.665	Turbidity and sedimentation in Mill Creek	1.000	1.30	1.00	**1.30**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.275	Stocked trout fishery in upper Mill Creek drainage competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.89	1	**0.89**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.275	Turbidity and Sedimentation in Mill Creek	1.000	0.89	1	**0.89**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Mill Creek	0.600	0.29	3	**0.88**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.400	0.13	6	**0.78**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.14	5	**0.71**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.10	6	**0.61**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.175	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.57	1	**0.57**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.10	5	**0.49**	**VH**

Mill Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.06	7	**0.45**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	7	**0.45**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	7	**0.45**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.06	7	**0.45**	**VH**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Mill Creek	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.250	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Mill Creek	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.18	2	**0.36**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Mill Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	3	**0.29**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	3	**0.29**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Mill Creek	0.100	0.07	4	**0.29**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Mill Creek	0.100	0.07	4	**0.29**	**H**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.06	5	**0.28**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	4	**0.27**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	5	**0.24**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.24	1.00	**0.24**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.075	Water Temperature in Mill Creek	1.000	0.24	1	**0.24**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Mill Creek	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**

Mill Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Mill Creek	0.100	0.03	7	**0.22**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Mill Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.20	1.00	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Mill Creek	1.000	0.20	1.00	**0.20**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Mill Creek	0.200	0.05	4	**0.18**	**M**
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Mill Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.16**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.050	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Mill Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.16**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Mill Creek	0.050	0.03	5	**0.14**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Mill Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.11**	**L**

Mill Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.11**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.10**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.05	2	**0.09**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Mill Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Mill Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.02	1.00	**0.02**	**L**

Deer Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Deer Creek	0.600	0.49	5	**2.44**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Deer Creek	0.700	0.57	4	**2.28**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.665	Turbidity, sedimentation, hazardous spills (HWY 32) in Deer Creek	1.000	1.30	1.00	**1.30**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.25	4	**1.02**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Deer Creek	0.400	0.20	5	**0.98**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.275	Put-and-take rainbow trout fishery in upper Deer Creek, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.89	1	**0.89**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Deer Creek	0.600	0.29	3	**0.88**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.22	4	**0.87**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.400	0.13	6	**0.78**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.14	5	**0.71**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Hazardous Spills (Hwy 32) in Deer Creek	0.600	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Availability	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.200	Turbidity, Sedimentation, Hazardous Spills (Hwy 32) in Deer Creek	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.10	6	**0.61**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**

Deer Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.15	4	**0.58**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.175	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.57	1	**0.57**	**VH**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Deer Creek	0.450	0.10	5	**0.51**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Deer Creek	0.150	0.11	4	**0.44**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Deer Creek	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.07	5	**0.37**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.18	2	**0.36**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.09	4	**0.36**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**

Deer Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.05	7	**0.32**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	7	**0.32**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	7	**0.32**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.05	7	**0.32**	**H**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	3	**0.29**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.150	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	3	**0.29**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Deer Creek	0.100	0.07	4	**0.29**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Deer Creek	0.100	0.07	4	**0.29**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.06	5	**0.28**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	4	**0.27**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.24**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.24	1.00	**0.24**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.075	Water Temperature in Deer Creek	1.000	0.24	1	**0.24**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Deer Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Deer Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.20	1.00	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Deer Creek	1.000	0.20	1.00	**0.20**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Deer Creek	0.200	0.05	4	**0.18**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Delta	0.150	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.03	5	**0.16**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in Deer Creek	0.100	0.02	7	**0.16**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Deer Creek	0.050	0.03	5	**0.14**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.12**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Deer Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**

Deer Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.05	2	**0.09**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.08	1	**0.08**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Deer Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.08**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Deer Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.02	1.00	**0.02**	**L**

Antelope Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Antelope Creek	0.700	0.58	4	**2.31**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Agricultural Diversion Dam(s) in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.45	5	**2.25**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual or Terminal Diversions and loss of channel connectivity in Antelope Creek	0.500	0.32	7	**2.21**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.36	3	**1.08**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.94**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.94**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.94**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.20	4	**0.81**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.300	0.20	4	**0.81**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.20	4	**0.81**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.16	5	**0.79**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	5	**0.79**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.400	Turbidity, sedimentation in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.72	1.00	**0.72**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.225	Stocked trout fishery in upper Antelope drainage - competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	0.68	1	**0.68**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.13	5	**0.66**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Antelope Creek	0.600	0.13	5	**0.63**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Gravel embeddedness and fines	1.000	0.60	1	**0.60**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.200	Turbidity, Sedimentation in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.60	1	**0.60**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.09	6	**0.57**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.09	6	**0.54**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.300	Sedimentation, turbidity, physical disturbance	1.000	0.54	1.00	**0.54**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Antelope Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.13	4	**0.54**	**VH**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.175	Habitat Availability	1.000	0.53	1	**0.53**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.06	7	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	7	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.06	7	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.100	0.06	7	**0.44**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Antelope Creek	0.150	0.10	4	**0.40**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	4	**0.40**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	4	**0.40**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.06	6	**0.38**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.06	6	**0.38**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.08	5	**0.38**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.08	5	**0.38**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.38**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.38**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.12	3	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.12	3	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.06	6	**0.36**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.800	0.17	2	**0.34**	**H**

Antelope Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.08	4	**0.34**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Delta	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.275	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	4	**0.33**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.06	5	**0.32**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.06	5	**0.32**	**H**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.06	5	**0.30**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.165	Water Temperature in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.30	1.00	**0.30**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.06	5	**0.28**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.05	5	**0.26**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.06	4	**0.25**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.23	1.00	**0.23**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.125	0.04	6	**0.23**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.125	0.04	6	**0.23**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	6	**0.23**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	6	**0.23**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**

Antelope Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.075	Water Temperature in Antelope Creek	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.03	7	**0.22**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.150	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.03	7	**0.22**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.04	5	**0.19**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.04	5	**0.19**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	6	**0.19**	**M**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.17**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Antelope Creek	0.200	0.04	4	**0.17**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.15	1	**0.15**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.125	Predation in Antelope Creek	0.050	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Antelope Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**

Antelope Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Dam(s)	0.200	0.04	2	**0.08**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.02	4	**0.08**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Antelope Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.05**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.03**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.03**	**L**
Antelope Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.02	1.00	**0.02**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Battle Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	North Fork Dams	0.325	0.74	7	**5.18**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	South Fork Dams	0.325	0.74	7	**5.18**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Battle Creek	0.550	0.63	5	**3.13**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Battle Creek - Coleman - Competition for habitat and food	0.350	0.40	6	**2.39**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.150	0.34	7	**2.39**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Battle Creek	0.400	0.52	4	**2.08**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.34	6	**2.05**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Battle Creek	0.250	0.23	8	**1.82**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Barriers	0.250	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.63	1	**1.63**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low instream flows per FERC license	1.000	1.63	1	**1.63**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.250	Coleman - competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1.000	1.63	1	**1.63**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.32	5	**1.59**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.32	5	**1.59**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.32	5	**1.59**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.18	8	**1.46**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.27	5	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.27	5	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.27	5	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.23	6	**1.37**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.33	4	**1.30**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Battle Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Battle Creek	0.400	0.18	7	**1.27**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	6	**1.23**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.20	6	**1.23**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.375	0.24	5	**1.22**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.20	6	**1.19**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	5	**1.19**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.150	0.14	8	**1.09**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.14	8	**1.09**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.14	8	**1.09**	**VH**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.275	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.07	1.00	**1.07**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.275	Water Temperature in Battle Creek	1.000	1.07	1.00	**1.07**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.26	4	**1.04**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.17	6	**1.02**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.17	6	**1.02**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Delta	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Battle Creek	0.200	0.16	6	**0.98**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.16	6	**0.98**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.16	6	**0.98**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.98	1	**0.98**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	5	**0.91**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.18	5	**0.91**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Battle Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.18	5	**0.89**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in Battle Creek	0.125	0.14	6	**0.85**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.14	6	**0.82**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.11	7	**0.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.11	7	**0.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.11	7	**0.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.050	0.11	7	**0.80**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.20	4	**0.78**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.12	6	**0.73**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.12	6	**0.73**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.14	5	**0.71**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.14	5	**0.71**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.14	5	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.300	0.10	7	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Delta	0.100	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Predation	0.125	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	6	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Battle Creek	0.200	0.14	5	**0.68**	**H**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.09	7	**0.64**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Battle Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.10	6	**0.61**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.150	Water Quality in Battle Creek	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.11	5	**0.57**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Delta	0.100	0.11	5	**0.57**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Temperature	0.175	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.11	5	**0.57**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	North Fork Dams	0.400	0.18	3	**0.55**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	South Fork Dams	0.400	0.18	3	**0.55**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.125	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	6	**0.49**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.10	5	**0.49**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	5	**0.46**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	5	**0.46**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Battle Creek	0.100	0.09	5	**0.46**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	5	**0.46**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	6	**0.41**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	6	**0.41**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	6	**0.41**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	6	**0.41**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.05	8	**0.36**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Battle Creek	0.150	0.05	7	**0.34**	**M**

Battle Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.125	Bays	0.050	0.06	6	**0.34**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Changes in Hydrology	0.100	0.05	7	**0.32**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.05	7	**0.32**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.16	2	**0.32**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**M**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.14	2	**0.27**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.09	3	**0.27**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.05	6	**0.27**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.03	7	**0.24**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.075	0.03	7	**0.24**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Battle Creek	0.050	0.05	5	**0.23**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Battle Creek	0.050	0.05	5	**0.23**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in Battle Creek	0.050	0.03	6	**0.20**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.025	0.02	8	**0.18**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.025	0.02	8	**0.18**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.09	2	**0.18**	**L**

Battle Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Water Temperature	0.075	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.03	5	**0.17**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.025	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.025	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Water Quality	0.025	Water Quality in Battle Creek	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Spawning	0.25	Water Temperature	0.025	Water Temperature in Battle Creek	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.050	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.050	0.02	7	**0.16**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.07	2	**0.14**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.35	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Battle Creek	0.050	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Battle Creek	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Battle Creek	0.025	0.02	5	**0.08**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Cow Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stresor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Impediments/Barriers in Cow Creek	0.86	2.322	6	**13.932**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Cow Creek	0.95	2.565	4	**10.260**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Unscreened Diversions in Cow Creek	0.4	0.900	8	**7.200**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.250**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Cow Creek	0.75	1.688	4	**6.750**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Cow Creek	0.6	0.810	5	**4.050**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Cow Creek	0.75	1.013	4	**4.050**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1	3.600	1	**3.600**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.2	0.450	8	**3.600**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Cow Creek	0.8	0.720	5	**3.600**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Cow Creek	0.5	0.450	7	**3.150**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.300	Stocked trout fishery in upper Cow Creek - competition for habitat, genetic integrity	1	2.700	1	**2.700**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in Cow Creek	0.4	0.360	6	**2.160**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.4	0.360	6	**2.160**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.405	5	**2.025**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the Delta	0.1	0.225	8	**1.800**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.225	8	**1.800**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Cow Creek	0.2	0.270	5	**1.350**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.2	0.270	5	**1.350**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.270	5	**1.350**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.2	0.270	5	**1.350**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Changes in Hydrology	0.2	0.180	7	**1.260**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.325	Water Quality in Cow Creek	1.00	0.975	1.00	**0.975**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Cow Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stresor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.325	Water Temperature in Cow Creek	1.00	0.975	1	**0.975**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.135	7	**0.945**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.05	0.113	8	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.113	8	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.05	0.113	8	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.250	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.05	0.113	8	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.250**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.225	4	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.250**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.225	4	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.250**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.225	4	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.100	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1	0.900	1	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Cow Creek	0.4	0.180	5	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in Cow Creek	1	0.900	1	**0.900**	**VH**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.05	0.135	6	**0.810**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Impediments/Barriers in Cow Creek	0.9	0.405	2	**0.810**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Middle Sacramento River	0.25	0.113	7	**0.788**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.1	0.135	5	**0.675**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.135	5	**0.675**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	Cow Creek	0.3	0.135	5	**0.675**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.135	5	**0.675**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Cow Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stresor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.090	7	**0.630**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Cow Creek	0.2	0.090	7	**0.630**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1	0.600	1	**0.600**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.25	0.113	5	**0.563**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.135	4	**0.540**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.135	4	**0.540**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.090	6	**0.540**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1	0.450	1	**0.450**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.090	5	**0.450**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.090	5	**0.450**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.090	5	**0.450**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.068	5	**0.338**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.05	0.068	5	**0.338**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Middle Sacramento River	0.03	0.081	4	**0.324**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Diversion into Central Delta	0.05	0.045	7	**0.315**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.045	7	**0.315**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.05	0.045	7	**0.315**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.05	0.045	7	**0.315**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Delta	0.1	0.045	7	**0.315**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.045	7	**0.315**	**H**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.068	4	**0.270**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Cow Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stresor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.045	6	**0.270**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Water Quality	0.030	Water Quality in Cow Creek	1	0.270	1	**0.270**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Cow Creek	0.45	0.041	6	**0.243**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.00	0.225	1.00	**0.225**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1	0.225	1	**0.225**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.045	5	**0.225**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.050**	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.1	0.045	5	**0.225**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.05	0.045	5	**0.225**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.04	0.036	6	**0.216**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in Cow Creek	0.35	0.032	6	**0.189**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.04	0.036	5	**0.180**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.01	0.027	6	**0.162**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.01	0.027	6	**0.162**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.01	0.027	6	**0.162**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.01	0.027	6	**0.162**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.027	6	**0.162**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.027	6	**0.162**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.8	0.072	2	**0.144**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.8	0.072	2	**0.144**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Delta	0.3	0.027	5	**0.135**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.027	5	**0.135**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.25	0.023	6	**0.135**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Cow Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stresor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.2	0.018	6	**0.108**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Lower Sacramento River	0.01	0.027	4	**0.108**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Upper Sacramento River	0.01	0.027	4	**0.108**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Bays	0.03	0.014	7	**0.095**	**M**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1	0.090	1	**0.090**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.1	0.045	2	**0.090**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.04	0.018	5	**0.090**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Spawning	0.3	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.010	Habitat Suitability	1	0.090	1	**0.090**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Lower Sacramento River	0.15	0.014	5	**0.068**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Upper Sacramento River	0.15	0.014	5	**0.068**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.050**	Ocean	0.02	0.009	7	**0.063**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.009	6	**0.054**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.01	0.009	6	**0.054**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Cow Creek	0.1	0.009	5	**0.045**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.01	0.009	5	**0.045**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.2	0.018	2	**0.036**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.2	0.018	2	**0.036**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.005	6	**0.027**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.01	0.005	5	**0.023**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.050**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.01	0.005	5	**0.023**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Cow Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stresor Category
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.04	0.004	6	**0.022**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.04	0.004	6	**0.022**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.01	0.001	6	**0.005**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.01	0.001	6	**0.005**	**L**
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Bays	0	0.000	5		
Cow Creek	0.3	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0	0.000	4		
Cow Creek	0.3	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.300**	Delta	0	0.000	4		

Central Valley Steelhead

Stony Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Black Butte Dam	0.960	1.382	5	**6.912**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.075	North Diversion Dam	0.500	0.150	3	**0.450**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.300	Stony Creek	0.500	0.720	4	**2.880**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Stony Creek	0.600	0.720	3	**2.160**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Barrier	0.300	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	1.680	1	**1.680**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.300	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.680	1	**1.680**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Stony Creek	0.450	0.270	6	**1.620**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Stony Creek	0.600	0.360	4	**1.440**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.200	0.288	4	**1.152**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.288	4	**1.152**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Diversion into Central Delta	0.250	0.150	6	**0.900**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.350	0.210	4	**0.840**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.240	3	**0.720**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.240	3	**0.720**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.180	4	**0.720**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.400	0.096	6	**0.576**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.144	4	**0.576**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.560	1	**0.560**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.100	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.560	1	**0.560**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Changes in Hydrology	0.150	0.090	6	**0.540**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Delta	0.350	0.105	5	**0.525**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.325	Water Quality in Stony Creek	1.000	0.520	1.00	**0.520**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Stony Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.325	Water Temperature in Stony Creek	1.000	0.520	1	**0.520**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.350	0.070	7	**0.490**	**VH**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Stony Creek	0.200	0.120	4	**0.480**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.120	4	**0.480**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.075	Tributary Barriers	0.500	0.150	3	**0.450**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Delta	0.350	0.105	4	**0.420**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Delta	0.350	0.105	4	**0.420**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.400	0.080	5	**0.400**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.400	0.096	4	**0.384**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.072	5	**0.360**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.072	5	**0.360**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the Delta	0.250	0.050	7	**0.350**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.083	4	**0.330**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Stony Creek	0.275	0.083	4	**0.330**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.320	1	**0.320**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.060	5	**0.300**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.060	5	**0.300**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.060	5	**0.300**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.060	5	**0.300**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Stony Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.048	6	**0.288**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.072	4	**0.288**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.140	2	**0.280**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.280	1	**0.280**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.280	1	**0.280**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Stony Creek	1.000	0.280	1	**0.280**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Water Temperature	0.050	Water Temperature in Stony Creek	1.000	0.280	1	**0.280**	**H**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.075	0.045	6	**0.270**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Stony Creek	0.200	0.048	5	**0.240**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Stony Creek	0.200	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.075	Black Butte Dam	0.250	0.075	3	**0.225**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in Stony Creek	0.150	0.045	5	**0.225**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Bays	0.150	0.045	5	**0.225**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.045	5	**0.225**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Unscreened Diversions in Stony Creek	0.150	0.030	7	**0.210**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Stony Creek	0.200	0.040	5	**0.200**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.030	6	**0.180**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.075	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.045	4	**0.180**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Stony Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.024	6	**0.144**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.024	6	**0.144**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.024	6	**0.144**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Stony Creek	0.100	0.024	6	**0.144**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.020	7	**0.140**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.120	1.00	**0.120**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.060	2	**0.120**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.060	2	**0.120**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.024	5	**0.120**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.024	5	**0.120**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.120	1	**0.120**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.075	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.030	4	**0.120**	**M**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.200	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.200	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Stony Creek	0.200	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**

Stony Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Stony Creek	0.100	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.020	5	**0.100**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Stony Creek	0.100	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.150	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.025	0.015	6	**0.090**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.040	2	**0.080**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.010	0.014	5	**0.072**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.010	0.014	5	**0.072**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.010	0.014	5	**0.072**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.010	0.014	5	**0.072**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.010	7	**0.070**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.010	7	**0.070**	**L**
Stony Creek	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.010	7	**0.070**	**L**

Thomes Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Ag Diversion Dams, Braiding, Natural Channel Gradient	0.750	0.61	5	**3.05**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Thomes Creek	0.700	0.68	4	**2.73**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.30	1	**1.30**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.96**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.350	0.24	4	**0.96**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.20	4	**0.82**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	4	**0.82**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.20	4	**0.82**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	4	**0.82**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.250	0.11	7	**0.80**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.09	7	**0.64**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	7	**0.64**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	7	**0.64**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.59	1.00	**0.59**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.10	6	**0.59**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	5	**0.57**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Thomes Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.200	0.14	4	**0.55**	**VH**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.10	5	**0.49**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.10	5	**0.49**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.250	Sedimentation	1.000	0.49	1.00	**0.49**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.20	2	**0.41**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.20	2	**0.41**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.39	1.00	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.200	Water Quality in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.39	1.00	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.13	3	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.13	3	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.100	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.10	4	**0.39**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**

Thomes Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.14	2	**0.27**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.07	4	**0.27**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.14	2	**0.27**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.23**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Thomes Creek	0.500	0.06	4	**0.23**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.300	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.250	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.050	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Thomes Creek	0.200	0.07	3	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.300	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.03	5	**0.17**	**M**

Thomes Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Thomes Creek	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Thomes Creek	0.050	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**M**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.03	4	**0.13**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Thomes Creek	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.10	1.00	**0.10**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Thomes Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	4	**0.09**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.08	1	**0.08**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Thomes Creek	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Thomes Creek	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Thomes Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	4	**0.05**	**L**

Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Beegum Creek	0.600	0.49	5	**2.44**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	RBDD	0.550	0.36	5	**1.79**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.20	5	**1.02**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.300	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.98	1	**0.98**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.275	0.19	5	**0.94**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.19	5	**0.94**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.250	0.17	5	**0.85**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.09	8	**0.73**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	8	**0.73**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	8	**0.73**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.09	8	**0.73**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.300	0.10	7	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.11	6	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.11	6	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Watershed disturbance	0.350	Sedimentation	1.000	0.68	1.00	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.200	0.14	5	**0.68**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.16	4	**0.65**	**VH**

Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Beegum Creek	0.250	0.16	4	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.250	0.16	4	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.16	4	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.65	1	**0.65**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.09	6	**0.55**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.150	0.10	5	**0.49**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.08	6	**0.49**	**VH**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.225	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.44	1.00	**0.44**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.225	Water Quality in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.44	1.00	**0.44**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.07	6	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.20	2	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Delta	0.600	0.20	2	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Delta	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Temperature	0.250	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	5	**0.41**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**

Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Beegum Creek	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	5	**0.34**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Barrier	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.33	1	**0.33**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.100	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.100	0.07	5	**0.33**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.05	6	**0.29**	**H**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.125	0.04	7	**0.28**	**M**

Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Beegum Creek	0.500	0.06	5	**0.28**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.05	6	**0.27**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	6	**0.27**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.14	2	**0.27**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.075	Bays	0.400	0.14	2	**0.27**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.125	Water Temperature in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.24	1.00	**0.24**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	7	**0.23**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	1.000	0.23	1	**0.23**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Adult Immigration and Holding	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Bay	0.100	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in Beegum Creek	0.050	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Entrainment	0.100	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	8	**0.18**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.250	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.03	6	**0.17**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Beegum Creek	1.000	0.16	1	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Changes in Hydrology	0.200	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**

Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.02	7	**0.16**	**M**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.15	1.00	**0.15**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	6	**0.14**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.150	0.02	6	**0.10**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.02	5	**0.09**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Spawning	**0.25**	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.050	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.500	0.08	1	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Flow Conditions	0.025	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.01	7	**0.08**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Beegum Creek	0.050	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Cottonwood/Beegum Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban in Beegum Creek	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Quality	0.025	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.01	6	**0.07**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Delta	0.100	0.01	5	**0.06**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Beegum Creek	0.050	0.01	6	**0.03**	**L**
Beegum Creek	0.13	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	**0.35**	Water Temperature	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.01	5	**0.03**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Clear Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.250	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	2.10	1	**2.10**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.410	0.34	6	**2.07**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Clear Creek	0.400	0.50	4	**2.02**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Whiskeytown Dam	0.355	0.30	6	**1.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.68	1	**1.68**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in Clear Creek	1.000	1.68	1	**1.68**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.29	5	**1.47**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.26	1	**1.26**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Clear Creek	0.400	0.42	3	**1.26**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Delta	0.300	0.25	5	**1.26**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.29	4	**1.18**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Quality	0.350	Sedimentation in Clear Creek	1.000	1.10	1.00	**1.10**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Clear Creek	0.450	0.18	6	**1.06**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.21	5	**1.05**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.16	6	**0.98**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.95	1.00	**0.95**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.17	5	**0.84**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Barriers	0.100	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.84	1	**0.84**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.79**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Clear Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in Clear Creek	1.000	0.79	1.00	**0.79**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.13	6	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Clear Creek	0.200	0.13	6	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.200	0.13	6	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Delta	0.150	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Lower Sacramento River	0.150	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Temperature	0.300	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.19	4	**0.76**	**VH**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Clear Creek	0.200	0.17	4	**0.67**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Delta	0.200	0.17	4	**0.67**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.17	4	**0.67**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.21	3	**0.63**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.21	3	**0.63**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Flow Conditions	0.250	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.21	3	**0.63**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.13	5	**0.63**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	6	**0.57**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	6	**0.57**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.175	0.06	8	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.175	0.06	8	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.175	0.06	8	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.175	0.06	8	**0.51**	**H**

Clear Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.350	0.07	7	**0.51**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.100	0.08	6	**0.50**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Diversion into Central Delta	0.200	0.08	6	**0.47**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.09	5	**0.46**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.08	5	**0.42**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in Clear Creek	1.000	0.42	1	**0.42**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in Clear Creek	0.100	0.07	6	**0.39**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.08	5	**0.39**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bay	0.100	0.06	6	**0.38**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.700	0.18	2	**0.37**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in Clear Creek	0.100	0.04	8	**0.29**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.04	8	**0.29**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Clear Creek	0.200	0.04	7	**0.29**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Clear Creek	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Clear Creek	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Clear Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Clear Creek	0.200	0.05	5	**0.26**	**H**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.050	0.04	6	**0.25**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.04	6	**0.25**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.030	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.25	1	**0.25**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Changes in Hydrology	0.100	0.04	6	**0.24**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.100	0.04	6	**0.24**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Delta	0.300	0.05	5	**0.24**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.04	5	**0.21**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.125	Predation in the Bays	0.050	0.03	6	**0.20**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.04	5	**0.20**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.035	0.03	6	**0.18**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.04	4	**0.17**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Spawning	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.020	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.17	1	**0.17**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.16	1.00	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Clear Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Whiskeytown Dam	0.300	0.08	2	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Clear Creek	0.150	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.03	5	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Embryo Incubation	**0.15**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.16	1.00	**0.16**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.02	8	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.02	8	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.02	7	**0.15**	**M**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.100	0.03	5	**0.13**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.075	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.12**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.02	5	**0.11**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.2	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.050	0.01	7	**0.07**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Clear Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.01	5	**0.07**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.06**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.600	0.03	2	**0.06**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.400	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Bays	0.050	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**
Clear Creek	0.21	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.030	Clear Creek	0.050	0.01	5	**0.04**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Putah Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Solano Dam	0.550	0.462	4	**1.848**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Montecello Dam	0.400	0.336	4	**1.344**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Putah Creek	0.600	0.297	4	**1.188**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Flow Conditions	0.400	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Putah Creek	1.000	0.960	1	**0.960**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Temperature	0.150	Putah Creek	0.750	0.371	2	**0.743**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Putah Creek	0.750	0.180	4	**0.720**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Putah Creek	0.700	0.347	2	**0.693**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.150	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.149	4	**0.594**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Predation	0.100	Predation in Putah Creek	0.550	0.182	3	**0.545**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Putah Creek	0.700	0.231	2	**0.462**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Putah Creek	0.700	0.231	2	**0.462**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Flow Conditions	0.550	Flow Fluctuations	0.375	0.371	1	**0.371**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in Putah Creek	0.500	0.124	3	**0.371**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.173	2	**0.347**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.150	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	0.450	0.304	1	**0.304**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.300	0.099	3	**0.297**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.149	2	**0.297**	**VH**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	0.325	0.293	1	**0.293**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.250	0.124	2	**0.248**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.074	3	**0.223**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.099	2	**0.198**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.099	2	**0.198**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in Putah Creek	0.800	0.096	2	**0.192**	**H**

Putah Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.450	0.037	5	**0.186**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Solano Dam	0.750	0.062	3	**0.186**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.150	0.050	3	**0.149**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Putah Creek	0.600	0.050	3	**0.149**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.050	3	**0.149**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.075	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.074	2	**0.149**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.150	0.036	4	**0.144**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in Putah Creek	0.400	0.048	3	**0.144**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.400	0.048	3	**0.144**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.072	2	**0.144**	**H**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.500	0.041	3	**0.124**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.700	0.058	2	**0.116**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Water Temperature	0.300	Water Temperature in Putah Creek	0.200	0.108	1	**0.108**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Individual Diversions in Putah Creek	0.250	0.021	5	**0.103**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.150	Diversion into Central Delta	0.050	0.025	4	**0.099**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Flow Conditions	0.150	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.050	0.025	4	**0.099**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Water Temperature	0.050	Putah Creek	0.400	0.048	2	**0.096**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.025	0.021	4	**0.084**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.025	0.021	4	**0.084**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.300	0.025	3	**0.074**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.200	0.024	3	**0.072**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Putah Creek	0.200	0.017	3	**0.050**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Putah Creek Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Montecello Dam	0.200	0.017	3	**0.050**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.017	3	**0.050**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.017	3	**0.050**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.300	0.025	2	**0.050**	**M**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.050	0.012	4	**0.048**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.050	0.012	4	**0.048**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.200	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.200	0.024	2	**0.048**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	0.050	0.045	1	**0.045**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.008	5	**0.041**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.008	5	**0.041**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Entrainment	0.025	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.100	0.008	5	**0.041**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Barrier	0.250	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	0.025	0.028	1	**0.028**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	0.275	0.025	1.00	**0.025**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	0.075	0.017	1	**0.017**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.275	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.025	Tributary Barriers	0.050	0.004	3	**0.012**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	0.050	0.011	1	**0.011**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Water Temperature	0.050	Putah Creek	0.050	0.011	1	**0.011**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Spawning	0.375	Water Quality	0.050	Putah Creek	0.025	0.006	1	**0.006**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	0.050	0.005	1	**0.005**	**L**
Putah Creek	0.12	Embryo Incubation	0.150	Water Quality	0.050	Water Pollution	0.050	0.005	1.00	**0.005**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Impediments/Barriers in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.76	1.231	6	**7.387**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.95	1.283	4	**5.130**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.8	0.864	5	**4.320**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.200**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.75	0.810	4	**3.240**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.4	0.324	8	**2.592**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Barriers	0.400	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1	2.160	1	**2.160**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.2	0.324	6	**1.944**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.5	0.270	7	**1.890**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.75	0.405	4	**1.620**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.4	0.216	6	**1.296**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.4	0.216	6	**1.296**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.2	0.162	8	**1.296**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.3	0.243	5	**1.215**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.243	5	**1.215**	**VH**

Central Valley Steelhead

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Impediments/Barriers in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.5	0.540	2	**1.080**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.200	Tributary Barriers	0.5	0.540	2	**1.080**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1	1.080	1	**1.080**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.146	7	**1.021**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Middle Sacramento River	0.25	0.122	7	**0.851**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.6	0.162	5	**0.810**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.150	Habitat Suitability	1	0.810	1	**0.810**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.162	5	**0.810**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Changes in Hydrology	0.2	0.108	7	**0.756**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.2	0.097	7	**0.680**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.375	Water Temperature in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	1.00	0.675	1	**0.675**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the Delta	0.1	0.081	8	**0.648**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.081	8	**0.648**	**VH**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.108	5	**0.540**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Water Temperature	0.100	Water Temperature in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	1	0.540	1	**0.540**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.275	Water Quality in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	1.00	0.495	1.00	**0.495**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.200**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.108	4	**0.432**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.200**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.108	4	**0.432**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.081	5	**0.405**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.081	5	**0.405**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Quality	**0.150**	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.1	0.081	5	**0.405**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.054	7	**0.378**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1	0.360	1	**0.360**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Delta	0.1	0.049	7	**0.340**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.049	7	**0.340**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.054	6	**0.324**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.05	0.041	8	**0.324**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.041	8	**0.324**	**H**

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Individual Unscreened Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.05	0.041	8	**0.324**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Entrainment	0.150	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.05	0.041	8	**0.324**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.2	0.054	5	**0.270**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.2	0.054	5	**0.270**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.2	0.054	5	**0.270**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Delta	0.2	0.054	5	**0.270**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Upper Sacramento River	0.05	0.054	5	**0.270**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.050	Flow Fluctuations	1	0.270	1	**0.270**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Water Quality	0.050	Water Quality in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	1	0.270	1	**0.270**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Flow Conditions	**0.200**	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.054	4	**0.216**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.1	0.054	4	**0.216**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.054	4	**0.216**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.040	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1	0.216	1	**0.216**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Lower Sacramento River	0.04	0.043	5	**0.216**	**H**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Diversion into Central Delta	0.05	0.027	7	**0.189**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.027	7	**0.189**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.05	0.027	7	**0.189**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.05	0.027	7	**0.189**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.027	6	**0.162**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Middle Sacramento River	0.03	0.041	4	**0.162**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.45	0.024	6	**0.146**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.075	Redd disturbance	1.00	0.135	1.00	**0.135**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.1	0.027	5	**0.135**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.1	0.027	5	**0.135**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.075	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1	0.135	1	**0.135**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Delta	0.04	0.022	6	**0.130**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.35	0.019	6	**0.113**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.027	4	**0.108**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.4	0.022	5	**0.108**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Bays	0.03	0.015	7	**0.102**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Delta	0.3	0.016	6	**0.097**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.016	6	**0.097**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.01	0.016	6	**0.097**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.01	0.016	6	**0.097**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.01	0.016	6	**0.097**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Passage Impediments/Barriers	**0.300**	Yolo Bypass - Freemont Weir	0.01	0.016	6	**0.097**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.3	0.016	6	**0.097**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.016	6	**0.097**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.8	0.043	2	**0.086**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Delta	0.8	0.043	2	**0.086**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.3	0.016	5	**0.081**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.25	0.014	6	**0.081**	**M**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	**0.090**	Ocean	0.02	0.010	7	**0.068**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.014	5	**0.068**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.05	0.014	5	**0.068**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.25	0.014	5	**0.068**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.2	0.011	6	**0.065**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Spawning	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.010	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1	0.054	1	**0.054**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.01	0.011	5	**0.054**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Lower Sacramento River	0.01	0.014	4	**0.054**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Upper Sacramento River	0.01	0.014	4	**0.054**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Lower Sacramento River	0.15	0.008	6	**0.049**	**L**

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Upper Sacramento River	0.15	0.008	6	**0.049**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.1	0.005	6	**0.032**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Predation	0.100	Predation in the Bays	0.01	0.005	6	**0.032**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.1	0.005	6	**0.032**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.2	0.011	2	**0.022**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Bays	0.2	0.011	2	**0.022**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.05	0.003	6	**0.016**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.04	0.002	6	**0.013**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.04	0.002	6	**0.013**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.04	0.002	5	**0.011**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.010	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.01	0.001	6	**0.003**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Water Quality	0.010	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.01	0.001	6	**0.003**	**L**
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.01	0.001	5	**0.003**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Upper Sacramento Tributaries Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Hatchery Effects	0.010	Bays	0	0.000	6		
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.3	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0	0.000	4		
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	**0.010**	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0	0.000	5		
Upper Sacramento Tributaries	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.3	Water Temperature	**0.250**	Delta	0	0.000	4		

Sacramento River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Keswick Dam	0.525	0.82	7	**5.73**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Barrier/Genetics	0.450	Keswick/Shasta Dam	1.000	3.51	1	**3.51**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Red Bluff Diversion Dam	0.300	0.47	7	**3.28**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the lower Sacramento River	0.350	0.58	4	**2.33**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the Delta	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the Delta	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the Delta	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.50	4	**2.00**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Delta	0.250	0.39	5	**1.95**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.39	5	**1.95**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the upper Sacramento River	0.400	0.37	5	**1.87**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure (GCID, RBDD) related in the middle Sacramento River	0.225	0.35	5	**1.76**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply in upper Sacramento River	1.000	1.56	1	**1.56**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.28	5	**1.40**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Non-site specific and structure (ACID) related in the upper Sacramento River	0.175	0.27	5	**1.37**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.160	Loss of Floodplain Habitat in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**

Sacramento River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.160	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.33	4	**1.33**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.15	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.15	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.200	0.15	7	**1.02**	**VH**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function	0.160	Loss of Natural Morphologic Function in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.25	4	**1.00**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.225	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.88	1	**0.88**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Quality	0.225	Water Pollution in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.88	1	**0.88**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.21	4	**0.83**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.350	0.14	6	**0.82**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Predation	0.150	Predation in the Bay	0.100	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.78	1	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.78	1	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	5	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Water Temperature	0.200	Water Temperature in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.78	1	**0.78**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.250	0.15	5	**0.73**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.250	0.15	5	**0.73**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.250	0.15	5	**0.73**	**H**

Sacramento River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.275	0.14	5	**0.72**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the lower Sacramento River	0.275	0.14	5	**0.72**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the upper Sacramento River	0.275	0.14	5	**0.72**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.175	Redd disturbance in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.68	1.00	**0.68**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Embryo Incubation	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.175	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.68	1	**0.68**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Lower Sacramento River	0.300	0.16	4	**0.62**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.075	Habitat Suitability in in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.59	1	**0.59**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.300	0.15	4	**0.59**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Lower Sacramento River	0.400	0.20	3	**0.59**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Middle Sacramento River	0.400	0.20	3	**0.59**	**H**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Changes in Delta Hydrology	0.300	0.09	6	**0.56**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Reverse Flow Conditions in the Delta	0.300	0.09	6	**0.56**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Yolo Bypass-Freemont Weir	0.050	0.08	7	**0.55**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Individual Diversions in the upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.07	7	**0.51**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Diversion into Central Delta	0.250	0.08	6	**0.47**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.09	5	**0.47**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the Delta	0.100	0.09	5	**0.47**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Hatchery Effects	0.090	Competition, Predation in the lower Sacramento River	0.100	0.09	5	**0.47**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.150	0.09	5	**0.44**	**M**

Sacramento River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	4	**0.42**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.39	1	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the lower Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	4	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Ag, Urban in the middle Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	4	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.125	Urban, Heavy Metals in the upper Sacramento River	0.200	0.10	4	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in Lower Sacramento River	0.333	0.13	3	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Middle Sacramento River	0.333	0.13	3	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.100	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Upper Sacramento River	0.333	0.13	3	**0.39**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel	0.035	0.05	7	**0.38**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.035	0.05	7	**0.38**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sutter Bypass - Tisdale Weir	0.035	0.05	7	**0.38**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Upper Sacramento River	0.150	0.06	6	**0.35**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.150	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.06	5	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.125	0.05	6	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.125	0.05	6	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Lower Sacramento River	0.125	0.05	6	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Middle Sacramento River	0.125	0.05	6	**0.29**	**M**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.05	5	**0.26**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.04	7	**0.25**	**L**

Sacramento River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Entrainment	0.070	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.04	7	**0.25**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Delta	0.090	0.05	5	**0.23**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	ACID Dam	0.020	0.03	7	**0.22**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Temperature	0.050	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.05	4	**0.21**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the middle Sacramento River	0.075	0.04	5	**0.20**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Spawning	0.3	Water Temperature	0.025	Upper Sacramento River	1.000	0.20	1	**0.20**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Delta	0.800	0.08	2	**0.17**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Delta	0.800	0.08	2	**0.17**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.100	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.125	Upper Sacramento River	0.100	0.05	3	**0.15**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Keswick Dam	0.400	0.04	3	**0.12**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the lower Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the middle Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Flow Conditions	0.030	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the upper Sacramento River	0.050	0.02	6	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	ACID Dam	0.300	0.03	3	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.010	Tributary Barriers	0.300	0.03	3	**0.09**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Invasive species/Food Web Disruption	0.010	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, water hyacinth etc. in the Bays	0.200	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.010	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat in the Bays	0.200	0.02	2	**0.04**	**L**
Sacramento River	0.26	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.4	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.010	0.01	5	**0.03**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Mokelumne River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Camanche Dam	0.440	0.297	5	**1.485**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.175	Mokelumne River	0.650	0.427	3	**1.280**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Barrier	0.200	Competition for spawning habitat	1.000	1.200	1	**1.200**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	1.200	1	**1.200**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.200	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.200	1	**1.200**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Pardee Reservoir Dam	0.340	0.230	5	**1.148**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Flow Conditions	0.325	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.975	1	**0.975**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Mokelumne River	0.400	0.300	3	**0.900**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.275	Water temperature in the Mokelumne River	1.000	0.825	1	**0.825**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.500	0.141	5	**0.703**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.225	3	**0.675**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.200	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.300	0.225	3	**0.675**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in the Mokelumne River	1.000	0.675	1	**0.675**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.600	1	**0.600**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.100	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.600	1	**0.600**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Water Temperature	0.100	Water temperature in the Mokelumne River	1.000	0.600	1	**0.600**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.150	0.101	5	**0.506**	**VH**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.175	Delta	0.250	0.164	3	**0.492**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Mokelumne River	0.525	0.118	4	**0.473**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.450	1.00	**0.450**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.150	Water Pollution	1.000	0.450	1.00	**0.450**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.100	Mokelumne River	0.600	0.225	2	**0.450**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.500	0.188	2	**0.375**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Mokelumne River	0.500	0.188	2	**0.375**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Mokelumne River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.079	4	**0.315**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.300	1	**0.300**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.300	1	**0.300**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Spawning	0.40	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in the Mokelumne River	1.000	0.300	1	**0.300**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.150	2	**0.300**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Mokelumne River	0.200	0.056	5	**0.281**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.100	Mokelumne River	0.600	0.135	2	**0.270**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.131	2	**0.263**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Delta	0.450	0.084	3	**0.253**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Mokelumne River	0.450	0.084	3	**0.253**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Mokelumne River	0.750	0.084	3	**0.253**	**H**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Mokelumne River	0.600	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Mokelumne River	0.600	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Camanche Dam	0.300	0.056	4	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Woodbridge Dam	0.300	0.056	4	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the Mokelumne River	0.400	0.075	3	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.400	0.075	3	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Mokelumne River	0.500	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.500	0.113	2	**0.225**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.175	Bays	0.100	0.066	3	**0.197**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.090	2	**0.180**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Mokelumne River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Mokelumne River	0.600	0.056	3	**0.169**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.034	5	**0.169**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.075	2	**0.150**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.075	2	**0.150**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.075	2	**0.150**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Pardee Reservoir Dam	0.200	0.038	4	**0.150**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.038	4	**0.150**	**M**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.028	5	**0.141**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.028	5	**0.141**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.075	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.100	0.028	5	**0.141**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.056	2	**0.113**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.200	0.038	3	**0.113**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Bays	0.100	0.023	4	**0.090**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.028	3	**0.084**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.200	0.023	3	**0.068**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Woodbridge Dam	0.020	0.014	5	**0.068**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.019	3	**0.056**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.100	0.009	3	**0.028**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.100	Ocean	0.025	0.006	4	**0.023**	**L**
Mokelumne River	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.15	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.050	0.006	3	**0.017**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Calaveras River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Bellota Weir	0.375	0.748	5	**3.741**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Flash Board Dams	0.375	0.748	5	**3.741**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Calaveras River	0.500	0.855	3	**2.565**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Flow Conditions	0.450	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.710	1	**1.710**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low flows limiting attraction into the Calaveras Rvier	1.000	1.710	1	**1.710**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.513	3	**1.539**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.150	0.299	5	**1.496**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.175	Bellota Weir	0.400	0.399	3	**1.197**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.175	New Hogan Dam	0.400	0.399	3	**1.197**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the Calaveras River	0.700	0.599	2	**1.197**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.300	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.342	3	**1.026**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.125	Calaveras River	0.700	0.499	2	**0.998**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water temperature in the Calaveras River	1.000	0.950	1	**0.950**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Calaveras River	0.550	0.314	3	**0.941**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.225	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.855	1	**0.855**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Barrier	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.760	1	**0.760**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.760	1	**0.760**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.760	1	**0.760**	**VH**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Calaveras River	0.600	0.342	2	**0.684**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Calaveras River	0.600	0.342	2	**0.684**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Delta	0.500	0.214	3	**0.641**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.175	Tributary Barriers	0.200	0.200	3	**0.599**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.150	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.570	1.00	**0.570**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Calaveras River	0.450	0.128	4	**0.513**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Calaveras River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Calaveras River	0.400	0.171	3	**0.513**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Calaveras River	0.600	0.171	3	**0.513**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.171	3	**0.513**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.257	2	**0.513**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.350	0.100	5	**0.499**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	New Hogan Dam	0.050	0.100	5	**0.499**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.100	5	**0.499**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.228	2	**0.456**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.228	2	**0.456**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Calaveras River	0.300	0.086	5	**0.428**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.125	Delta	0.300	0.214	2	**0.428**	**H**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.350	0.100	4	**0.399**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.100	Water Pollution	1.000	0.380	1.00	**0.380**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	Calaveras River	0.600	0.171	2	**0.342**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.057	5	**0.285**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.086	3	**0.257**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.086	3	**0.257**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.800	0.114	2	**0.228**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.114	2	**0.228**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.100	2	**0.200**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.190	1	**0.190**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.190	1	**0.190**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Calaveras River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in the Calaveras River	1.000	0.190	1	**0.190**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Water Temperature	0.050	Water temperature in the Calaveras River	1.000	0.190	1	**0.190**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.400	0.057	3	**0.171**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.150	0.043	4	**0.171**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.086	2	**0.171**	**M**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.029	5	**0.143**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.043	3	**0.128**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.300	0.043	3	**0.128**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.025	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Calaveras River	0.300	0.043	3	**0.128**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.025	Bays	0.400	0.057	2	**0.114**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Spawning	0.20	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.095	1	**0.095**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.029	3	**0.086**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.025	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.043	2	**0.086**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.014	5	**0.071**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.050	0.014	4	**0.057**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.025	Calaveras River	0.200	0.029	2	**0.057**	**L**
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.000	0.000	3	**0.000**	
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Calaveras River	0.000	0.000	3	**0.000**	
Calaveras River	0.19	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.000	0.000	3	**0.000**	

Central Valley Steelhead

San Joaquin River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Friant Dam	0.500	0.900	5	4.500	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.250	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the San Joaquin River	0.500	0.750	4	3.000	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.250	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.450	4	1.800	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.550	0.495	3	1.485	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Mendota Pool	0.150	0.270	5	1.350	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Sack Dam	0.150	0.270	5	1.350	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.150	0.270	5	1.350	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.700	0.630	2	1.260	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Temperature	0.150	San Joaquin River	0.700	0.630	2	1.260	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in San Joaquin River	1.000	0.900	1	0.900	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.250	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.150	0.225	4	0.900	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.700	0.420	2	0.840	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.270	3	0.810	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.250	Habitat Suitability	1.000	0.750	1	0.750	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.400	0.120	5	0.600	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Barrier	0.200	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.600	1	0.600	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.500	0.150	4	0.600	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.500	0.150	4	0.600	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.500	0.150	4	0.600	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.500	0.150	4	0.600	VH
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Delta	0.400	0.180	3	0.540	H
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Predation	0.075	Predation in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.180	3	0.540	H

Central Valley Steelhead

San Joaquin River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Quality	0.200	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.270	2	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.270	2	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.600	0.270	2	**0.540**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.175	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.525	1	**0.525**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.450	1	**0.450**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.400	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.090	5	**0.450**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.500	0.150	3	**0.450**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.210	2	**0.420**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Friant Dam	0.700	0.210	2	**0.420**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Flow Conditions	0.275	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.413	1	**0.413**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Quality	0.250	Water Pollution	1.000	0.375	1.00	**0.375**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water temperature in the San Joaquin River	1.000	0.375	1	**0.375**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.400	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.600	0.180	2	**0.360**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.180	2	**0.360**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.180	2	**0.360**	**H**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.060	5	**0.300**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.060	5	**0.300**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Flow Conditions	0.250	Diversion into Central Delta	0.050	0.075	4	**0.300**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.600	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Bays	0.200	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

San Joaquin River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.300	0.068	4	**0.270**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.050	Delta	0.400	0.120	2	**0.240**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.350	0.079	3	**0.236**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Water Quality	0.075	Water quality in the San Joaquin River	1.000	0.225	1	**0.225**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Water Temperature	0.075	Water temperature in the San Joaquin River	1.000	0.225	1	**0.225**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.060	3	**0.180**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.200	0.045	4	**0.180**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.090	2	**0.180**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.300	0.090	2	**0.180**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.250	0.056	3	**0.169**	**M**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.100	0.030	5	**0.150**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.100	0.030	5	**0.150**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.150	1	**0.150**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Spawning	0.20	Hatchery Effects	0.050	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.150	1	**0.150**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.100	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	1.000	0.150	1	**0.150**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Hatchery Effects	0.075	Density dependent impacts - Redd superimposition, fungus	1.000	0.113	1	**0.113**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.200	0.030	3	**0.090**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.40	Hatchery Effects	0.025	San Joaquin River	0.200	0.030	3	**0.090**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.100	0.023	4	**0.090**	**L**
San Joaquin Rive	0.15	Embryo Incubation	**0.10**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	1.000	0.075	1.00	**0.075**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Merced River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.400	Habitat Suitability	1.000	1.920	1	**1.920**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in Merced River	0.350	0.336	5	**1.680**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Crocker Huffman	0.300	0.288	5	**1.440**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	McSwain Dam	0.250	0.240	5	**1.200**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in San Joaquin River	0.550	0.528	2	**1.056**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Flow Conditions	0.550	Flow Fluctuations	0.550	0.968	1	**0.968**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.192	5	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.192	5	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	New Exchequer Dam	0.200	0.192	5	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.200	0.192	5	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.200	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	0.960	1	**0.960**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.300	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in the Merced River	0.450	0.432	2	**0.864**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	Merced River	0.400	0.256	3	**0.768**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	San Joaquin River	0.400	0.256	3	**0.768**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Delta	0.350	0.252	3	**0.756**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.252	3	**0.756**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Changes in Hydrology	0.150	0.144	5	**0.720**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.150	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.720	1	**0.720**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Water Temperature	0.150	Water temperature in the Merced River	1.000	0.720	1	**0.720**	**VH**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.450	0.108	6	**0.648**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.150	Merced River	0.300	0.216	3	**0.648**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.450	0.216	3	**0.648**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Merced River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Merced River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Merced River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Flow Conditions	0.200	Diversion into Central Delta	0.100	0.096	5	**0.480**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Merced River	0.500	0.120	4	**0.480**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.144	3	**0.432**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Merced River	0.300	0.144	3	**0.432**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Crocker Huffman	0.450	0.108	4	**0.432**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.096	4	**0.384**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.128	3	**0.384**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.200	0.128	3	**0.384**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.350	0.112	3	**0.336**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.168	2	**0.336**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	McSwain Dam	0.350	0.084	4	**0.336**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.350	0.084	4	**0.336**	**H**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.048	6	**0.288**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.200	0.096	3	**0.288**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.144	2	**0.288**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.072	4	**0.288**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.072	4	**0.288**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Merced River	0.350	0.056	5	**0.280**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.300	0.048	5	**0.240**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Merced River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.048	5	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Merced River	0.250	0.080	3	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.240	1	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in Merced River	1.000	0.240	1	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the San Joaquin River	0.250	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.350	0.056	4	**0.224**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Merced River	0.150	0.036	6	**0.216**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water temperature in the Merced River	0.250	0.200	1	**0.200**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.096	2	**0.192**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban in the Merced River	0.200	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.032	5	**0.160**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.100	0.024	6	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.072	2	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	New Exchequer Dam	0.150	0.036	4	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Delta	0.150	0.036	4	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Water Quality	0.050	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.036	4	**0.144**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Merced River	0.200	0.032	4	**0.128**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Merced River	0.100	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Merced River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.016	5	**0.080**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.100	0.016	5	**0.080**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.012	6	**0.072**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.012	6	**0.072**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.050	0.012	4	**0.048**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.100	Water Pollution	0.100	0.032	1.00	**0.032**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	0.050	0.008	1.00	**0.008**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	0.050	0.008	1	**0.008**	**L**
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Barrier	0.000	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.000	1	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Spawning	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.000	1	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Bays	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Delta	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Merced River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Merced River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.30	Hatchery Effects	0.000	San Joaquin River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	

Central Valley Steelhead

Tuolumne River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.500	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.800	1	**2.800**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	La Grange	0.500	0.560	4	**2.240**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Don Pedro	0.350	0.392	5	**1.960**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.300	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	1.680	1	**1.680**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Flow Conditions	0.600	Flow Fluctuations	0.600	1.152	1	**1.152**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.200	San Joaquin River	0.450	0.360	3	**1.080**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Tuolumne River	0.350	0.175	5	**0.875**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.200	Tuolumne River	0.350	0.280	3	**0.840**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	San Joaquin River	0.400	0.256	3	**0.768**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	Tuolumne River	0.400	0.256	3	**0.768**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues in Tuolumne River	0.550	0.352	2	**0.704**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.200	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in San Joaquin River	0.450	0.288	2	**0.576**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.192	3	**0.576**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.100	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	0.560	1	**0.560**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Water Temperature	0.100	Water temperature in the Tuolumne River	1.000	0.560	1	**0.560**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the Tuolumne River	0.350	0.168	3	**0.504**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.100	5	**0.500**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.200	0.100	5	**0.500**	**VH**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.200	0.160	3	**0.480**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.100	0.112	4	**0.448**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.350	0.070	6	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.140	3	**0.420**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Tuolumne River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Tuolumne River	0.350	0.140	3	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.350	0.140	3	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.140	3	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.350	0.105	4	**0.420**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.200	Delta	0.200	0.128	3	**0.384**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Changes in Hydrology	0.150	0.075	5	**0.375**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.120	3	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Tuolumne River	0.300	0.120	3	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.250	0.120	3	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the San Joaquin River	0.300	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Tuolumne River	0.300	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.075	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.080	4	**0.320**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the San Joaquin River	0.250	0.050	6	**0.300**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Don Pedro	0.500	0.100	3	**0.300**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	La Grange	0.500	0.100	3	**0.300**	**H**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Tuolumne River	0.350	0.056	5	**0.280**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.280	1	**0.280**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in Tuolumne River	1.000	0.280	1	**0.280**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.140	2	**0.280**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Diversion into Central Delta	0.100	0.050	5	**0.250**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.200	0.040	6	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.120	2	**0.240**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Tuolumne River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Bays	0.200	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.075	Predation in the Delta	0.200	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban in the Tuolumne River	0.200	0.060	4	**0.240**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.350	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.050	0.056	4	**0.224**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.350	0.056	4	**0.224**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	Delta	0.350	0.070	3	**0.210**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.070	3	**0.210**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.250	0.040	5	**0.200**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in the Tuolumne River	0.250	0.200	1	**0.200**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.048	4	**0.192**	**M**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Tuolumne River	0.150	0.030	6	**0.180**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.050	Tuolumne River	0.300	0.060	3	**0.180**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.075	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.150	0.045	4	**0.180**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.032	5	**0.160**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.080	2	**0.160**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.040	4	**0.160**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Tuolumne River	0.200	0.032	4	**0.128**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.060	2	**0.120**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.150	0.024	4	**0.096**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.016	5	**0.080**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Tuolumne River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Tuolumne River	0.16	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.100	0.016	5	**0.080**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Tuolumne River	0.100	0.020	4	**0.080**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.010	6	**0.060**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.010	6	**0.060**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.025	0.003	4	**0.010**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.025	0.003	4	**0.010**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	0.050	0.008	1.00	**0.008**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	0.050	0.008	1	**0.008**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Pollution	0.050	0.008	1.00	**0.008**	**L**
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Barrier	0.000	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, hybridization/genetic integrity	1.000	0.000	1	**0.000**	
Tuolumne River	0.16	Spawning	0.35	Hatchery Effects	0.000	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat, Genetic Integrity	1.000	0.000	1	**0.000**	
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	San Joaquin River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Tuolumne River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	
Tuolumne River	0.16	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.000	0.000	3	**0.000**	

Central Valley Steelhead

Stanislaus River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Physical Habitat Alteration	0.350	Limited Instream Gravel Supply	1.000	2.205	1	**2.205**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Spawning Habitat Availability	0.350	Habitat Suitability	1.000	2.205	1	**2.205**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Goodwin Dam	0.350	0.378	5	**1.890**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	New Melones	0.300	0.324	5	**1.620**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.350	Low Flows - attraction, migratory cues AND Flood Flows - non-natal area attraction in San Joaquin River	0.550	0.693	2	**1.386**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Flow Conditions	0.600	Flow Fluctuations	0.600	1.296	1	**1.296**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Flow Conditions	0.200	Flow Fluctuations	1.000	1.260	1	**1.260**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Flow Conditions	0.350	Low flows limiting attraction into the Stanislaus River	0.450	0.567	2	**1.134**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the Stanislaus River	0.400	0.225	5	**1.125**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	San Joaquin River	0.500	0.338	3	**1.013**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Tulloch Dam	0.180	0.194	5	**0.972**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Changes in Hydrology	0.300	0.169	5	**0.844**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel	0.150	0.162	5	**0.810**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.450	0.243	3	**0.729**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.180	4	**0.720**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.400	0.216	3	**0.648**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Delta	0.300	0.203	3	**0.608**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	0.400	0.090	6	**0.540**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Stanislaus River	0.400	0.180	3	**0.540**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	DO, Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in th Delta	0.300	0.135	4	**0.540**	**VH**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.350	0.158	3	**0.473**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Stanislaus River	0.350	0.158	3	**0.473**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Stanislaus River	0.500	0.113	4	**0.450**	**H**

Central Valley Steelhead

Stanislaus River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	Delta	0.400	0.144	3	**0.432**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.400	0.144	3	**0.432**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Flow Dependent Habitat Availability in the San Joaquin River	0.150	0.084	5	**0.422**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Temperature	0.150	Stanislaus River	0.200	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Floodplain Habitat	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	Delta	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover	0.100	San Joaquin River	0.300	0.135	3	**0.405**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Stanislaus River	0.400	0.072	5	**0.360**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban in the Stanislaus River	0.200	0.090	4	**0.360**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Recreational, Poaching, Angler Impacts	1.000	0.315	1	**0.315**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Water Quality	0.050	Water quality in Stanislaus River	1.000	0.315	1	**0.315**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Spawning	0.35	Water Temperature	0.050	Water temperature in the Stanislaus River	1.000	0.315	1	**0.315**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Delta	0.700	0.158	2	**0.315**	**H**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Goodwin Dam	0.330	0.074	4	**0.297**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	New Melones	0.330	0.074	4	**0.297**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tulloch Dam	0.330	0.074	4	**0.297**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the San Joaquin River	0.400	0.072	4	**0.288**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Reverse Flow Conditions	0.100	0.056	5	**0.281**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the San Joaquin River	0.200	0.045	6	**0.270**	**M**

Central Valley Steelhead

Stanislaus River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Natural River Morphology	0.100	Stanislaus River	0.200	0.090	3	**0.270**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Delta	0.600	0.135	2	**0.270**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.068	4	**0.270**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Quality	0.150	Ag, Urban in the Stanislaus River	0.150	0.081	3	**0.243**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	San Joaquin River	0.250	0.045	5	**0.225**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the San Joaquin River	0.250	0.056	4	**0.225**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Temperature	0.250	Water Temperature in the Stanislaus River	0.250	0.225	1	**0.225**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Water Temperature	0.100	Stanislaus River	0.200	0.072	3	**0.216**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Delta	0.300	0.054	4	**0.216**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Delta	0.150	0.034	6	**0.203**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Individual Diversions in the Stanislaus River	0.150	0.034	6	**0.203**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Delta	0.200	0.036	5	**0.180**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat	0.050	Bays	0.400	0.090	2	**0.180**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bays	0.200	0.045	4	**0.180**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Water Quality	0.100	Ag, Urban, Heavy Metals in the Bays	0.100	0.045	4	**0.180**	**M**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Stanislaus River	0.200	0.036	4	**0.144**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Flow Conditions	0.125	Diversion into Central Delta	0.050	0.028	5	**0.141**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Invasive Species/Food Web Disruption	0.050	Asian clam, A. aspera, Microcystis, etc. in the Bays	0.300	0.068	2	**0.135**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Delta	0.150	0.034	4	**0.135**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.300	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure	0.020	0.022	5	**0.108**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Bays	0.100	0.018	5	**0.090**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Predation	0.050	Predation in the Bays	0.100	0.023	4	**0.090**	**L**

Central Valley Steelhead

Stanislaus River Steelhead Stressor Matrix

Population	Pop Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Life Stage	Life Stage Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Primary Stressor Category	Primary Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Specific Stressor	Specific Stressor Weight (0-1) Sum to 1	Composite Weight (X100)	# of Specific Stressors	Normalized Weight (Composite * # of specific stressors)	Overall Stressor Category
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Stanislaus River	0.100	0.023	4	**0.090**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills in the Bay	0.100	0.018	4	**0.072**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Contra Costa Power Plant	0.050	0.011	6	**0.068**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Entrainment	0.050	Pittsburg Power Plant	0.050	0.011	6	**0.068**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Adult Immigration and Holding	0.20	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Ocean	0.050	0.009	5	**0.045**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Harvest/Angling Impacts	0.050	Redd disturbance	0.050	0.009	1.00	**0.009**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Short-term Inwater Construction	0.050	Sedimentation, turbidity, acoustic effects, hazardous spills, physical disturbance	0.050	0.009	1	**0.009**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Embryo Incubation	**0.20**	Water Quality	0.050	Water Pollution	0.050	0.009	1.00	**0.009**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Bays	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Delta	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	San Joaquin River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Hatchery Effects	0.025	Stanislaus River	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	**L**
Stanislaus River	0.18	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration	0.25	Passage Impediments/Barriers	0.050	Tributary Barriers	0.000	0.000	4	**0.000**	**L**

Appendix B

Recovery Actions

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION **1-1**

2.0 WINTER-RUN CHINOOK SALMON **2-1**

2.1 Watershed- and Site-Specific Recovery Actions **2-1**

3.0 SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON **3-1**

3.1 Watershed- and Site-Specific Recovery Actions **3-1**

4.0 STEELHEAD **4-1**

4.1 Watershed- and Site-Specific Recovery Actions **4-1**

5.0 LITERATURE CITED **5-1**

List of Tables

Table 2-1. Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Threats and Associated Recovery Actions 2-1

Table 3-1. Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions 3-1

Table 3.2 Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions 3-35

Table 3-3 Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Threats and Associated Recovery Actions 3-51

Table 4-1. Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions 4-1

Table 4-2. Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions 4-43

Table 4-3. Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions 4-69

Table 4-4. Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions 4-95

List of Acronyms

AFRP	Anadromous Salmonid Restoration Program
Bay/Delta	San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
BRT	Biological Resource Team
CALFED	CALFED Bay-Delta Program
CAMP	Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program
CCWD	Contra Costa Water District
CCWMG	Cow Creek Watershed Management Group
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CMARP	Comprehensive Monitoring Assessment and Research Program
cm	centimeters
cm/sec	centimeters per second
CNFH	Coleman National Fish Hatchery
CVP	Central Valley Project
CVPIA	Central Valley Project Improvement act
CVSEPWT	Central Valley Salmonid Escapement Project Work Team
CWT	Coded Wire Tag
Delta	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DWR	Department of Water Resources
ERP	Ecosystem Restoration Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
EWA	Environmental Water Account
FRFH	Feather River Fish Hatchery
ft/sec	feet per second
IEP	Interagency Ecological Program
m	meters
m/sec	millimeters per second
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
QC	Quality Control
RBDD	Red Bluff Diversion Dam
Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
RM	River Mile
RST	Rotary Screw Trap
SEWD	Stockton East Water District
TRT	Technical Review Team
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VSP	Viable Salmonid Population
WSRCD	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Recovery Plan maintains a consistent strategic framework for the establishment of recovery goals and criteria, the identification and prioritization of threats, and the identification of recovery actions. As described in Chapter 4, the framework for ESU or DPS recovery includes goals and criteria directed at the diversity group (recovery units) and population (management units) levels. Similarly, the threats assessment framework for each ESU or DPS also was organized by diversity groups and populations. For winter-run Chinook salmon, threats were prioritized within the Sacramento River population, whereas for spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead, threats were prioritized within each diversity group as well as within each population.

Results from the threats assessment and prioritization process (described in Appendix A) were used to guide the identification of watershed- and site-specific recovery actions for each diversity group and population. In that process, threat/stressor matrices were used to structure diversity group, population, life stage, and stressor information into hierarchically-related tiers so that stressors to each ESU or DPS could be prioritized. Prioritizing stressors was accomplished by weighting each tier beneath the diversity group tier, calculating a composite and normalized weight for each specific stressor, and then sorting the normalized weights[1]. A completed stressor matrix sorted by normalized weight resulted in a prioritized list of the life stage-specific stressors affecting each ESU or DPS throughout its life cycle[2].

Although the matrix provides a semi-quantitative means of comparatively ranking individual stressors within a diversity group or population, it is important to avoid attributing unwarranted specificity to the prioritized stressor list. As such, the prioritized stressor list was distributed into four separate quartiles which represent four tiers of stressor importance. The stressors in the quartile with the highest normalized weights were identified as having "Very High" importance. The stressors in the other three quartiles were identified as having either a "High", "Medium", or "Low" importance depending on the magnitude and distribution of the normalized weights.

By linking specific recovery actions to the highest ranked threats, those recovery actions also become prioritized in importance to the diversity group or population. These recovery actions represent the first step at eliminating or alleviating the factors believed to be most detrimental to the viability of a particular diversity group or population.

In an effort to focus and direct energy at the most significant threats (i.e., threats in the "Very High" or "High" quartiles) to the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon ESU, the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon ESU, and the Central Valley steelhead DPS, watershed- or site-specific recovery actions for the threats ranked in the "Medium" or "Low" quartiles have not been described in this recovery plan. Although such actions would certainly contribute to ESU or DPS recovery, considering

[1] The stressor weighting and prioritization process is fully described in Appendix A.

[2] Threats to the species that were included in the matrices were limited to those which could potentially be minimized or eliminated with some directed action. For example, although ocean conditions, such as upwelling, are believed to be a major factor affecting the growth and survival of Chinook salmon, this factor was not included in the stressor matrices, because there is no way to control the frequency and magnitude of upwelling events. Conversely, ocean harvest and poaching is a managed threat included in the stressor matrices.

the number of specific threats that ranked in the "Very High" or "High" quartiles for each diversity group[3], we believe an efficient recovery strategy should address the most important threats first.

The status of the recovery actions identified corresponding to the threats of "Very High" or "High" importance will be assessed through the adaptive management program of the recovery plan at the 5- and 10-year status reviews of the ESU and DPS. During these status reviews, the threats identification and prioritization process could be re-initiated to account for threats that have been alleviated and for changes in environmental and biotic conditions, which may have altered the distribution of stressors in terms of importance. Such alterations would result in a re-prioritization of recovery actions.

Watershed- or site-specific recovery actions have been identified for each specific threat that was considered to be of "Very High" or "High" importance within a particular diversity group (spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead) or population (winter-run Chinook salmon) (**Appendix B**). Specific stressors that are common to multiple populations were listed only once in each species- and diversity group-specific table. For example, within the Northern Sierra Nevada spring-run Chinook salmon diversity group, although loss of floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento River ranked as a stressor of "Very High" importance affecting juvenile Chinook salmon produced in each population, this particular stressor (and associated recovery actions) was only listed once. Similarly, within a diversity group, specific stressors that are common to multiple life stages within a population were only listed once in each table.

[3] Nearly 250 specific threats were identified in the "Very High" quartile for the Northern Sierra Nevada steelhead diversity group alone.

2.0 WINTER-RUN CHINOOK SALMON

2.1 WATERSHED- AND SITE-SPECIFIC RECOVERY ACTIONS

Table 2-1. Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Threats and Associated Recovery Actions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Keswick/Shasta Dam impeding and/or blocking adults returning to the Sacramento River and limiting the spatial distribution of spawning in the Sacramento River	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing winter-run Chinook salmon access to habitat above Shasta Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Shasta Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Shasta dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the ESU, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline Catastrophe	WR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Sacramento River	Flow fluctuations in the upper[4] Sacramento River affecting spawning and embryo incubation in the Sacramento River	Implement a river flow management plan that balances carryover storage needs with instream flow needs for winter-run Chinook salmon based on runoff and storage conditions (USFWS 2001)	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

[4] Threats in the mainstem Sacramento River were geographically distinguished among the lower, middle, and upper part of the river. The lower section extends from the I Street Bridge upstream to Princeton (RM 163), the middle section extends from Princeton to Red Bluff Diversion Dam (RM 243), and the upper section extends from RBDD up to Keswick Dam (RM 302).

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Loss of natural morphology and function in the Delta affecting juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Restore dendritic channel systems in areas where this habitat feature existed historically Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the lower Sacramento River affecting juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon	Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Delta affecting juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and identify and implement similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Implement boat wake restrictions along primary migration corridors in the Delta to prevent bank erosion and promote riparian recruitment and growth. Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the lower Sacramento River affecting juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE) Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring, and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	W-R 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk) Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the lower Sacramento River especially between Colusa and Verona Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento			
Sacramento River	Predation on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the upper Sacramento River	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on Chinook salmon by non-native species in the upper Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 3: Threats from Predation
Sacramento River	Predation on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the middle Sacramento River	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on winter-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the middle Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 3: Threats from Predation
Sacramento River	Predation on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the Delta	Implement studies to develop quantitative estimates of predation on winter-run Chinook salmon by non-native species throughout the Delta. The steelhead predation study being conducted by DWR et al. in Clifton Court Forebay is one example of such a study.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 3.2: Threats from Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at irrigation diversions and junctions and gate/barrier structures (e.g., DCC gates, South Delta barriers, and potential False River and Three-Mile River barriers to Frank's Tract) throughout the Delta, including the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Sacramento River	Predation on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in the lower Sacramento River	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on winter-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the lower Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 3: Predation
Sacramento River	Commercial and recreational harvest in the ocean.	Develop an ecosystem-based salmon fishery management plan that considers multi-trophic interactions, ocean currents, upwelling patterns, ocean temperatures, and other relevant factors. Implement restrictions that limit harvest of winter-run Chinook salmon in commercial and recreational fisheries.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 2.1 Threats from Overutilization
Sacramento River	Entrainment of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon at the Jones and Banks Pumping Plants	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 5.3

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.			
Sacramento River	Changes in Delta hydrology affecting juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon	Implement a study designed to identify water conveyance projects that would allow the Delta to function as a natural estuary. Such a study would include modeling to examine upstream and downstream effects of identified projects as well as project-specific operational criteria	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	WR – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality WR – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity WR – 5.3: Threat from Water Diversions
Sacramento River	Diversion into the central Delta affecting juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon	Operate the DCC gates consistent with recommendations from the CALFED Operations Group, SWRCB D-1641, and the Salmon Decision Process in order to minimize the number of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon being diverted into the central Delta (NMFS 2004).	A, P	Criteria indirectly affected include effective population size and population decline	WR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River	Water quality in the upper Sacramento River affecting embryo incubation	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Redding and in surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Improve and maintain containment of contaminants from Iron Mountain Mine.			
Sacramento River	Water temperature in the upper Sacramento River affecting embryo incubation and spawning	Achieve the daily average water temperature targets described in the Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan (NMFS 2004)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality WR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Sacramento River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the upper Sacramento River affecting juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon	Modify gravel pits and mounds to ensure full drainage of these features to allow flooding while preventing juvenile salmonid stranding and warm water predator habitat. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active upper Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the upper Sacramento River	Use the best available data regarding winter-run Chinook salmon spawning habitat availability as a key consideration for determining Keswick Dam releases. Conduct periodic (e.g., every 5 years) spawning gravel assessments in the upper Sacramento River (i.e., above RBDD) and implement gravel augmentation projects, as necessary.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.1: Threats to Historical Spawning Habitat
Sacramento River	Red Bluff Diversion Dam impeding and/or blocking adults returning to the Sacramento River	Maintain the gates-up position to prevent passage impediments to listed species.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Low flow conditions in the lower Sacramento River limiting habitat availability during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Sacramento River	Entrainment of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon at individual diversion in the Delta	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	WR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River	Harvest/angling impacts in the upper Sacramento River affecting the spawning and embryo incubation (i.e., walking on redds) life stages.	Modify sport fishing regulations to minimize the number of anglers wading in the river during winter-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation (i.e., April through October). Implement outreach projects to educate the public regarding the salmon life cycle including how to identify a salmon redd.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Sacramento River	Low flows in the lower Sacramento River affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage by reducing attraction and migratory cues	Develop and implement pulse flow schedules during peak migration periods for years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Sacramento River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Implement habitat improvement projects throughout the Delta including, but not limited to: (1) Liberty Farms and Hastings Tract Restoration Project; (2) Little Holland Tract Restoration Project; and (3) Eastern Egbert Tract Restoration Project (see Four Pumps Delta Fish Agreement Amendment – Ongoing Actions to Address State Water Project Impacts). Restore floodplains and establish floodplain habitat in Snodgrass and Georgiana sloughs, near the mouths of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, and in the McCormick-Williamson Tract (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Implement restoration projects for Lindsey and Barker sloughs (CDFG *et al*. 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Evaluate the potential effects of reconnecting Elk Slough to the Sacramento River, and if the evaluation suggests that habitat conditions for salmonids would improve, then implement a project to carry out the reconnection (Siegel 2007). Manage Elk, Sutter, and Steamboat Sloughs for salmon passage and habitats (Siegel 2007). Re-establish hydrologic connectivity between historical Stone Lakes floodplain and the Sacramento River with a design that minimizes juvenile stranding (Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007). Enhance the Yolo Bypass by re-configuring Fremont and Sacramento weirs to target inundation frequency, duration, and magnitude levels that best match natural, historic conditions. Implement additional projects to: (1) improve fish passage through Fremont weir for multiple species; (2) enhance lower Putah Creek floodplain habitat; (3) improve fish passage along the toe drain/Lisbon weir; and (4) enhance floodplain habitat along the toe drain (Siegel 2007). Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection (including bank relocation) and ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE). Replace and modify the Lisbon Weir to improve fish habitats (and passage) and management flexibility (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Restore tidal wetlands and associated habitats at Brannan Island State Park, northeast tip of Sherman Island, along Seven-Mile slough, and the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (CDFG *et al.* 2008). Implement projects to restore native riparian vegetation along channel margins and set-back levees (*CDFG et al. 2008*).			
Sacramento River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles	The Corps, DWR, CDFG, BLM, USFWS, NMFS, private land owners, and Resource Conservation Districts should continue to focus on retaining, restoring and creating continuous riparian corridors within their jurisdictions. Utilize bio-technical techniques for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Restore the current Lake Red Bluff footprint to riparian habitat.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Physical habitat alterations (e.g., Keswick and Shasta dams) limiting the supply of spawning gravels to the upper Sacramento River	Conduct periodic (e.g., every 5 years) spawning gravel assessments in the upper Sacramento River (i.e., above RBDD) and implement gravel augmentation projects, as necessary.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.1: Threats to Historical Spawning Habitat
Sacramento River	Low flow conditions in the middle Sacramento River limiting habitat availability during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Low flow conditions in the upper Sacramento River limiting habitat availability during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the middle Sacramento River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Middle Sacramento River water temperatures affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality WR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Predation on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon in San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun bays	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 3: Predation
Sacramento River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the middle Sacramento River affecting the juvenile rearing life stage	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website)	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the upper Sacramento River affecting the juvenile rearing life stage	Modify gravel pits and mounds to ensure full drainage of these features to allow flooding while preventing stranding and warm water predator habitat. Curtail further development in active upper Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Aquatic invasive species (e.g., Asian clam, A. aspera, microcystis, water hyacinth) and associated food web disruption in the Delta affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement the management actions for addressing aquatic invasive species described in the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (CDFG 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	WR – 5.4: Threats Resulting from Non-native Aquatic Invasive Species

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Entrainment of juveniles at diversions in the lower, middle, and upper section of the Sacramento River	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River	Loss of tidal marsh habitat in the Delta affecting the juveniles	Restore and protect tidal wetlands and associated habitats throughout the Delta including: (1) at Brannon Island State Park; (2) along the northeast tip of Sherman Island (3) along Seven-Mile Slough (4) at the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (5) within Sherman Lake (6) in the Hotchkiss and Veale Tracts (7) around Decker Island (8) at Dutch Slough; (9) at Big Break (10) at Frank's Tract (11) along the north shore of the Sacramento River along the Montezuma Hills; and (12) in Sand Mound Slough (CDFG et al. 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Water temperature in the lower Sacramento River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality WR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Sacramento River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE) Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	WR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk) Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the middle Sacramento River Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website 2007)			
Sacramento River	Agricultural and urban runoff/return flows in the lower Sacramento River affecting water quality during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Sacramento and in residential, commercial, and industrial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Agricultural and urban runoff/return flows in the middle Sacramento River affecting water quality during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in residential and commercial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Sacramento River	Agricultural, urban, and industrial inputs to San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun bays affecting water quality during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Bay area (NMFS 2007b). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Enforce Clean Water Act legislation to reduce urban and industrial contamination in the Bays.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Sacramento River	Agricultural, urban, and industrial inputs to the Delta affecting water quality during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Delta and surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Implement the water quality and reliability improvements of the Delta Improvements Package (CALFED 2007) Implement projects that would reduce anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve concentrations below 4 μmol L^{-1} in order to promote increased primary and secondary production (Dugdale *et al*. 2007). Implement tidal marsh restoration projects to promote nitrification and retention of NH_4 (Dugdale *et al*. 2007).			

3.0 SPRING-RUN CHINOOK SALMON

3.1 WATERSHED- AND SITE-SPECIFIC RECOVERY ACTIONS

Table 3-1. Northern Sierra Nevada Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Deer Creek	Agricultural diversion dams in Deer Creek impeding and/or blocking adult immigration	Permit and construct a state-of-the-art fish ladder that meets NMFS' adult fish passage criteria and install a new apron at the Cone-Kimball Diversion (AFRP Website 2005). Install state-of-the-art fish ladder at Stanford-Vina Dam (AFRP Website 2005, NMFS 2007b). Conduct fish passage evaluation at all agricultural diversions to determine if they meet NMFS' fish passage criteria. Design and install state-of-the-art fish passage facilities at diversions that currently do not meet the passage criteria. Study feasibility of consolidating diversion points to minimize the number of diversions on Deer Creek. Based on this study, consolidate diversions where feasible. Conduct a study designed to determine adult fish passage flows at critical riffles and fish ladders. Develop a water exchange agreement with all water users to allow implementation of those flows.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek	Agricultural diversions in Mill Creek impeding and/or blocking adult immigration	Conduct fish passage evaluation at all agricultural diversions to determine if they meet NMFS' fish passage criteria. Design and install state-of-the-art fish passage facilities at diversions that currently do not meet the passage criteria. Conduct a study designed to determine adult fish passage flows at critical riffles and fish ladders. Develop a water exchange agreement with all water users to allow implementation of those flows.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Yuba River, Butte Creek, Feather River, Antelope Creek, Big Chico Creek	Ocean harvest and other mortality associated with the ocean fishery affecting the populations in Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek, Antelope Creek, and Big Chico Creek, Yuba River, and the Feather River	Develop an ecosystem-based salmon fishery management plan that considers multi-trophic interactions, ocean currents, upwelling patterns, ocean temperatures, and other relevant factors. Implement restrictions that limit harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in commercial and recreational fisheries.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1: Threats from Overutilization
Deer Creek	Deer Creek water temperatures affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows (Deer Creek meadows, Childs meadows, Gurnsey Creek, and North Fork Deer Creek) to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade and reduce sources of chronic road-related erosion of sediment (Deer Creek Conservancy Watershed Report, U.S. Forest Service Long-term Anadromous Fish Conservation Strategy)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Mill Creek	Mill Creek water temperatures affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade and reduce sources of chronic road-related erosion of sediment (Mill Creek Conservancy Watershed Report, U.S. Forest Service Long-term Anadromous Fish Conservation Strategy)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Yuba River	Englebright Dam blocking upstream migration of adults returning to the Yuba River, and affecting spawning by increasing the potential for redd superimposition, increasing competition for habitat, and reducing genetic integrity due to hybridization with hatchery-produced Chinook salmon and fall-run Chinook salmon	Implement actions to enhance habitat conditions and improve access within the area above Englebright Dam, including increasing minimum flows, providing passage at Our House, New Bullards Bar, and Log Cabin dams, and assessing feasibility of passage improvement at natural barriers. Design and conduct an experimental fish passage program to evaluate adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Englebright Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Englebright Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the ESU, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Feather River	The Fish Barrier Dam and Oroville Dam blocking upstream migration of adults returning to the Feather River, and affecting spawners by causing redd superimposition, increasing competition for habitat, and reducing genetic integrity due to hybridization	Provide access to suitable habitat in the Sacramento basin to create a new geographically isolated independent population of a minimum of 2,000 to 3,000 spring-run Chinook salmon (Habitat Expansion Agreement for Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and California Valley Steelhead). Implement actions to enhance habitat conditions and improve access within the area above Oroville Dam, including increasing minimum flows, providing passage at upstream dams, and assessing feasibility of passage improvement at natural barriers. Design and conduct a trap-and-haul pilot program to evaluate adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Oroville Dam. Implement actions to allow spring-run Chinook salmon access to habitat above Oroville Dam.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Antelope Creek water temperatures affecting the adult immigration and holding, spawning, and embryo incubation life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade and reduce sources of chronic road-related erosion of sediment (U.S. Forest Service Long-term Anadromous Fish Conservation Strategy)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Butte Creek	Butte Creek water temperatures affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade (U.S. Forest Service Long-term Anadromous Fish Conservation Strategy).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Antelope Creek	Agricultural diversions in Antelope Creek impeding and/or blocking adult immigration	Implement the Edwards Dam Ladder construction project (AFRP Website 2005). Conduct fish passage evaluation at all agricultural diversions to determine if they meet NMFS' fish passage criteria. Design and install state-of-the-art fish passage facilities at diversions that currently do not meet the passage criteria.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Terminal diversions and loss of channel connectivity affecting juveniles in Antelope Creek	Develop an Antelope Creek fish passage assessment, including recommendations for improving channel connectivity, flow consolidation, and minimizing entrainment through installation of state-of-the-art fish passage facilities at diversions (AFRP Website 2005). Conduct fish passage evaluation at all agricultural diversions to determine if they meet NMFS' fish passage criteria. Design and install state-of-the-art fish passage facilities at diversions that currently do not meet the passage criteria.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 5.2: Threats from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Big Chico Creek	Dilapidated fish passage facilities through Iron Canyon affecting adult Chinook salmon returning to Big Chico Creek	Implement the Iron Canyon Fish Passage Project (AFRP Website 2005). Conduct fish passage evaluation at all dams and diversions to determine if they meet NMFS' fish passage criteria. Design and install state-of-the-art fish passage facilities at diversions (1-mile dam, 5-mile dam) that currently do not meet the passage criteria.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Big Chico Creek	Water temperatures in Big Chico Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding, spawning, and embryo incubation life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade and reduce sources of chronic road-related erosion of sediment	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Butte Creek	Butte Creek diversion dams and weirs impeding and/or blocking adult immigration	Install state-of-the-art fish ladders at DWR weir 2 and Willow Slough weir. Develop a Butte Creek Watershed Assessment, including recommendations for improving conditions for immigrating anadromous salmonids. Maintain state-of-the-art fish passage facilities at diversions to meet NMFS' passage criteria. Study feasibility of consolidating diversion points to minimize the number of diversions on Butte Creek. Based on this study, consolidate diversions where feasible.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek	Turbidity and sedimentation affecting spawning and embryo incubation in Mill Creek	Restore meadows and reduce stream channel incisement and bank erosion by modifying grazing practices and excluding cattle from nearshore zones, and reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, and reduce sources of chronic road-related erosion (U.S. Forest Service Long-term Anadromous Fish Conservation Strategy)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality
Deer Creek	Turbidity, sedimentation and hazardous spills (HWY 32) affecting spawning and embryo incubation in Deer Creek	Carry out a Deer Creek (upper) erosion reduction project (AFRP Website 2005). Restore meadows and reduce stream channel incisement and bank erosion by modifying grazing practices and excluding cattle from nearshore zones, and reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, and reduce sources of chronic road-related erosion (U.S. Forest Service Long-term Anadromous Fish Conservation Strategy). Ban fuel tanker truck traffic on highway 32. Maintain current size and configuration of highway 32 within the Deer Creek watershed.	A, P, S, D	Catastrophe (for actions directed at hazardous spills) Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Decommission Fire Mountain Lodge Hydro-electric project, and remove the earthen dam, restore the stream channel, and obliterate project roads.			
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Butte Creek, Yuba River, Big Chico Creek, Feather River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, and Big Chico creeks, and in the Yuba and Feather rivers	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website)	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Big Chico Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, and Big Chico creeks	Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website). Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Butte Creek, Yuba River, Big Chico Creek, Feather River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, and Big Chico creeks, and in the Yuba and Feather rivers	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE) Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring, and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk) Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the lower Sacramento River especially between Colusa and Verona Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Big Chico Creek, Antelope Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Big Chico, and Antelope creeks	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE) Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk) Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the middle Sacramento River Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website 2007)			
Yuba River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Yuba River affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration	Set back training walls and restore floodplain function in gold fields and other appropriate floodplain zones. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Implement gravel injection program below Englebright Dam to restore geofluvial processes. Curtail further development in active Yuba River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship. Create and restore side-channel habitats to increase the quantity and quality of off-channel rearing (and spawning) areas.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Yuba River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Yuba River affecting juveniles	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Relocate the riverside motocross recreation area (i.e., shad pad) outside of the active flood plain. Develop vegetation maintenance inspection protocols and practices within the State flood control project to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor on the Yuba River.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Develop and implement a large woody material restoration program along the lower Yuba River utilizing sources of wood that enter upstream reservoirs. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Yuba River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Antelope Creek	Low flows in Antelope Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage by reducing attraction and migratory cues	Evaluate and dedicate instream flows and consolidate channels to facilitate upstream attraction and passage (NMFS 2007b) Dedicate instream flows through water exchange agreements with all water users. Improve passage conditions at Paynes crossing to allow upstream passage during low flows.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Deer Creek	Low flows in Deer Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage by decreasing the magnitude of attraction and migratory cues	Implement water exchange agreement with the Deer Creek Irrigation Company and the Stanford-Vina Irrigation District and dedicate fish passage flows (AFRP Website 2005)	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek	Low flows in Mill Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage by decreasing the magnitude of attraction and migratory cues	Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to develop dedicated instream water; participate in the lower Mill Creek Watershed Restoration Project (AFRP Website 2005)	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Butte Creek, Yuba River, Big Chico Creek, Feather River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, and Big Chico creeks, and in the Yuba and Feather rivers	Implement habitat improvement projects throughout the Delta including, but not limited to: (1) Liberty Farms and Hastings Tract Restoration Project; (2) Little Holland Tract Restoration Project; and (3) Eastern Egbert Tract Restoration Project (see Four Pumps Delta Fish Agreement Amendment – Ongoing Actions to Address State Water Project Impacts). Restore floodplains and establish floodplain habitat in Snodgrass and Georgiana sloughs, near the mouths of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, and in the McCormick-Williamson Tract (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Implement restoration projects for Lindsey and Barker sloughs (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Evaluate the potential effects of reconnecting Elk Slough to the Sacramento River, and if the evaluation suggests that habitat conditions for salmonids would improve, then implement a project to carry out the reconnection (Siegel 2007). Manage Elk, Sutter, and Steamboat Sloughs for salmon passage and habitats (Siegel 2007). Re-establish hydrologic connectivity between historical Stone Lakes floodplain and the Sacramento River with a design that minimizes juvenile stranding (Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007). Enhance the Yolo Bypass by re-configuring Fremont and Sacramento weirs to target inundation frequency, duration, and magnitude levels that best match natural, historic conditions. Implement additional projects to: (1) improve fish passage through Fremont weir for multiple species; (2) enhance lower Putah Creek floodplain habitat; (3) improve fish passage along the toe drain/Lisbon weir; and (4) enhance floodplain habitat along the toe drain (Siegel 2007). Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection (including bank relocation) and ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE). Replace and modify the Lisbon Weir to improve fish habitats (and passage) and management flexibility (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Restore tidal wetlands and associated habitats at Brannan Island State Park, northeast tip of Sherman Island, along Seven-Mile slough, and the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (CDFG *et al.* 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Implement projects to restore native riparian vegetation along channel margins and set-back levees (*CDFG et al. 2008*).			
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Butte Creek, Yuba River, Feather River, Big Chico Creek	Predation in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, and Big Chico creeks, and in the Yuba and Feather rivers	Implement studies to develop quantitative estimates of predation on winter-run Chinook salmon by non-native species throughout the Delta. The steelhead predation study being conducted by DWR et al. in Clifton Court Forebay is one example of such a study. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at irrigation diversions and junctions and gate/barrier structures (e.g., DCC gates, South Delta barriers, and potential False River and Three-Mile River barriers to Frank's Tract) throughout the Delta, including the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River, Feather River, Big Chico Creek	Predation in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, and Big Chico creeks, and in the Yuba and Feather rivers	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the lower Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs (e.g., Freemont Weir), diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Yuba River	Flow fluctuations and flood events in the Yuba River affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Complete the fry stranding and redd dewatering study being conducted by YCWA to determine the effectiveness of the flow fluctuation requirements specified in the Narrows II FERC license. Implement flow fluctuation and ramping rates found to be protective of embryos and juveniles by the fry stranding and redd dewatering study.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Butte Creek, Antelope Creek, Feather River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Big Chico Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather rivers, and in Butte, Antelope, Mill, Deer, and Big Chico creeks	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and identify and implement similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Implement boat wake restrictions along primary migration corridors in the Delta to prevent bank erosion and promote riparian recruitment and growth. Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Butte Creek, Yuba River, Deer Creek, Feather River, Big Chico Creek,	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Butte, Deer, Big Chico, and Antelope Creeks	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Restore dendritic channel systems in areas where this habitat feature existed historically Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Deer Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability in Deer Creek	Identify gravel starved areas in Deer Creek and implement gravel additions. Re-design highway 32 culvert crossing at Calf Creek to allow for unimpeded bedload transport. Conduct a spawning gravel augmentation feasibility study to increase available spawning habitat. Implement spawning gravel augmentation projects if the feasibility study determines that such projects will not cause adverse ecological impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Big Chico Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability/suitability in Big Chico Creek	Develop a spawning gravel budget and implement an augmentation plan and use flow management to optimize spawning weighted usable area in consideration of hydrologic limitations and other species (e.g., steelhead) and life stage requirements. Implement One-mile Dam modification and gravel supplementation project (City of Chico); add spawning gravels at Five-Mile Diversion (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Deer Creek	Gravel embeddedness and fines affecting spawning in Deer Creek	Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Mill Creek	Gravel embeddedness and fines affecting spawning in Mill Creek	Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Butte Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability/suitability in Butte Creek	Identify gravel starved areas in Butte Creek and implement gravel additions. Develop a spawning gravel budget and implement an augmentation plan and use flow management to optimize spawning weighted usable area in consideration of hydrologic limitations and other species (e.g., steelhead) and life stage requirements	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River	Predation on juveniles in the Yuba River	Identify and implement projects designed to minimize predation on juvenile salmonids at Daguerre Point Dam and associated structures. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Big Chico Creek	Predation in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, and Big Chico creeks	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the middle Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (e.g., GCID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR –- 3: Predation
Feather River	Hatchery-produced Chinook salmon (primarily FRFH) affecting naturally-produced Chinook salmon in the Feather River by increasing competition for spawning habitat, potentially reducing genetic integrity, and potentially contributing to redd superimposition	Convert the Feather River Fish Hatchery to a spring-run Chinook salmon conservation hatchery (NMFS 2007b). Implement the use of a temporary weir to spatially segregate spring-run Chinook salmon and fall-run Chinook salmon during spawning.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline Hatchery influence	SR – 5.1: Threats from Artificial Propagation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Feather River	Limited instream gravel supply affecting Feather River spawning	Develop a spawning gravel budget, identify gravel starved areas, and implement an augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Deer Creek	Water quality affecting juveniles in Deer Creek	Continue educational outreach and support and assist DCWC in watershed management activities (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Antelope Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Antelope Creek affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in the active Antelope Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Yuba River	Daguerre Point Dam impeding and/or blocking passage of adults attempting to return to the Yuba River	Collaboratively design the Daguerre Point Dam fish ladder passage engineering and design of the preferred alternative described in DWR and Corps (2003) (AFRP Website 2005)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability in Antelope Creek	Identify gravel starved areas in Antelope Creek and implement gravel additions.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Agricultural and urban runoff into Antelope Creek affecting adult immigration and holding, spawning, embryo incubation, and juvenile rearing and outmigration.	Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River	Diversion into Central Delta (e.g., Delta Cross Channel operations) affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks, and in the Yuba River	Operate the DCC gates consistent with recommendations from the CALFED Operations Group, SWRCB D-1641, and the Salmon Decision Process in order to minimize the number of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon being diverted into the central Delta (NMFS 2004). Reduce the Export/Inflow ratio water quality control standard in the Delta from 65 percent to 35 percent in January in order to promote higher survival during juvenile salmonid outmigration (per CVPIA Delta Action 8 salmon survival studies).	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threat from Water Diversions
Butte Creek	Predation of juveniles in Butte Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in Butte Creek. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Yuba River	Entrainment of juveniles at individual diversions in the Yuba River and at DPD	Improve efficiency of screening devices at Hallwood-Cordua and Brophy-South Yuba water diversions, and construct screens at unscreened diversions (USFWS 2001).	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 5.2: Threats from Water Diversions
Yuba River	Hatchery-produced Chinook salmon (primarily FRFH) and naturally-produced fall-run Chinook salmon affecting naturally-produced spring-run Chinook salmon in the Yuba River by increasing competition for spawning habitat, potentially reducing genetic integrity, and potentially contributing to redd superimposition	Examine the feasibility of utilizing a temporary weir, or other techniques to spatially segregate spring-run Chinook salmon and fall-run Chinook salmon during spawning.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline Hatchery influence	SR – 5.1: Threats from Artificial Propagation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the Yuba River	Conduct gravel additions above and below Narrows Pool (Corps mitigation) (AFRP Website 2005). Implement actions to enhance habitat conditions and improve access within the area above Englebright Dam, including increasing minimum flows, providing passage at Our House, New Bullards Bar, and Log Cabin dams, and assessing feasibility of passage improvement at natural barriers. Design and conduct an experimental fish passage program to evaluate adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Englebright Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Englebright Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the ESU, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria (for actions related to passage above Englebright) Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Big Chico Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, and Big Chico creeks	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Butte Creek	Flow fluctuations affecting Butte Creek spawning and embryo incubation	Install and maintain real-time flow monitoring gages. Develop sustainable instream flow criteria for spawning and incubation periods. Develop and implement flow ramping protocols to protect all life stages of spring-run Chinook salmon. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Butte Creek	Summer inner tubing and swimming affecting adults returning and holding in Butte Creek	Reduce the number of temporary passage impediments installed to create swimming holes in Butte Creek near Chico; conduct associated public outreach projects.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Feather River, Yuba River	Predation in the Feather River affecting juveniles produced in the Feather and Yuba rivers	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the Feather River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Antelope Creek	Gravel embeddedness and fines affecting spawning in Antelope Creek	Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Butte Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover affecting juveniles in Butte Creek	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Curtail further development in active Butte Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Antelope Creek	Water quality affecting juveniles in Antelope Creek	Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Butte Creek, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River, and Feather River	Agricultural, urban, industrial inputs in the Delta affecting water quality during the adult immigration life stage for the Mill, Deer, Butte, and Antelope creek populations, and during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage for the Butte Creek, Yuba River, and Feather River populations	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Delta and surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007). Implement the water quality and reliability improvements of the Delta Improvements Package (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Implement projects that would reduce anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve concentrations below 4 μmol L^{-1} in order to promote increased primary and secondary production (Dugdale *et al*. 2007). Implement tidal marsh restoration projects to promote nitrification and retention of NH_4 (Dugdale *et al*. 2007).			
Butte Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Butte Creek affecting juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Butte Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek, Antelope Creek, Feather River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather rivers, and in Mill, Deer, Butte, Big Chico, and Antelope creeks	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek, Antelope Creek, and Feather River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather rivers, and in Mill, Deer, Butte, Big Chico, and Antelope creeks	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Big Chico Creek, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek, Antelope Creek, Feather River	Entrainment at the Jones and Banks pumping plants affecting juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather rivers, and in Mill, Deer, Big Chico, Butte, and Antelope creeks	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility. Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Butte Creek	Water quality in Butte Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding, spawning, and embryo incubation life stages	Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Butte Creek	Water temperatures affecting the embryo incubation life stage in Butte Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality
Feather River, Yuba River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Feather River affecting juvenile rearing and Outmigration of juvenile from the Feather and Yuba rivers	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Feather River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Yuba River affecting juveniles	Purchase conservation easements (AFRP 2006b) adjacent to the Yuba River and manage those easements as seasonal floodplain habitats. Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve habitat conditions for juvenile rearing (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Butte Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Butte Creek affecting juveniles	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve habitat conditions for juvenile rearing (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Big Chico Creek, Antelope Creek	Entrainment at individual diversions in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Mill Deer, Big Chico, and Antelope creeks	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Antelope Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in Antelope Creek affecting juvenile rearing	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Antelope Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Deer Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Deer Creek affecting juvenile rearing	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve habitat conditions for juvenile rearing (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Mill Creek affecting juvenile rearing	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve habitat conditions for juvenile rearing (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Feather River, Yuba River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Feather River affecting juveniles produced in the Feather and Yuba rivers	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Develop vegetation maintenance inspection protocols and practices within the State flood control project to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor on the Feather River. Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Feather River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Butte Creek	Recreational harvest of Butte Creek spring-run Chinook salmon	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in Butte Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Butte Creek	Water temperature in Butte Creek affecting spawning	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Butte Creek, Feather River	Water temperature in the Delta affecting: (1) adults attempting to immigrate to Mill, Deer, Antelope, and Butte Creeks; and (2) juveniles emigrating from the Yuba and Feather rivers	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Yuba River, Feather River	Water temperatures in the Feather River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration and adult immigration and holding life stages for the Yuba River population, and the adult immigration and holding, spawning, embryo incubation, and juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages for the Feather River population	Implement Facilities Modifications(s) to achieve temperatures at least as protective as those specified in Table 2 of the Settlement Agreement For Licensing of the Oroville Facilities (March 2006) (http://orovillerelicensing.water.ca.gov/settlement%20agreement.html)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2 Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Butte Creek, and Feather River	Water temperature in the lower Sacramento River affecting: (1) the adult immigration life stage for the Yuba River, and Mill, Deer, Antelope, and Butte creek populations; and (2) the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage for the Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Yuba River, Antelope Creek, and Feather River populations	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Changes in Delta hydrology affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Implement a study designed to identify water conveyance projects that would allow the Delta to function as a natural estuary. Such a study would include modeling to examine upstream and downstream effects of identified projects as well as project-specific operational criteria.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality SR – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity SR – 5.3: Threat from Water Diversions
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River	Reverse flow conditions in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks, and in the Yuba River	Operate the DCC gates consistent with recommendations from the CALFED Operations Group, SWRCB D-1641, and the Salmon Decision Process in order to minimize the number of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon being diverted into the central Delta (NMFS 2004). Implement QWEST standard from the 1992 winter-run biological opinions. Maintain the Old and Middle River at less than negative 5,000 cfs. Implement a 35 percent Export to Inflow Ratio in January.	A, P	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 5.3 Threats from Water Diversions
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel impeding and/or delaying adults attempting to return to Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Design and implement a project(s) to eliminate the adverse effects on anadromous species related to the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel. Such projects could include providing upstream passage at the lock gates and/or eliminating flow through the lock gates.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure impeding and/or delaying adults attempting to return to Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Continue to operate the SMSCS with the boat lock open in order to allow fish passage in and out of Suisun Marsh.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Sutter Bypass (Tisdale Weir) impeding and/or delaying adults attempting to return to Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Sutter Bypass weirs that currently impede adult passage (e.g., Tisdale Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek, Antelope Creek, and Big Chico Creek	Yolo Bypass (Freemont Weir) impeding and/or delaying adults attempting to return to Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, and Big Chico creeks	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Yolo Bypass weirs that impede adult passage (e.g., Freemont Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River, and Feather River	Agricultural and urban runoff/return flows in the lower Sacramento River affecting water quality during the adult immigration life stage for the Mill, Deer, Butte, and Antelope creek populations, and during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage for the Butte Creek, Yuba River, and Feather River populations	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Sacramento and in residential, commercial, and industrial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.			
Mill Creek, Deer Creek	Agricultural and urban runoff/return flows in the middle Sacramento River affecting water quality during the adult immigration life stage for the Mill, Deer, and Antelope creek populations	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in residential and commercial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Yuba River and Feather River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Feather River affecting juveniles produced in the Feather and Yuba rivers	Develop feasibility plan through the Oroville Dam FERC negotiated relicensing study plan; and implement riparian and floodplain habitat modeling and restoration projects (AFRP website 2005)	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Deer Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Deer Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in Deer Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Mill Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Mill Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in Mill Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Big Chico Creek	Water temperature in Big Chico Creek affecting spawning	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2 Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Butte Creek, Yuba River, Feather River	Agricultural, urban, and industrial inputs in the bays affecting water quality during the adult immigration life stage for the Mill, Deer, and Antelope creek populations, and during the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage for the Butte Creek, Yuba River, and Feather River populations	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Bay area (NMFS 2007b). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Enforce Clean Water Act legislation to reduce urban and industrial contamination in the Bays.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Mill Creek	Passage impediments in Mill Creek affecting juvenile outmigration	Identify and implement projects designed to improve downstream passage conditions for juveniles.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 5.3 Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Deer Creek	Passage impediments in Deer Creek affecting juvenile outmigration	Identify and implement projects designed to improve downstream passage conditions for juveniles.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 5.3 Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Feather River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the Feather River	Conduct a spawning gravel augmentation feasibility study to increase available spawning habitat. Implement spawning gravel augmentation projects if the feasibility study determines that such projects will not cause adverse ecological impacts. Provide access to suitable habitat in the Sacramento basin to create a new geographically isolated independent population of a minimum of 2,000 to 3,000 spring-run Chinook salmon (Habitat Expansion Agreement for Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and California Valley Steelhead). Implement actions to enhance habitat conditions and improve access within the area above Oroville Dam, including increasing minimum flows, providing passage at upstream dams, and assessing feasibility of passage improvement at natural barriers. Design and conduct a trap-and-haul pilot program to evaluate adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Oroville Dam. Implement actions to allow spring-run Chinook salmon access to habitat above Oroville Dam.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Grouds
Feather River	Water temperature in the Feather River affecting the spawning life stage	Implement Facilities Modifications(s) to achieve temperatures at least as protective as those specified in Table 2 of the Settlement Agreement For Licensing of the Oroville Facilities (March 2006) (http://orovillerelicensing.water.ca.gov/settlement%20agreement.html)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2 Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Butte Creek, Antelope Creek, Mill Creek, Deer Creek	Low flows in the lower Sacramento River resulting in reduced attraction and migratory cues for adults attempting to return to Butte, Antelope, Mill, and Deer creeks	Develop and implement pulse flow schedules during peak migration periods for years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Butte Creek	Juvenile entrainment at Butte Creek diversions	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Antelope Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Antelope Creek affecting the juvenile rearing life stage	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve habitat conditions for juvenile rearing (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Water temperature in the middle Sacramento River affecting: (1) the adult immigration life stage for the Mill, Deer, and Antelope creek populations; and (2) the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage for the Mill Creek and Deer Creek populations	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Big Chico Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Big Chico Creek affecting the juvenile rearing life stage	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve habitat conditions for juvenile rearing (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Big Chico Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Big Chico Creek	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Big Chico Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Feather River	Harvest/angling impacts in the Feather River affecting the adult immigration and holding and embryo incubation life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest/angling impacts on spring-run Chinook salmon in the Feather River. Modify sport fishing regulations to minimize the impact of anglers wading in the river during spring-run Chinook salmon embryo incubation. Implement outreach projects to educate the public regarding the salmon life cycle including how to identify a salmon redd.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Antelope Creek, Mill Creek, Deer Creek	Low flows in the middle Sacramento River resulting in reduced attraction and migratory cues for adults attempting to return to Antelope, Mill, and Deer creeks	Develop and implement pulse flow schedules during peak migration periods for years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Antelope Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in Antelope Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Deer Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Deer Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Deer Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Mill Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Curtail further development in the active Mill Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Deer Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in Deer Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade. Curtail further development in active Deer Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in Mill Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade. Curtail further development in active Mill Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Yuba River	Harvest/angling impacts in the Yuba River affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in Mill Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Big Chico Creek	Physical habitat alteration (i.e., watershed disturbance) in the Big Chico Creek watershed affecting the embryo incubation life stage through increased sedimentation	Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek	Predation in the Bays on juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, and Butte creeks	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	WR – 3: Predation
Butte Creek	Hatchery effects (i.e., competition and predation) in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Butte Creek	Develop HGMPs and control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline Hatchery influence	SR – 5.1: Threats from Artificial Propagation
Butte Creek	Hatchery effects (i.e., competition and predation) in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Butte Creek	Develop HGMPs and control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline Hatchery influence	SR – 5.1: Threats from Artificial Propagation
Antelope Creek	Passage impediments (e.g., agricultural diversions) in Antelope Creek affecting juvenile outmigration	Implement projects that cooperatively work with landowners to modify existing diversions so that fish do not become entrained in agricultural fields.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Yuba River, Big Chico Creek	Aquatic invasive species(e.g., Asian clam, A. aspera, microcystis, water hyacinth) and associated food web disruption in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Yuba River and in Big Chico Creek	Implement the management actions for addressing aquatic invasive species described in the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (CDFG 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 5.4: Threats Resulting from Non-native Aquatic Invasive Species
Yuba River, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek	Loss of tidal marsh habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Yuba River, and in Butte and Big Chico creeks	Restore and protect tidal wetlands and associated habitats throughout the Delta including: (1) at Brannon Island State Park; (2) along the northeast tip of Sherman Island (3) along Seven-Mile Slough (4) at the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (5) within Sherman Lake	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		(6) in the Hotchkiss and Veale Tracts (7) around Decker Island (8) at Dutch Slough; (9) at Big Break (10) at Frank's Tract (11) along the north shore of the Sacramento River along the Montezuma Hills; and (12) in Sand Mound Slough (CDFG et al. 2008).			
Feather River	Low flows in Feather River resulting in reduced attraction and migratory cues for the adult immigration life stage	Develop and implement pulse flow schedules during peak migration periods for years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Feather River	Feather River flow conditions (i.e., flow fluctuations and flood flows) affecting embryo incubation	Develop and implement instream flow schedules and flow fluctuation criteria designed to minimize redd dewatering.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Feather River	Water quality in the Feather River affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek	Flow fluctuations in Mill Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Deer Creek	Flow fluctuations in Deer Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Yuba River	Feather River diversions affecting juveniles produced in the Yuba River	Ensure that all Feather River diversions have fish screens that meet NMFS' fish screen criteria.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Table 3.2 Basalt and Porous Lava Spring-run Chinook Salmon Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	North Fork Dams impeding and/or blocking adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Install state-of-the-art fish ladders at, or remove small dams on the North Fork of Battle Creek to provide fish passage (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	South Fork Dams impeding and/or blocking adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Install state-of-the-art ladders at, or remove small dams on the South Fork of Battle Creek to provide fish passage (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Water temperature in Battle Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding, the embryo incubation, and the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Increase streamflows as specified in the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead	SR – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality
Sacramento River	Keswick/Shasta Dam affecting adult immigration and spawning (barrier/genetics)	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing spring-run Chinook salmon access to habitat above Shasta Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Shasta Dam.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Shasta dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the ESU, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.			
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Ocean harvest of adults from the mainstem Sacramento River and from Battle Creek	Develop an ecosystem-based salmon fishery management plan that considers multi-trophic interactions, ocean currents, upwelling patterns, ocean temperatures, and other relevant factors. Implement restrictions that limit harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in commercial and recreational fisheries.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1: Threats from Overutilization
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Red Bluff Diversion Dam impeding and/or blocking adults attempting to return to the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Maintain the gates-up position to prevent passage impediments to listed species.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Hatchery effects (competition/predation) in Battle Creek on the juvenile rearing and spawning life stages	Develop HGMPs and control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock. Conduct feasibility study of moving and/or modifying Coleman Hatchery operations to prevent all adverse impacts to listed species in Battle Creek.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline Hatchery influence	SR – 5.1: Threats from Artificial Propagation
Battle Creek	Low flows in Battle Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage by reducing the magnitude of attraction and migratory cues	Increase flow releases from remaining diversion dams affecting anadromous fish on Battle Creek as per the Battle Creek Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007). Avoid implementation of additional water projects (i.e., FERC permits) that are detrimental to the goals and objectives of the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Predation in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Implement studies to develop quantitative estimates of predation on winter-run Chinook salmon by non-native species throughout the Delta. The steelhead predation study being conducted by DWR et al. in Clifton Court Forebay is one example of such a study. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass).	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Implement projects to minimize predation at irrigation diversions and junctions and gate/barrier structures (e.g., DCC gates, South Delta barriers, and potential False River and Three-Mile River barriers to Frank's Tract) throughout the Delta, including the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Battle Creek	Low instream flows per FERC license affecting Battle Creek spawning	Increase flow releases from remaining diversion dams affecting anadromous fish on Battle Creek as per the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Battle Creek	Entrainment at individual diversions in Battle Creek affecting juveniles	Screen PG&E diversions to prevent entrainment of juvenile salmonids as per the Battle Creek Restoration Project (AFRP Website 2006). Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the mainstem Sacramento River and in Battle Creek	Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Implement habitat improvement projects throughout the Delta including, but not limited to: (1) Liberty Farms and Hastings Tract Restoration Project; (2) Little Holland Tract Restoration Project; and (3) Eastern Egbert Tract Restoration Project (see Four Pumps Delta Fish Agreement Amendment – Ongoing Actions to Address State Water Project Impacts). Restore floodplains and establish floodplain habitat in Snodgrass and Georgiana sloughs, near the mouths of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, and in the McCormick-Williamson Tract (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Implement restoration projects for Lindsey and Barker sloughs (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Evaluate the potential effects of reconnecting Elk Slough to the Sacramento River, and if the evaluation suggests that habitat conditions for salmonids would improve, then implement a project to carry out the reconnection (Siegel 2007). Manage Elk, Sutter, and Steamboat Sloughs for salmon passage and habitats (Siegel 2007). Re-establish hydrologic connectivity between historical Stone Lakes floodplain and the Sacramento River with a design that minimizes juvenile stranding (Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007). Enhance the Yolo Bypass by re-configuring Fremont and Sacramento weirs to target inundation frequency, duration, and magnitude levels that best match natural, historic conditions. Implement additional projects to: (1) improve fish passage through Fremont weir for multiple species; (2) enhance lower Putah Creek floodplain habitat; (3) improve fish passage along the toe drain/Lisbon weir; and (4) enhance floodplain habitat along the toe drain (Siegel 2007). Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection (including bank relocation) and ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE). Replace and modify the Lisbon Weir to improve fish habitats (and passage) and management flexibility (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Restore tidal wetlands and associated habitats at Brannan Island State Park, northeast tip of Sherman Island, along Seven-Mile slough, and the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (CDFG *et al.* 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Implement projects to restore native riparian vegetation along channel margins and set-back levees (*CDFG et al. 2008*).			
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Loss of natural morphology and function in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project (CALFED 2007). Restore dendritic channel systems in areas where this habitat feature existed historically. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	S-R 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and identify and implement similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Implement boat wake restrictions along primary migration corridors in the Delta to prevent bank erosion and promote riparian recruitment and growth. Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the Delta.			
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring, and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk) Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the lower Sacramento River especially between Colusa and Verona. Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento.			
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Predation in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the lower Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs (Freemont Weir), diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Entrainment at the Jones and Banks Pumping Plants affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility. Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Hatchery effects related to competition and predation in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and in Battle Creek	Develop HGMPs and control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b). Conduct feasibility study of moving and/or modifying Coleman Hatchery operations to prevent all adverse impacts to listed species in Battle Creek.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline Hatchery influence	SR – 5.1: Threats from Artificial Propagation
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Predation in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the middle Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (e.g., GCID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Battle Creek	Redd superimposition, increased competition for habitat, and hybridization, (from barriers) affecting Battle Creek spawning	Provide anadromous fish passage as specified in the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Flow dependent habitat availability affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek	Implement the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	Water quality in the lower Sacramento River affecting adults returning to, and juveniles produced in Battle Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Sacramento and in residential, commercial, and industrial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Battle Creek	Water quality in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Delta and surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Implement the water quality and reliability improvements of the Delta Improvements Package (CALFED 2007). Implement projects that would reduce anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve concentrations below 4 μmol L^{-1} in order to promote increased primary and secondary production (Dugdale *et al*. 2007). Implement tidal marsh restoration projects to promote nitrification and retention of NH_4 (Dugdale *et al*. 2007).			
Sacramento River	Limited instream gravel supply in the upper Sacramento River affecting Sacramento River spawning	Conduct periodic (e.g., every 5 years) spawning gravel assessments in the upper Sacramento River (i.e., above RBDD) and implement gravel augmentation projects, as necessary.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Historical Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Hatchery effects (predation and competition) in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline Hatchery influence	SR – 5.1: Threats from Artificial Propagation
Battle Creek	Low flows in the middle Sacramento River affecting attraction/migratory cues of adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Develop and implement pulse flow schedules during peak migration periods for years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Sacramento River	Predation in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the upper Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (RBDD and ACID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Battle Creek	Hatchery effects (predation and competition) in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline Hatchery influence	SR – 5.1: Threats from Artificial Propagation
Battle Creek	Water temperature in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Modify gravel pits and mounds to ensure full drainage of these features to allow flooding while preventing stranding and warm water predator habitat. Curtail further development in active upper Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Modify gravel pits and mounds to ensure full drainage of these features to allow flooding while preventing stranding and warm water predator habitat. Curtail further development in active upper Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and in Battle Creek	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the middle Sacramento River. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	The Corps, DWR, CDFG, BLM, USFWS, NMFS, private land owners, and Resource Conservation Districts should continue to focus on retaining, restoring and creating continuous riparian corridors within their jurisdictions. Utilize bio-technical techniques for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Restore the current Lake Red Bluff footprint to riparian habitat.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	Flow fluctuations in Battle Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Implement the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan. Modernize/upgrade PG&E facilities to reduce the potential for flow fluctuations and outages.	A, P	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead. Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Battle Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability in Battle Creek	Implement the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan	A, P, S, D	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the middle Sacramento River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage for juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website). Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Battle Creek	Predation in Battle Creek affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in Battle Creek. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals. Modify hatchery operations to prevent hatchery steelhead predation on naturally-produced juvenile salmonids. Modify hatchery operations (e.g., release strategies) to prevent the build-up of predators targeting hatchery released salmonids.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Battle Creek	Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel impeding and/or delaying adults attempting to return to Battle Creek.	Design and implement a project(s) to eliminate the adverse effects on anadromous species related to the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel. Such projects could include providing upstream passage at the lock gates and/or eliminating flow through the lock gates.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure impeding and/or delaying adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Continue to operate the SMSCS with the boat lock open in order to allow fish passage in and out of Suisun Marsh.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Sutter Bypass (Tisdale Weir) impeding and/or delaying adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Sutter Bypass weirs that currently impede adult passage (e.g., Tisdale Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	Yolo Bypass (Freemont Weir) impeding and/or delaying adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Yolo Bypass weirs that impede adult passage (e.g., Freemont Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Low flows in the upper Sacramento River resulting in reduced attraction and migratory cues for adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Develop and implement pulse flow schedules during peak migration periods for years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Water temperature in the lower Sacramento River affecting adults returning to Battle Creek	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Battle Creek	Water temperature in the middle Sacramento River affecting adults returning to Battle Creek	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Table 3-3 Northwestern California Spring-run Chinook Salmon Threats and Associated Recovery Actions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek	Water temperature in Beegum Creek affecting the immigration and holding life stage and spawning	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Thomes Creek	Agricultural diversion dams, braiding, and low natural channel gradient affecting adults attempting to return to Thomes Creek	Conduct a feasibility study on potential channel modifications that would improve upstream migration conditions. Design and implement a Thomes Creek anadromous fish passage study (AFRP Website 2005). Evaluate and improve passage at the Corning Canal siphon and small diversion dams near Paskenta and Henlyville. Flow consolidation through reduction of braided channels.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek, Clear Creek	Ocean harvest of adults from Beegum, Thomes, and Clear creeks	Develop an ecosystem-based salmon fishery management plan that considers multi-trophic interactions, ocean currents, upwelling patterns, ocean temperatures, and other relevant factors. Implement restrictions that limit harvest of spring-run Chinook salmon in commercial and recreational fisheries.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 2.1 Threats from Overutilization
Thomes Creek	Water temperature in Thomes Creek affecting the immigration and holding life stage and spawning	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek	Passage impediments associated with the RBDD affecting adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek and Clear Creek	Maintain the gates-up position to prevent passage impediments to listed species	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability and associated limited instream gravel supply affecting Clear Creek spawning	Develop a spawning gravel budget and implement an augmentation plan and use flow management to optimize spawning weighted usable area in consideration of hydrologic limitations and other species (e.g., steelhead) and life stage requirements. Develop a spawning gravel budget and implement an augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Clear Creek	Water temperature in Clear Creek affecting the immigration and holding life stage, spawning and embryo incubation	Increase stream flows as needed to reduce water temperatures (NMFS 2007b) Develop a real time water temperature model to track the coldwater pool in Whiskeytown Reservoir and budget releases to Clear Creek to meet a daily water temperature of 60^0F at the Igo gauge from June 1 to September 15 and 56^0F from September 15 to October 31. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Clear Creek	Whiskeytown Dam impeding and/or blocking adults attempting to return to Clear Creek	Conduct a passage feasibility study, including an assessment of potential habitat above Whiskeytown Dam.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threat to Spawning Habitat
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek, Thomes Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek, Clear Creek and Thomes Creek	Implement habitat improvement projects throughout the Delta including, but not limited to: (1) Liberty Farms and Hastings Tract Restoration Project; (2) Little Holland Tract Restoration Project; and (3) Eastern Egbert Tract Restoration Project (see Four Pumps Delta Fish Agreement Amendment – Ongoing Actions to Address State Water Project Impacts). Restore floodplains and establish floodplain habitat in Snodgrass and Georgiana sloughs, near the mouths of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, and in the McCormick-Williamson Tract (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Implement restoration projects for Lindsey and Barker sloughs (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Evaluate the potential effects of reconnecting Elk Slough to the Sacramento River, and if the evaluation suggests that habitat conditions for salmonids would improve, then implement a project to carry out the reconnection (Siegel 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Manage Elk, Sutter, and Steamboat Sloughs for salmon passage and habitats (Siegel 2007). Re-establish hydrologic connectivity between historical Stone Lakes floodplain and the Sacramento River with a design that minimizes juvenile stranding (Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007). Enhance the Yolo Bypass by re-configuring Fremont and Sacramento weirs to target inundation frequency, duration, and magnitude levels that best match natural, historic conditions. Implement additional projects to: (1) improve fish passage through Fremont weir for multiple species; (2) enhance lower Putah Creek floodplain habitat; (3) improve fish passage along the toe drain/Lisbon weir; and (4) enhance floodplain habitat along the toe drain (Siegel 2007). Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection (including bank relocation) and ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE). Replace and modify the Lisbon Weir to improve fish habitats (and passage) and management flexibility (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Restore tidal wetlands and associated habitats at Brannan Island State Park, northeast tip of Sherman Island, along Seven-Mile slough, and the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (CDFG *et al.* 2008). Implement projects to restore native riparian vegetation along channel margins and set-back levees (*CDFG et al. 2008*).			
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek, Thomes Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek, Clear Creek and Thomes Creek	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).			
Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek, Clear Creek	Loss of natural morphology and function in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek and Clear Creek	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project (CALFED 2007). Restore dendritic channel systems in areas where this habitat feature existed historically. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek and Thomes Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek, Clear Creek and Thomes Creek	Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR -–1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Beegum Creek	Limited spawning habitat suitability in Beegum Creek	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially reduce local water temperatures.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek and Clear Creek	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and identify and implement similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Implement boat wake restrictions along primary migration corridors in the Delta to prevent bank erosion and promote riparian recruitment and growth. Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek, Thomes Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek, Clear Creek and Thomes Creek	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring, and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the lower Sacramento River especially between Colusa and Verona. Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Thomes Creek	Habitat suitability affecting Thomes Creek spawning	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially reduce local water temperatures.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Beegum Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Cottonwood Creek watershed affecting juveniles	Protect/enhance existing riparian habitat and corridors (NMFS 2007b). Modify gravel mining operations to allow riparian regeneration. Apply NMFS gravel mining criteria to all gravel mining projects. Integrate riparian habitat restoration into bank protection and other stream side development projects. Implement non-native plant (e.g. Arundo) eradication plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Cottonwood Creek watershed floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Clear Creek	Flow fluctuations affecting Clear Creek spawning and embryo incubation	Develop and implement flow ramping protocols to protect all life stages of spring-run Chinook salmon. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Clear Creek	Low flows (attraction, migratory cues) in Clear Creek affecting the immigration and holding life stage	Develop and implement optimal pulse flow schedules and increase flow allocation for Clear Creek in years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek	Entrainment at individual diversions in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek and Thomes Creek	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek	Entrainment at individual diversions in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek and Thomes Creek	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek	Entrainment at individual diversions in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum and Thomes creeks	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek	Entrainment at the Jones and Banks Pumping Plants affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek and Thomes Creek	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility. Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	SR – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Beegum Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Cottonwood Creek watershed affecting juveniles	Re-establish natural channel morphology by: (1) applying NMFS gravel mining criteria to all gravel mining projects; (2) integrating natural morphological features and functions into bank protection and other stream side development projects; and (3) implementing non-native plant (e.g. Arundo) eradication plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek, Thomes Creek	Predation in the Delta and the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek, Clear Creek and Thomes Creek	Implement studies to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species throughout the Delta and in the lower Sacramento River. The steelhead predation study being conducted by DWR et al. in Clifton Court Forebay is one example of such a study. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at irrigation diversions and junctions and gate/barrier structures (e.g., DCC gates, South Delta barriers, and potential False River and Three-Mile River barriers to Frank's Tract) throughout the Delta, including the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Clear Creek	Sedimentation in Clear Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Sedimentation in Beegum Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Clear Creek	Flow dependent habitat availability in Clear Creek affecting juveniles	Develop a cooperative program to improve flow on Clear Creek by increasing releases from Whiskeytown Dams (USFWS 1997).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek	Low flows (attraction and migratory cues) and flood flows (non-natal area attraction) in the lower Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek	Increase integration of the State and Federal water projects through shared storage and conveyance agreements. Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005). Implement projects that improve fish passage between the Sacramento River and flood bypasses.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Beegum Creek	Low flows (attraction and migratory cues) in lower Cottonwood Creek affecting the immigration life stage	Develop cooperative water use agreements (e.g., groundwater exchange agreements) with local water users to provide flows during the immigration life stage.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Beegum Creek	Low flows (attraction and migratory cues) in the middle Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek	Develop and implement pulse flow schedules during peak migration periods for years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Beegum Creek	Low flows (attraction and migratory cues) in the upper Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek	Develop and implement pulse flow schedules during peak migration periods for years with low water availability.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Thomes Creek, Clear Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Thomes Creek and Clear Creek	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the middle Sacramento River. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website 2007).			
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek	Predation in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek and Clear Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the middle Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (GCID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Clear Creek	Redd superimposition, competition for habitat and hybridization (from barriers) affecting Clear Creek spawning	Develop long-term operation and maintenance plan for the segregation weir. Conduct a passage feasibility study, including an assessment of potential habitat above Whiskeytown Dam.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Clear Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Clear Creek affecting juveniles	Implement Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Project (Phase 3B) and other projects designed to improve juvenile rearing habitat (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Clear Creek affecting juveniles	Implement Lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Project (Phase 3B) (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Yolo Bypass – Freemont Weir impeding and/or blocking adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Yolo Bypass weirs that impede adult passage (e.g., Freemont Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Clear Creek	Predation in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Clear Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on spring-run Chinook salmon by non-native species in the upper Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (e.g., RBDD and ACID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 3: Predation
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek	Water quality in the lower Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek and Clear Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Sacramento and in residential, commercial, and industrial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.			
Clear Creek	Water quality in Clear Creek affecting the immigration and holding life stage	Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Clear Creek	Water quality in the Delta affecting adults attempting to return to Clear Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Delta and surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007). Implement the water quality and reliability improvements of the Delta Improvements Package (CALFED 2007). Implement projects that would reduce anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve concentrations below 4 µmol L^{-1} in order to promote increased primary and secondary production (Dugdale *et al*. 2007). Implement tidal marsh restoration projects to promote nitrification and retention of NH_4 (Dugdale *et al*. 2007).			
Clear Creek	Water temperature in the Delta, lower Sacramento River, middle Sacramento River, and upper Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Clear Creek	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the mainstems and Delta.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Clear Creek	Water temperature in the upper Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Clear Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Beegum Creek	Flow fluctuations in Beegum Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage and spawning	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Water quality in Beegum Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S ,D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.		Population decline	
Clear Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in Clear Creek affecting juveniles	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Clear Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

4.0 STEELHEAD

4.1 WATERSHED- AND SITE-SPECIFIC RECOVERY ACTIONS

Table 4-1. Northern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Passage impediments in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting the adult immigration and holding and juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages	Conduct an anadromous fish passage assessment in Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek including recommendations for improving passage conditions.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Deer Creek	Agricultural diversion dams in Deer Creek impeding and/or blocking adult immigration	Permit and construct a fish ladder and new apron on the Cone-Kimball Diversion (AFRP Website 2005). Jump pool enhancement and rock installation at Stanford-Vina Dam Fish ladder (AFRP Website 2005). Design and implement a Deer Creek anadromous fish passage study (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek	Agricultural diversion dam(s) in Mill Creek affecting adult immigration	Implement a Mill Creek anadromous fish passage study (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Water temperature in Antelope Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Bear River	Water temperature in the Bear River affecting the adult immigration and holding, embryo incubation, and juvenile rearing life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Deer Creek	Water temperature in Deer Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Mill Creek	Water temperature in Mill Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality SR – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Antelope Creek	Agricultural diversion dams in Antelope Creek affecting adult immigration	Implement the Edwards Dam Ladder construction project (AFRP Website 2005). Implement an Antelope Creek Anadromous Fish Passage Study.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Entrainment in Antelope Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop an Antelope Creek Watershed Assessment, including recommendations for improving channel connectivity and minimizing entrainment at diversions (AFRP Website 2005). Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Yuba River	Englebright Dam affecting adult immigration and spawning.	Implement actions to enhance habitat conditions and improve access within the area above Englebright Dam, including increasing minimum flows, providing passage at Our House, New Bullards Bar, and Log Cabin dams, and assessing feasibility of passage improvement at natural barriers. Design and conduct an experimental fish passage program to evaluate adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Englebright Dam.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Englebright Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the ESU, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.			
Big Chico Creek	Passage impediment/barrier at Iron Canyon, City of Chico swimming holes, and associated dams affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages in Big Chico Creek	Implement the Iron Canyon Fish Passage Project (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Bear River	Flow conditions in the Bear River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop a Bear River Watershed Plan (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Dry Creek	Passage impediments/barriers in the Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting the adult immigration life stage	Conduct an anadromous fish passage assessment in Dry Creek including recommendations for improving passage conditions.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Big Chico Creek	Water temperature in Big Chico Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding, spawning, and embryo incubation life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2 Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Bear River	Low flows in the Bear River limiting attraction of immigrating adults	Evaluate pulse flow benefits for steelhead attraction and passage; if pulse flows are determined to be effective for attracting steelhead, implement the most beneficial pulse flow regime.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek	Water quality, including turbidity and sedimentation in Mill Creek affecting spawning and embryo incubation	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas. Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Deer Creek	Water quality in Deer Creek affecting embryo incubation, adult immigration, juvenile rearing and emigration and spawning	Carry out a Deer Creek (upper) erosion reduction project (AFRP Website 2005). Continue educational outreach and support and assist DCWC in watershed management activities (AFRP Website 2005). Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas. Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets".	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Dry Creek	Water quality in Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting adult immigration and holding, spawning, and the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas. Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Butte Creek	Water temperature in Butte Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2 Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
American River	Nimbus Dam blocking adult immigration to historical spawning habitat in the American River	Conduct a passage feasibility study, including an assessment of potential salmonid habitat above Nimbus and Folsom dams.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Low flows in Antelope Creek limiting attraction of immigrating adults	Re-evaluate/dedicate instream flows for upstream/downstream passage (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Feather River	Fish Barrier Dam/Oroville Dam affecting spawning in the Feather River	Determine the feasibility of providing steelhead access to habitat above the Fish Barrier Dam and above Oroville Dam. Provide access to suitable habitat in the Sacramento basin to create a new geographically isolated independent population of steelhead (Habitat Expansion Agreement for Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and California Valley Steelhead). Implement actions to enhance habitat conditions and improve access within the area above Oroville Dam, including increasing minimum flows, providing passage at upstream dams, and assessing feasibility of passage improvement at natural barriers. Design and conduct a trap-and-haul pilot program to evaluate adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Oroville Dam. Implement actions to allow steelhead access to habitat above Oroville Dam.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River, Big Chico Creek, Feather River, Butte Creek, Dry Creek, Bear River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Big Chico, Dry, and Butte creeks, and in the Yuba, Bear, and Feather rivers	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River, Feather River, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek, Bear River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the lower Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Big Chico and Butte creeks, and in the Yuba, Bear, and Feather rivers	Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the middle Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website). Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Big Chico Creek, Yuba River, Feather River, Butte Creek, Dry Creek, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek, Bear River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the lower Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Big Chico, Dry, Auburn Ravine/Coon and Butte creeks, and in the Yuba, Bear, and Feather rivers	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring, and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the lower Sacramento River especially between Colusa and Verona.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento.			
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Big Chico Creek, Antelope Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the middle Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Big Chico, and Antelope creeks	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the middle Sacramento River. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST -- 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Yuba River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Yuba River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Set back training walls and restore floodplain function in gold fields and other appropriate floodplain zones. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Implement gravel injection program below Englebright Dam to restore geofluvial processes.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Curtail further development in active Yuba River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship. Create and restore side-channel habitats to increase the quantity and quality of off-channel rearing (and spawning) areas.			
Yuba River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Yuba River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Relocate the riverside motocross recreation area (i.e., shad pad) outside of the active floodplain. Develop vegetation maintenance inspection protocols and practices within the State flood control project to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor on the Yuba River. Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Develop and implement a large woody material restoration program along the lower Yuba River utilizing sources of wood that enter upstream reservoirs. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Yuba River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Butte Creek	Butte Creek Diversion Dams and Weirs affecting adult immigration	Construct high water volume fish ladder at White Mallard Dam and associated diversion – Phase III (USFWS 2001). Develop a Butte Creek Watershed Assessment, including recommendations for improving conditions for immigrating anadromous salmonids.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Deer Creek	Put-and-take rainbow trout fishery in the upper Deer Creek affecting spawning	Eliminate the put-and-take rainbow trout fishery program in upper Deer Creek.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Mill Creek	Stocked trout fishery at the upper Mill Creek drainage affecting spawning	Eliminate the put-and-take rainbow trout fishery program in upper Mill Creek.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
American River	Water temperature in the American River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration, spawning and embryo incubation life stages	Develop and implement an ecologically based flow management plan for the lower American River, including water temperature considerations (Water Forum 2001).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2 Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Deer Creek	Low flows in Deer Creek limiting attraction of immigrating adults	Implement water exchange agreement with the Deer Creek Irrigation Company to better ensure fish passage flows (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Mill Creek	Low flows in Mill Creek limiting attraction of immigrating adults	Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to develop dedicated instream water; participate in the lower Mill Creek Watershed Restoration Project (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, American River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Feather River, Big Chico Creek, Butte Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba River, American River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Feather River, Big Chico Creek, and Butte Creek	Implement habitat improvement projects throughout the Delta including, but not limited to: (1) Liberty Farms and Hastings Tract Restoration Project; (2) Little Holland Tract Restoration Project; and (3) Eastern Egbert Tract Restoration Project (see Four Pumps Delta Fish Agreement Amendment – Ongoing Actions to Address State Water Project Impacts). Restore floodplains and establish floodplain habitat in Snodgrass and Georgiana sloughs, near the mouths of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, and in the McCormick-Williamson Tract (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Implement restoration projects for Lindsey and Barker sloughs (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Evaluate the potential effects of reconnecting Elk Slough to the Sacramento River, and if the evaluation suggests that habitat conditions for salmonids would improve, then implement a project to carry out the reconnection (Siegel 2007). Manage Elk, Sutter, and Steamboat Sloughs for salmon passage and habitats (Siegel 2007). Re-establish hydrologic connectivity between historical Stone Lakes floodplain and the Sacramento River with a design that minimizes juvenile stranding (Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007). Enhance the Yolo Bypass by re-configuring Fremont and Sacramento weirs to target inundation frequency, duration, and magnitude levels that best match natural, historic conditions. Implement additional projects to: (1) improve fish passage through Fremont weir for multiple species; (2) enhance lower Putah Creek floodplain habitat; (3) improve fish passage along the toe drain/Lisbon weir; and (4) enhance floodplain habitat along the toe drain (Siegel 2007). Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection (including bank relocation) and ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE). Replace and modify the Lisbon Weir to improve fish habitats (and passage) and management flexibility (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Restore tidal wetlands and associated habitats at Brannan Island State Park, northeast tip of Sherman Island, along Seven-Mile slough, and the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (CDFG *et al.* 2008). Implement projects to restore native riparian vegetation along channel margins and set-back levees (*CDFG et al. 2008*).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, American River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Feather River, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Predation in the Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba, American and Feather rivers, in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, and Big Chico creeks, and in Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Implement studies to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species throughout the Delta. The steelhead predation study being conducted by DWR et al. in Clifton Court Forebay is one example of such a study. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at irrigation diversions and junctions and gate/barrier structures (e.g., DCC gates, South Delta barriers, and potential False River and Three-Mile River barriers to Frank's Tract) throughout the Delta, including the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River, Butte Creek, Feather River, Big Chico Creek, American River, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Predation in the lower Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, Auburn Ravine/Coon and Big Chico creeks, and in the Yuba, American and Feather rivers	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the lower Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs (Freemont Weir), diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Antelope Creek, Feather River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Butte Creek, American River, Bear River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba, Bear, American and Feather rivers, and in Antelope, Mill, Deer, and Butte creeks	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and identify and implement similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Implement boat wake restrictions along primary migration corridors in the Delta to prevent bank erosion and promote riparian recruitment and growth. Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Antelope Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Antelope Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in the active Antelope Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Big Chico Creek	Spawning habitat availability in Big Chico Creek affecting spawning	Develop a spawning gravel budget and implement an augmentation plan and use flow management to optimize spawning weighted usable area in consideration of hydrologic limitations and other species (e.g., steelhead) and life stage requirements. Implement One-mile Dam modification and gravel supplementation project (City of Chico); add spawning gravels at Five-Mile Diversion (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Dry Creek	Water temperature in the Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration and adult immigration and holding life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting spawning	Assess feasibility of providing enhanced steelhead habitat (Water Forum 2001).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Yuba River	Predation in the Yuba River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Identify and implement projects designed to minimize predation on juvenile salmonids at Daguerre Point Dam and associated structures. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Antelope Creek	Water quality in Antelope Creek affecting embryo incubation, juvenile rearing and outmigration and spawning	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas. Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify stream banks with native vegetation.			
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Predation in the middle Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the middle Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (e.g., GCID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
American River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the American River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active American River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Feather River, Antelope Creek, Big Chico Creek, Butte Creek, American River, Dry Creek, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek, Bear River	Loss of natural morphology and function in the Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba, Bear, American and Feather rivers, in Mill, Deer, Antelope, Big Chico, Dry, and Butte creeks, and in Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project (CALFED 2007). Restore dendritic channel systems in areas where this habitat feature existed historically. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Feather River, Bear River	Hatchery effects in the Feather River affecting spawning in the Feather River and juveniles produced in the Bear River	Develop a hatchery management plan for the Feather River Hatchery, including specific criteria for operating as either an integrated or segregated hatchery.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Feather River	Physical habitat alteration in the Feather River affecting spawning	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Hatchery effects in Antelope Creek affecting spawning	Decrease "swamping" with hatchery fish o address spawning and juvenile rearing and emigration (NMFS 2007a).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River	Daguerre Point Dam affecting the adults returning to the Yuba River	Collaboratively design the Daguerre Point Dam fish ladder passage engineering and design of the preferred alternative described in DWR and Corps (2003) (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Deer Creek	Spawning habitat availability in Deer Creek affecting spawning	Identify gravel starved areas in Deer Creek and implement gravel additions.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Entrainment in Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Dry Creek	Flow conditions in the Dry Creek Drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration and embryo incubation life stages	Conduct a hydrologic analysis of the Dry Creek watershed that explores conjunctive use opportunities to reduce water allocations that are dependent on surface water.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Bear River	Flow conditions in the Bear River affecting spawning	Develop a Bear River Watershed Plan (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Flow conditions in the Central Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba River, Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks, and in Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Operate the DCC gates consistent with recommendations from the CALFED Operations Group, SWRCB D-1641, and the Salmon Decision Process in order to minimize the number of juvenile steelhead being diverted into the central Delta (NMFS 2004).	A, P	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Yuba River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the Yuba River and DPD affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Improve efficiency of screening devices at Hallwood-Cordua and Brophy-South Yuba water diversions, and construct screens that meet NMFS fish screening criteria at the Brown's Valley water diversion and other unscreened diversions (USFWS 2001).	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Yuba River	Hatchery effects in the Yuba River affecting spawning	Develop a hatchery management plan for the Feather River Hatchery, including specific criteria for operating as either an integrated or segregated hatchery.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Yuba River	Physical habitat alteration in the Yuba River affecting spawning	Conduct gravel additions above and below Narrows Pool (Corps mitigation) (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Physical habitat alteration in Antelope Creek affecting spawning	Build sediment retention structures; fortify stream banks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Bear River	Entrainment in the Bear River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Conduct a SHIRA Analysis of the Lower Bear River; conduct feasibility analyses for screening and laddering five agricultural diversions in Dry Creek (tributary to Bear River) (AFRP website 2005).	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Feather River, Bear River	Predation in the Feather River affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba, Bear, and Feather Rivers	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the Feather River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the middle Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek	Physical habitat alteration in Mill Creek affecting spawning	Evaluate gravel resources on Mill Creek and identify locations for gravel restoration (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Deer Creek	Physical habitat alteration in Deer Creek affecting spawning	Evaluate gravel resources on Deer Creek and identify locations for gravel restoration (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Dry Creek	Barrier at Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting spawning	Evaluate gravel resources on Dry Creek and identify locations for gravel restoration (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST 1.1 – Threats to Spawning Habitat
Dry Creek	Spawning habitat availability in Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting spawning	Conduct stream habitat restoration on the Sierra College campus and conduct Secret Ravine Channel Habitat Restoration (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST 1.1 – Threats to Spawning Habitat
Antelope Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in Antelope Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Antelope Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
American River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the American River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Inventory locations for creating shallow inundated floodplain habitat for multi-species benefits and implement where suitable opportunities are available (Water Forum 2001). Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Antelope Creek	Spawning habitat availability in Antelope Creek affecting spawning	Identify gravel starved areas in Antelope Creek and implement gravel additions.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST 1.1 – Threats to Spawning Habitat
Deer Creek	Hatchery effects in Deer Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Decrease "swamping" with hatchery fish to address spawning and juvenile rearing and emigration (NMFS 2007a).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Low flows in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage limiting attraction of immigrating adults	Conduct a hydrologic analysis of the Auburn/Coon Creek watershed that explores conjunctive use opportunities to reduce water allocations that are dependent on surface water.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Antelope Creek, Big Chico Creek, Feather River, Butte Creek, Deer Creek	Entrainment in the Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather Rivers and in Mill, Antelope, Butte, Deer, and Big Chico creeks	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Antelope Creek, and Big Chico Creek, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek, Butte Creek, Deer Creek	Entrainment in the lower Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather Rivers and in Mill, Antelope, Butte, Deer, Auburn Ravine/Coon and Big Chico creeks	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Feather River, Big Chico Creek, Mill Creek, Antelope Creek, Dry Creek, Butte Creek, Deer Creek	Entrainment at the Jones and Banks Pumping Plants affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather Rivers and in Big Chico, Mill, Dry, Butte, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility. Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Bear River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Bear River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Restore and improve opportunities for rivers to inundate their floodplain on a seasonal basis (CALFED 2000). Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Bear River	Flow conditions in the Bear River affecting embryo incubation	Develop a Bear River Watershed Plan (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Feather River, Yuba River, Bear River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Feather River affecting the juveniles produced in the Feather, Bear, and Yuba rivers	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Feather River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Yuba River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Yuba River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Purchase conservation easements (AFRP 2006b) adjacent to the Yuba River and manage those easements as seasonal floodplain habitats. Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve habitat conditions for juvenile rearing (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River	Spawning habitat availability in the Yuba River affecting spawning	Conduct gravel additions above and below Narrows Pool (Corps mitigation) (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1.: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Dry Creek	Low flows at the Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) limiting attraction of immigrating adults	Conduct a hydrologic analysis of the Dry Creek watershed that explores conjunctive use opportunities to reduce water allocations that are dependent on surface water.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Water quality at the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting the adult immigration and holding, spawning, and juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas. Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Antelope Creek, Big Chico Creek, Deer Creek	Entrainment in the middle Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Antelope, and Big Chico creeks	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Dry Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Conduct stream habitat restoration on the Sierra College campus and conduct Secret Ravine Channel Habitat Restoration (AFRP website 2005). Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Dry Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Dry Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Conduct stream habitat restoration on the Sierra College campus and conduct Secret Ravine Channel Habitat Restoration (AFRP website 2005). Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Dry Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
American River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the American River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop a riparian corridor management plan and improve and protect riparian habitat and instream cover (USFWS 2001). Inventory locations for creating shallow inundated floodplain habitat for multi-species benefits and implement where suitable opportunities are available (Water Forum 2001) Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Deer Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Deer Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Mill Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Feather River, Yuba River, Bear River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Feather River affecting the juveniles produced in the Feather, Bear, and Yuba rivers	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Develop vegetation maintenance inspection protocols and practices within the State flood control project to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor on the Feather River. Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Feather River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River, Bear River, Feather River, Big Chico Creek, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Water temperatures in the Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba, Feather, and Bear Rivers, and Big Chico and Mill Creeks, and adults attempting to return to the Yuba River and Deer and Antelope Creeks	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Yuba River, Bear River, Feather River	Water temperature in the Feather River affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba, Feather, and Bear Rivers, adults immigrating into the Yuba and Feather Rivers, and the embryo incubation life stage in the Feather River	Increase stream flows as needed to reduce water temperatures for steelhead juvenile rearing (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Dry Creek, Bear River, Feather River, Big Chico Creek, Mill Creek, Antelope Creek	Water temperature in the lower Sacramento River affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba, Feather, and Bear Rivers, and in Mill, Dry, Big Chico, Antelope, and Deer creeks, and adults attempting to return to Dry, Deer, Antelope, and Mill Creeks and the Yuba River	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento River during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the mainstem Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Flow conditions in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting spawning and juvenile rearing	Conduct a hydrologic analysis of the Auburn/Coon Creek watershed that explores conjunctive use opportunities to reduce water allocations that are dependent on surface water.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
American River, Yuba River, Dry Creek (Sacramento Region), Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek, Feather River, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek	Loss of tidal marsh habitat in the Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the American River, Yuba River, Feather River, Dry, Butte, Big Chico, and Auburn Ravine/Coon Creeks	Restore and protect tidal wetlands and associated habitats throughout the Delta including: (1) at Brannon Island State Park; (2) along the northeast tip of Sherman Island (3) along Seven-Mile Slough (4) at the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (5) within Sherman Lake (6) in the Hotchkiss and Veale Tracts (7) around Decker Island (8) at Dutch Slough; (9) at Big Break (10) at Frank's Tract (11) along the north shore of the Sacramento River along the Montezuma Hills; and (12) in Sand Mound Slough (CDFG et al. 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Dry Creek	Physical habitat alteration in the Dry Creek drainage (Sacramento Region) affecting spawning	Conduct stream habitat restoration on the Sierra College campus and conduct Secret Ravine Channel Habitat Restoration (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek	Flow conditions in Mill Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to develop dedicated instream water; participate in the Lower Mill Creek Watershed Restoration Project (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Deer Creek	Flow conditions in Deer Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Conduct real time flow and water temperature monitoring (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Yuba River, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Reverse flow conditions in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Mill, Deer, Auburn Ravine/Coon and Antelope creeks, and the Yuba River	Operate the DCC gates consistent with recommendations from the CALFED Operations Group, SWRCB D-1641, and the Salmon Decision Process in order to minimize the number of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon being diverted into the central Delta (NMFS 2004). Implement QWEST standard from the 1992 winter-run biological opinions. Maintain the Old and Middle River at less than negative 5,000 cfs. Implement a 35 percent Export to Inflow Ratio in January.	A, P	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 5.3 Threats from Water Diversions
Yuba River, Mill Creek, Feather River, Deer Creek, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek	Water quality in the Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather rivers, in Mill, Butte, Big Chico, and Deer creeks, in Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek, and adults attempting to return to Butte and Deer Creeks	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Delta and surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007). Implement the water quality and reliability improvements of the Delta Improvements Package (CALFED 2007). Implement projects that would reduce anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve concentrations below 4 µmol L^{-1} in order to promote increased primary and secondary production (Dugdale *et al*. 2007). Implement tidal marsh restoration projects to promote nitrification and retention of NH_4 (Dugdale *et al*. 2007).			
Yuba River, Bear River, Feather River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Feather River affecting the juveniles produced in the Yuba, Feather, and Bear Rivers	Develop feasibility plan through the Oroville Dam FERC negotiated relicensing study plan; and implement riparian and floodplain habitat modeling and restoration projects (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Dry Creek (Sacramento Region)	Passage impediments/barriers in the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel affecting the adults attempting to return to Mill, Dry, Antelope, and Deer creeks	Design and implement a project(s) to eliminate the adverse effects on anadromous species related to the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel. Such projects could include providing upstream passage at the lock gates and/or eliminating flow through the lock gates.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Dry Creek (Sacramento Region)	Passage impediments/barriers at the Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure affecting the adults attempting to return to Mill, Deer, Dry, and Antelope creeks	Continue to operate the SMSCS with the boat lock open in order to allow fish passage in and out of Suisun Marsh.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Sutter Bypass – Tisdale Weir affecting the adults attempting to return to Mill, Deer, and Antelope creeks	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Sutter Bypass weirs that currently impede adult passage (e.g., Tisdale Weir)	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Antelope Creek, Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek	Passage impediments/barriers in the Yolo Bypass – Freemont Weir affecting the adults attempting to return to Mill, Deer, Butte, Big Chico, and Antelope creeks	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Yolo Bypass weirs that impede adult passage (e.g., Freemont Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mill Creek, Butte Creek, Deer Creek, Dry Creek, Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek, Yuba River, Big Chico Creek	Water quality in the lower Sacramento River affecting the adults attempting to return to Mill, Butte, and Deer creeks, and juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather Rivers, Dry, Butte, Big Chico, and Auburn Ravine/Coon Creeks	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Sacramento and in residential, commercial, and industrial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Big Chico Creek	Water quality in the middle Sacramento River affecting the adults attempting to return to Mill, Big Chico, and Deer creeks	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in residential and commercial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Antelope Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Antelope Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop an Antelope Creek Watershed Assessment, which includes recommendations for restoring riparian habitat (AFRP Website 2005). Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b)	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Butte Creek	Spawning habitat availability in Butte Creek affecting spawning	Conduct an instream flow study to identify a spawning habitat-flow relationship and to identify factors (e.g., substrate size and quality, velocity, water depth) limiting spawning habitat availability	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Butte Creek	Hatchery effects in Butte Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage		A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Deer Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Deer Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Deer Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Mill Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Mill Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Mill Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Water temperature in Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration and spawning life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Antelope Creek	Flow conditions in Antelope Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop an Antelope Creek Watershed Assessment (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Antelope Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Sacramento Deep Water Channel affecting the adults attempting to return to Antelope Creek	Design and implement a project(s) to eliminate the adverse effects on anadromous species related to the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel. Such projects could include providing upstream passage at the lock gates and/or eliminating flow through the lock gates.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Butte Creek	Predation in Butte Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in Butte Creek. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Mill Creek, Deer Creek, Dry Creek, Yuba River, Butte Creek	Water quality in the Bays affecting the adults attempting to return to Mill and Deer creeks, and juveniles produced in Dry and Butte Creeks and the Yuba and Feather Rivers	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Bay area (NMFS 2007b). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Enforce Clean Water Act legislation to reduce urban and industrial contamination in the Bays.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Mill Creek	Passage impediments/barriers in Mill Creek affecting the juvenile rearing life stage	Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to develop dedicated instream water; participate in the Lower Mill Creek Watershed Restoration Project; implement the Mill Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Deer Creek	Passage impediments/barriers in Deer Creek affecting the juvenile rearing life stage	Permit and construct a fish ladder and new apron on the Cone-Kimball Diversion (AFRP); implement jump pool enhancement and rock installation, Stanford-Vina Dam Fish Ladder (AFRP); design and implement a Deer Creek anadromous fish passage study (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek	Predation in the Auburn Ravine and Coon Creek drainage affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Antelope Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Antelope Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Antelope Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
American River	Hatchery effects in the American River affecting the spawning and juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages	Evaluate Nimbus Steelhead Hatchery production and stocking practices to identify measures that would promote restoration of steelhead in the lower American River (Water Forum 2001). Develop Nimbus Hatchery Genetic Management Plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagations
Bear River	Physical habitat alteration in the Bear River affecting spawning	Evaluate gravel resources on Dry Creek (tributary to Bear River) and identify locations for gravel restoration (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Bear River	Spawning habitat availability in the Bear River affecting spawning	Conduct an instream flow study to identify a spawning habitat-flow relationship and to identify factors (e.g., substrate size and quality, velocity, water depth) limiting spawning habitat availability.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
American River	Flow conditions in the American River affecting the adult immigration and holding, spawning, and juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages	Develop and implement an ecologically based flow management plan for the lower American River, including water temperature considerations (Water Forum 2001).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
American River	Harvest/Angling impacts in the American River affecting the adult immigration and holding and embryo incubation life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in the lower American River.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
American River, Bear River, Butte Creek	Hatchery effects in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the American and Bear Rivers and Butte Creek	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagations
American River, Butte Creek	Predation in the Bays affecting juveniles produced in the American River and Butte Creek	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
American River, Bear River, Yuba River, Feather River, Big Chico Creek	Invasive aquatic species in the Delta affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement the management actions for addressing aquatic invasive species described in the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (CDFG 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.4: Threats Resulting from Non-native Aquatic Invasive Species
American River	Water quality in the American River affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in residential, commercial, and industrial areas throughout the American River watershed (NMFS 2007b). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets".	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
American River, Butte Creek	Hatchery effects in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the American River and Butte Creek	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagations
American River, Bear River	Loss of tidal marsh habitat in the Bays affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement the Blacklock Tidal Marsh Restoration project, the Suisun Marsh Property Acquisition and Habitat Restoration project, and other tidal marsh restoration projects throughout the Bays (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Dry Creek (Sacramento Region)	Harvest/Angling impacts in Dry Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Dry Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Dry Creek (Sacramento Region)	Hatchery effects in Dry Creek affecting the spawning life stage	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagations
Dry Creek (Sacramento Region)	Predation in Dry Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek affecting the spawning and adult immigration and holding life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Auburn Ravine/Coon Creek, Dry Creek, Butte Creek, Bear River, Big Chico Creek, Mill Creek, Antelope Creek	Low flows and flood flows in the lower Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Auburn Ravine/Coon, Big Chico, Mill, Antelope, and Butte Creeks	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005). Evaluate pulse flow benefits for steelhead attraction and passage; if pulse flows are determined to be effective for attracting steelhead, implement the most beneficial pulse flow regime. Implement projects designed to improve fish passage between the Sacramento River and flood bypasses.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Bear River	Water quality in Bear River affecting the adult immigration and holding and embryo incubation life stages	Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets".	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Bear River	Passage impediments/barriers in the Bear River affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Conduct an anadromous fish passage assessment in Bear River including recommendations for improving passage conditions.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Bear River	Harvest/angling impacts in the Bear River affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Bear River	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Yuba River	Harvest/angling impacts in the Yuba River affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in the Yuba River.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Yuba River, Feather River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the Feather River affecting juveniles produced in the Yuba and Feather Rivers	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Feather River	Harvest/angling impacts in the Feather River affecting the adult immigration and holding and embryo incubation life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest/angling impacts on steelhead in the Feather River. Modify sport fishing regulations to minimize the impact of anglers wading in the river on steelhead embryo incubation. Implement outreach projects to educate the public regarding the steelhead life cycle including how to identify a steelhead redd.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Feather River	Flow conditions (low flows) in the Feather River affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005). Evaluate pulse flow benefits for steelhead attraction and passage; if pulse flows are determined to be effective for attracting steelhead, implement the most beneficial pulse flow regime. Provide for flows that are protective of all steelhead life stages through FERC processes and Section 7 implementation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Feather River	Flow conditions (flow fluctuations and flooding) in the Feather River affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Adaptively manage releases in consideration of the spatial and temporal distribution of steelhead life stages in the Feather River. Develop and implement flow ramping protocols to protect all life stages of steelhead.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Feather River	Water quality in the Feather River affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Butte Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in Butte Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Butte Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Butte Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding and spawning life stages	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in the Yuba River.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Butte Creek	Water quality in Butte Creek affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage	Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Butte Creek	Entrainment at individual diversions in Butte Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Big Chico Creek	Sedimentation in Big Chico Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Big Chico Creek	Flow fluctuations in Big Chico Creek affecting the embryo incubation and spawning life stages	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Big Chico Creek	Water quality in Big Chico Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Big Chico Creek, Mill Creek, Deer Creek	Water temperatures in the middle Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Big Chico, Deer, Antelope, and Mill Creeks	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the mainstem Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Mill Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Mill Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Mill Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mill Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in Mill Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade. Curtail further development in active Mill Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Antelope Creek	Passage impediments/barriers in Antelope Creek affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Implement the Edwards Dam Ladder construction project (AFRP Website 2005). Implement an Antelope Creek Anadromous Fish Passage Study.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Table 4-2. Basalt and Porous Lava Steelhead Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Cow Creek	Passage impediments/barriers in Cow Creek affecting the adult immigration life stage	Conduct feasibility analyses for screening and laddering five agricultural diversions (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Cow Creek	Cow Creek water temperatures affecting adult immigration and holding, spawning, juvenile rearing and outmigration, and embryo incubation	Install water temperature recorders at select locations; develop recommendations for minimum instream flow based on temperature needs (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Passage impediments/barriers in Upper Sacramento River Tributaries (i.e., Stillwater, Churn, Sulphur, Salt, Olney, Paynes etc.) affecting the adult immigration life stage	Prepare a Paynes/Antelope watershed assessment (AFRP website 2006b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Cow Creek	Entrainment of juveniles at Cow Creek diversions	Conduct feasibility analyses for screening and laddering five agricultural diversions; conduct Cow Creek Diversion Mapping (AFRP website 2005). Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Cow Creek	Flow fluctuations in Cow Creek affecting embryo incubation	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	Dams on the North and South forks of Battle Creek blocking adult immigration to historically utilized spawning habitat and affecting juvenile emigration	Install state-of-the-art fish ladders at, or remove small dams on the North Fork of Battle Creek to provide fish passage (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Water temperatures in the upper Sacramento River Tributaries affecting all life stages	Identify and implement meadow and/or riparian habitat restoration projects	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Cow Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in Cow Creek affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration	Implement actions specified in the Cow Creek Watershed Management Plan directed at restoring instream and riparian habitat (AFRP Website 2003). Identify stream reaches that have been most altered by anthropogenic factors and reconstruct a natural channel geometry scaled to current channel forming flows. Curtail further development in the active Cow Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Cow Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration in Cow Creek	Cooperatively negotiate long-term agreements with local landowners to maintain and restore riparian communities along lower reaches of Cow Creek (CALFED 2000). Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade. Curtail further development in active Cow Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Cow Creek	Passage impediments in Cow Creek limiting spawning habitat availability and affecting juvenile outmigration.	Implement actions (e.g., spawning gravel augmentation) designed to increase spawning habitat availability and complement flows.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Cow Creek, Battle Creek, Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River, Sacramento River	Entrainment at the Jones and Banks Pumping Plants affecting juveniles in Cow Creek, Battle Creek, Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River and the Sacramento River	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility. Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River	Keswick Dam and Shasta Dam blocking upstream migration to historic spawning Habitat in the Sacramento River	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above Shasta Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Shasta Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Shasta dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the ESU, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline Catastrophe	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Sacramento River, Battle Creek, Cow Creek, Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Passage impediments/barriers at Red Bluff Diversion Dam affecting adults attempting to return to the Sacramento River, Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Maintain the gates-up position to prevent passage impediments to listed species.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Low flows in the small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River limiting attraction of immigrating adults and affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration	Conduct a hydrologic analysis for these tributaries and identify opportunities for conjunctive use to reduce surface water diversions.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Battle Creek	Water temperature affecting adult immigration and holding, embryo incubation and juvenile rearing in Battle Creek	Increase stream flows as specified in the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan(NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	DPS/ESU-level demographics criteria for steelhead, spring-run Chinook salmon, and winter-run Chinook salmon Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats resulting from Climate Change
Cow Creek	Stocked trout in Upper Cow Creek potentially spawning with wild steelhead in Cow Creek	Eliminate the put-and-take rainbow trout fishery program in upper Cow Creek.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Entrainment affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration in the small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Battle Creek, Stony Creek	Steelhead produced at Coleman Hatchery competing with adults and juveniles produced in Battle Creek and in Stony Creek	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River, Cow Creek, Battle Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function and function in the lower Sacramento River affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration	Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Passage impediments limiting spawning habitat availability in the small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Implement actions (e.g., spawning gravel augmentation) designed to increase spawning habitat availability.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Cow Creek, Sacramento River, Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Predation in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Cow Creek, the Sacramento River, and Small tributaries to the Predation in upper Sacramento River	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the upper Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (e.g., RBDD and ACID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	Low flows in Battle Creek limiting attraction of immigrating adults and affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration	Increase stream flows as specified in the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan(NMFS 2007b)	A, P, S, D	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Predation in the Bays and Delta affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Implement studies to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species throughout the Delta. The steelhead predation study being conducted by DWR et al. in Clifton Court Forebay is one example of such a study. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at irrigation diversions and junctions and gate/barrier structures (e.g., DCC gates, South Delta barriers, and potential False River and Three-Mile River barriers to Frank's Tract) throughout the Delta, including the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Cow Creek, Battle Creek Sacramento River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Cow Creek, Battle Creek and the Sacramento River	Modify gravel pits and mounds to ensure full drainage of these features to allow flooding while preventing stranding and warm water predator habitat. Curtail further development in active upper Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River, Battle Creek, Cow Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and upstream tributaries	Implement habitat improvement projects throughout the Delta including, but not limited to: (1) Liberty Farms and Hastings Tract Restoration Project; (2) Little Holland Tract Restoration Project; and (3) Eastern Egbert Tract Restoration Project (see Four Pumps Delta Fish Agreement Amendment – Ongoing Actions to Address State Water Project Impacts). Restore floodplains and establish floodplain habitat in Snodgrass and Georgiana sloughs, near the mouths of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, and in the McCormick-Williamson Tract (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Implement restoration projects for Lindsey and Barker sloughs (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Evaluate the potential effects of reconnecting Elk Slough to the Sacramento River, and if the evaluation suggests that habitat conditions for salmonids would improve, then implement a project to carry out the reconnection (Siegel 2007). Manage Elk, Sutter, and Steamboat Sloughs for salmon passage and habitats (Siegel 2007). Re-establish hydrologic connectivity between historical Stone Lakes floodplain and the Sacramento River with a design that minimizes juvenile stranding (Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007). Enhance the Yolo Bypass by re-configuring Fremont and Sacramento weirs to target inundation frequency, duration, and magnitude levels that best match natural, historic conditions. Implement additional projects to: (1) improve fish passage through Fremont weir for multiple species; (2) enhance lower Putah Creek floodplain habitat; (3) improve fish passage along the toe drain/Lisbon weir; and (4) enhance floodplain habitat along the toe drain (Siegel 2007). Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection (including bank relocation) and ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE). Replace and modify the Lisbon Weir to improve fish habitats (and passage) and management flexibility (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Restore tidal wetlands and associated habitats at Brannan Island State Park, northeast tip of Sherman Island, along Seven-Mile slough, and the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (CDFG *et al.* 2008). Implement projects to restore native riparian vegetation along channel margins and set-back levees (*CDFG et al. 2008*).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River, Battle Creek, Cow Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River, Battle Creek and Cow Creek	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River, Battle Creek, Cow Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River, Battle Creek, and Cow Creek	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project (CALFED 2007). Restore dendritic channel systems in areas where this habitat feature existed historically. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and identify and implement similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Implement boat wake restrictions along primary migration corridors in the Delta to prevent bank erosion and promote riparian recruitment and growth. Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring, and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the lower Sacramento River especially between Colusa and Verona. Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento.			
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Predation in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the lower Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs (e.g., Freemont Weir), diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Sacramento River	Competition and predation in the upper Sacramento River between hatchery-produced fish and steelhead produced in the Sacramento River	Develop a hatchery management plan for steelhead (NMFS 2007a).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Battle Creek	Entrainment in Battle Creek affecting juvenile rearing and outmigration	Implement the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007)	A, P	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Cow Creek, Battle Creek, upper Sacramento River tributaries	Entrainment in individual diversions in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in upstream	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Cow Creek, Battle Creek, upper Sacramento River tributaries	Entrainment in individual diversions in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced upstream	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River, Battle Creek, Cow Creek	Predation in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the middle Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (e.g., GCID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	Barriers limiting spawning habitat availability in Battle Creek	Implement the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007.)	A, P	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Low instream flows affecting spawning habitat availability in Battle Creek	Implement the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007).	A, P	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River, Cow Creek, Battle Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the mainstem Sacramento River, Cow Creek, and Battle Creek	The Corps, DWR, CDFG, BLM, USFWS, NMFS, private land owners, and Resource Conservation Districts should continue to focus on retaining, restoring and creating continuous riparian corridors within their jurisdictions. Utilize bio-technical techniques for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Restore the current Lake Red Bluff footprint to riparian habitat.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River	Limited instream gravel supply in the upper Sacramento River affecting spawning habitat availability in the Sacramento River	Conduct periodic (e.g., every 5 years) spawning gravel assessments in the upper Sacramento River (i.e., above RBDD) and implement gravel augmentation projects, as necessary.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Hatchery effects in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Battle Creek	Hatchery effects in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Cow Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat affecting juveniles produced in Cow Creek	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Cow Creek, Sacramento River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Cow Creek and the Sacramento River	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Modify gravel pits and mounds to ensure full drainage of these features to allow flooding while preventing stranding and warm water predator habitat. Curtail further development in active upper Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River, Battle Creek, Cow Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and upstream tributaries	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the middle Sacramento River. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website 2007) .	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Sacramento River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	The Corps, DWR, CDFG, BLM, USFWS, NMFS, private land owners, and Resource Conservation Districts should continue to focus on retaining, restoring and creating continuous riparian corridors within their jurisdictions. Utilize bio-technical techniques for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Restore the current Lake Red Bluff footprint to riparian habitat.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Battle Creek, Cow Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Sutter Bypass – Tisdale Weir affecting the adults attempting to return to	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Sutter Bypass weirs that currently impede adult passage (e.g., Tisdale Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Predation on juvenile steelhead in the small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Cow Creek	Low flow conditions limiting attraction of adults and affecting juveniles produced in Cow Creek	Investigate measures to increase flows in Cow Creek and tributaries, such as: (1) investigating opportunities to increase irrigation efficiency; (2) managing vegetation to improve water supply and timing of supply; (3) purchasing water or water rights from willing sellers; (4) removing or laddering diversions; (5) providing alternate water sources during important periods; and (6) implementing a conjunctive use program (AFRP Website 2003).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Water quality in the lower Sacramento River affecting adult immigration and juveniles produced upstream	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Sacramento and in residential, commercial, and industrial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.			
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Water quality in the Bay and Delta affecting juveniles produced in and adults attempting to return to Battle Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Delta and Bays and surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007). Implement the water quality and reliability improvements of the Delta Improvements Package (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Implement projects that would reduce anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve concentrations below 4 μmol L^{-1} in order to promote increased primary and secondary production (Dugdale *et al*. 2007). Implement tidal marsh restoration projects to promote nitrification and retention of NH_4 (Dugdale *et al*. 2007).			
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Water quality affecting adults attempting to return to the upper Sacramento River Tributaries and embryo incubation	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Redding and in surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Improve and maintain containment of contaminants from Iron Mountain Mine.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Water temperature in the lower Sacramento River affecting adult immigration and juveniles produced upstream	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento River during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the mainstem Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	Entrainment in individual diversions in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Passage impediments/barriers in the small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River affecting adult immigration	Conduct an anadromous fish passage assessment for Stillwater, Churn, Sulphur, Salt, Olney, and Paynes creeks.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Limited instream gravel supply affecting spawning habitat availability in the small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Identify gravel starved areas in these tributaries and implement gravel additions (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek, Cow Creek	Flow conditions in the middle Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to natal tributaries	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Hatchery effects in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Water temperature in the Delta affecting adult and juvenile steelhead.	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Small tributaries to the Sacramento River	Harvest/angling impacts in the upper Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to the small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in the upper Sacramento River.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Sacramento River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River	Entrainment at individual diversions in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River, Cow Creek	Entrainment at individual diversions in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in the Sacramento River and Battle Creek	Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy website 2007). Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Battle Creek	Limited spawning habitat suitability in Battle Creek	Implement the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007).	A, P	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Cow Creek	Water quality affecting adult immigration and embryo incubation in Cow Creek	Implement the water quality action options described in the Cow Creek Watershed Management Plan (AFRP Website 2003). Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas. Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify streambanks with native vegetation. Build sediment retention structures; fortify stream banks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Cow Creek, Sacramento River	Harvest/angling impacts in the upper Sacramento River affecting adult immigration, spawning, and embryo incubation	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in the upper Sacramento River.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Battle Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the middle Sacramento River affecting juvenile rearing	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Cow Creek, Sacramento River	Entrainment of juveniles at individual diversions in the upper Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Cow Creek, Battle Creek	Flow conditions in the upper Sacramento River affecting all steelhead life stages	Implement a river flow regulation plan that balances carryover storage needs with instream flow needs for steelhead based on runoff and storage conditions. Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Cow Creek	Limited instream gravel reducing potential spawning habitat	Develop and implement a Cow Creek spawning gravel augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Sacramento River, Cow Creek	Water quality in the upper Sacramento River affecting steelhead	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Redding and in surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Improve and maintain containment of contaminants from Iron Mountain Mine.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Battle Creek	Predation on juvenile steelhead in Battle Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in Battle Creek. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Upper Sacramento River Tributaries	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the upper Sacramento River tributaries affecting juvenile rearing	The Corps, DWR, CDFG, BLM, USFWS, NMFS, private land owners, and Resource Conservation Districts should continue to focus on retaining, restoring and creating continuous riparian corridors within their jurisdictions. Utilize bio-technical techniques for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Restore the current Lake Red Bluff footprint to riparian habitat.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Upper Sacramento river Tributaries	Spawning habitat availability in the upper Sacramento River tributaries affecting spawning	Conduct an instream flow studies to identify a spawning habitat-flow relationship and to identify factors (e.g., substrate size and quality, velocity, water depth) limiting spawning habitat availability. Conduct periodic (e.g., every 5 years) spawning gravel assessments in the upper Sacramento River (i.e., above RBDD) and implement gravel augmentation projects, as necessary.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Historical Spawning Habitat
Upper Sacramento Tributaries, Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Water quality in middle Sacramento River due to agriculture and urban runoff affecting adult immigration and juvenile rearing	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in residential and commercial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.			
Battle Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Sacramento Deep Water Channel affecting the adults attempting to return to natal tributaries	Design and implement a project(s) to eliminate the adverse effects on anadromous species related to the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel. Such projects could include providing upstream passage at the lock gates and/or eliminating flow through the lock gates.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Passage impediments/barriers in the Yolo Bypass – Freemont Weir affecting the adults attempting to return to natal tributaries	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Yolo Bypass weirs that impede adult passage (e.g., Freemont Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Sutter Bypass – Tisdale Weir affecting the adults attempting to return to natal tributaries	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Sutter Bypass weirs that currently impede adult passage (e.g., Tisdale Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Battle Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure affecting the adults attempting to return to natal tributaries	Continue to operate the SMSCS with the boat lock open in order to allow fish passage in and out of Suisun Marsh.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek	Low instream flows affecting attraction flows in Battle Creek	Implement the Battle Creek Salmon And Steelhead Restoration Plan (CALFED 2007).	A, P	ESU/DPS-level demographics criteria for spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and steelhead. Criteria indirectly include effective population size and Population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Sacramento River, Battle Creek	Water temperatures affecting steelhead adult immigration, embryo incubation and juvenile rearing in upper Sacramento River	Achieve the daily average water temperature targets described in the Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan (NMFS 2004).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Battle Creek, Sacramento River, upper Sacramento River tributaries	Water temperature in the middle Sacramento River affecting adult immigration and juveniles produced upstream	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries and tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the mainstem Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Battle Creek, Sacramento River	Hatchery effects (competition and predation) in the Bay and Delta between hatchery-produced fish and steelhead produced in the Sacramento River and tributaries	Develop a hatchery management plan for steelhead (NMFS 2007a).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Upper Sacramento River Tributaries	Harvest/angling impacts in the upper Sacramento River tributaries adults attempting to return to the small tributaries to the upper Sacramento River	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in the upper Sacramento River tributaries.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Battle Creek, Sacramento River, Upper Sacramento River Tributaries	Changes in Delta hydrology affecting juveniles produced in Battle Creek, the Sacramento River, and in the small tributaries so the Sacramento River	Implement a study designed to identify water conveyance projects that would allow the Delta to function as a natural estuary. Such a study would include modeling to examine upstream and downstream effects of identified projects as well as project-specific operational criteria.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity ST – 5.3: Threat from Water Diversions
Cow Creek	Harvest/angling impacts Cow Creek affecting adult immigration and holding	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Cow Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Battle Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in Battle Creek affecting juvenile rearing	The Corps, DWR, CDFG, BLM, USFWS, NMFS, private land owners, and Resource Conservation Districts should continue to focus on retaining, restoring and creating continuous riparian corridors within their jurisdictions. Utilize bio-technical techniques for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Table 4-3. Northwestern California Steelhead Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Stony Creek	Black Butte Dam affecting adults returning to Stony Creek.	Provide anadromous fish passage above Black Butte Dam	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Thomes Creek	Agricultural diversion dams, river braiding, and natural channel gradient affecting adults returning to Thomes Creek	Conduct a feasibility study on potential channel modifications that would improve upstream migration conditions.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Stony Creek	Water temperature in Stony Creek affecting adult immigration and holding and juvenile rearing	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Thomes Creek	Water temperature affecting adults returning to Thomes Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Beegum Creek	Water temperature affecting adults returning to Beegum Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek	Red Bluff diversion dam affecting adults returning to Clear and Beegum creeks	Maintain the gates-up position to prevent passage impediments to listed species.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek	Water temperature in Clear Creek affecting adult immigration and holding, spawning, and embryo incubation	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Putah Creek	Solano and Montecello dams affecting adults returning to Putah Creek	Conduct an anadromous fish passage feasibility study that assesses upstream habitat conditions and operational alternatives.	A, P, S, D	DPS-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Clear Creek	Whiskeytown dam affecting adults returning to Clear Creek	Develop long-term operation and maintenance plan for the segregation weir. Conduct a passage feasibility study, including an assessment of potential habitat above Whiskeytown Dam.	A, P, S, D	DPS-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Clear Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability in Clear Creek	Develop a spawning gravel budget and implement an augmentation plan and use flow management to optimize spawning weighted usable area in consideration of hydrologic limitations and other species (e.g., Chinook salmon) and life stage requirements. Develop a spawning gravel budget and implement an augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Stony Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability in Stony Creek	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan, which includes habitats above Black Butte Dam after passage is provided. Provide anadromous fish passage above Black Butte Dam.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Stony Creek	Low flow conditions reducing adult attraction into Stony Creek and limiting juvenile rearing habitat availability.	Evaluate water releases from Black Butte Dam, water exchanges with the Tehama-Colusa Canal and interim and long term water diversion solutions at RBDD (USFWS 2001).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek, Stony Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Clear, Beegum, Thomes creeks and Stony Creek	Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Thomes Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability in Thomes Creek	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Clear Creek	Low flows reducing adult attraction into Clear Creek	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek	Flow fluctuations affecting spawning and embryo incubation in Clear Creek	Adaptively manage releases from Whiskeytown Dam in consideration of the spatial and temporal distribution of steelhead life stages in Clear Creek. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek, Stony Creek, Thomes Creek, Putah Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Clear, Beegum, Stony, Thomes creeks and Putah Creek	Implement habitat improvement projects throughout the Delta including, but not limited to: (1) Liberty Farms and Hastings Tract Restoration Project; (2) Little Holland Tract Restoration Project; and (3) Eastern Egbert Tract Restoration Project (see Four Pumps Delta Fish Agreement Amendment – Ongoing Actions to Address State Water Project Impacts). Restore floodplains and establish floodplain habitat in Snodgrass and Georgiana sloughs, near the mouths of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, and in the McCormick-Williamson Tract (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Implement restoration projects for Lindsey and Barker sloughs (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Evaluate the potential effects of reconnecting Elk Slough to the Sacramento River, and if the evaluation suggests that habitat conditions for salmonids would improve, then implement a project to carry out the reconnection (Siegel 2007). Manage Elk, Sutter, and Steamboat Sloughs for salmon passage and habitats (Siegel 2007). Re-establish hydrologic connectivity between historical Stone Lakes floodplain and the Sacramento River with a design that minimizes juvenile stranding (Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007). Enhance the Yolo Bypass by re-configuring Fremont and Sacramento weirs to target inundation frequency, duration, and magnitude levels that best match natural, historic conditions. Implement additional projects to: (1) improve fish passage through Fremont weir for multiple species; (2) enhance lower Putah Creek floodplain habitat; (3) improve fish passage along the toe drain/Lisbon weir; and (4) enhance floodplain habitat along the toe drain (Siegel 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection (including bank relocation) and ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE). Replace and modify the Lisbon Weir to improve fish habitats (and passage) and management flexibility (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Restore tidal wetlands and associated habitats at Brannan Island State Park, northeast tip of Sherman Island, along Seven-Mile slough, and the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (CDFG *et al.* 2008). Implement projects to restore native riparian vegetation along channel margins and set-back levees (*CDFG et al. 2008*).			
Putah Creek	Low flow conditions limiting juvenile rearing habitat availability and limiting adult attraction into Putah Creek	Develop a cooperative program to provide water for target flows in Putah Creek from additional Lake Berryessa releases or reductions in water diversions at Solano Diversion Dam and in the creek downstream of the dam (CALFED 2000).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Clear Creek, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek, Stony Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles reared in Clear, Thomes, Beegum, and Stony creeks	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring, and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the lower Sacramento River especially between Colusa and Verona.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Restore a continuous 85-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Colusa and Sacramento.			
Stony Creek, Clear Creek, Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek	Water temperature in the Delta affecting adults returning Sacramento River tributaries and juvenile outmigration	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Stony Creek, Clear Creek, Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek	Water temperature in the lower Sacramento River affecting adults returning to upstream tributaries and juvenile outmigration	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the mainstem Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Clear Creek	Water quality affecting adult immigration and holding, spawning and embryo incubation in Clear Creek	Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Clear Creek	Low flow conditions limiting juvenile rearing habitat availability in Clear Creek	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek, Stony Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Clear, Beegum, Thomes, and Stony creeks	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Curtail further development in active lower Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).			
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek, Thomes Creek, Stony Creek	Loss of natural morphology and function in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Beegum, Clear, and Thomes creeks	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project (CALFED 2007). Restore dendritic channel systems in areas where this habitat feature existed historically. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Clear Creek, Thomes Creek, Cottonwood/Beegum Creek, Putah Creek, Stony Creek	Predation in the Delta on juvenile steelhead produced in Clear, Thomes, Cottonwood/Beegum, Putah, and Stony creeks	Implement studies to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species throughout the Delta. The steelhead predation study being conducted by DWR et al. in Clifton Court Forebay is one example of such a study. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass).	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Implement projects to minimize predation at irrigation diversions and junctions and gate/barrier structures (e.g., DCC gates, South Delta barriers, and potential False River and Three-Mile River barriers to Frank's Tract) throughout the Delta, including the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Beegum Creek	Limited spawning habitat availability in Beegum Creek	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Thomes Creek, Clear Creek, Beegum Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in upstream tributaries	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts to eliminate illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the middle Sacramento River. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of riparian habitat of an appropriate width to maintain ecologically viable function to flood-prone lands along both banks of the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek, Clear Creek, Thomes Creek, Stony Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in Beegum, Clear, Stony and Thomes creeks	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and identify and implement similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Implement boat wake restrictions along primary migration corridors in the Delta to prevent bank erosion and promote riparian recruitment and growth. Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Stony Creek, Clear Creek	Water diversions into the Central Delta affecting juveniles produced in Stony Creek, Clear Creek	Operate the DCC gates consistent with recommendations from the CALFED Operations Group, SWRCB D-1641, and the Salmon Decision Process in order to minimize the number of juvenile spring-run Chinook salmon being diverted into the central Delta (NMFS 2004).	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 5.3 Threats from Water Diversions
Beegum Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Cottonwood Creek watershed affecting juvenile steelhead	Protect/enhance existing riparian habitat and corridors (NMFS 2007b). Modify gravel mining operations to allow riparian regeneration. Apply NMFS gravel mining criteria to all gravel mining projects. Integrate riparian habitat restoration into bank protection and other stream side development projects. Implement non-native plant (e.g. Arundo) eradication plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Cottonwood Creek watershed floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.			
Clear Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat affecting juveniles in Clear Creek	Implement lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Project (Phase 3B) (CALFED 2007). Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Clear Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function affecting juveniles in Clear Creek	Implement lower Clear Creek Floodway Rehabilitation Project (Phase 3B) (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Clear Creek, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Clear, Beegum and Thomes creeks	Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy website 2007). Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek, Clear Creek, Stony	Entrainment at Jones and Banks Pumping Plants affecting juveniles produced in Thomes, Clear, Stony and Beegum creeks	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility. Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Clear Creek, Thomes Creek, Stony Creek	Predation in the lower Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Clear, Stony and Thomes creeks	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the lower Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs (e.g., Freemont Weir), diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Clear Creek, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek	Predation in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Clear, Thomes, and Beegum creeks	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the middle Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (e.g., GCID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek	Predation in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Clear Creek, Beegum Creek	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the upper Sacramento River. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures (e.g., RBDD and ACID). Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek, Stony Creek	Water quality in the lower Sacramento River affecting adults returning to and juveniles emigrating from Clear Creek, Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek, Stony Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Sacramento and in residential, commercial, and industrial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality “Fact Sheets”. Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek, Stony Creek, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek	Water quality in the Bay and Delta affecting adults returning to and juveniles emigrating from Clear Creek, Stony Creek, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Bay and Delta and surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007). Implement the water quality and reliability improvements of the Delta Improvements Package (CALFED 2007). Implement projects that would reduce anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve concentrations below 4 μmol L^{-1} in order to promote increased primary and secondary production (Dugdale *et al*. 2007). Implement tidal marsh restoration projects to promote nitrification and retention of NH_4 (Dugdale *et al*. 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek	Water temperature in the upper Sacramento River affecting adults returning to Clear Creek	Achieve the daily average water temperature targets described in the Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan (NMFS 2004).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Putah Creek	Water temperature affecting juveniles in Putah Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek , Clear Creek, Stony Creek	Entrainment at diversions in the Delta, lower Sacramento River, and middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum, Clear Creek, Stony Creek and Thomes creeks	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Stony Creek, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek, Clear Creek	Low flows in the lower, middle, and/or upper sections of the Sacramento River reducing attraction of adults returning to Stony Creek, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek, and Clear Creek	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005). Evaluate pulse flow benefits for steelhead attraction and passage; if pulse flows are determined to be effective for attracting steelhead, implement the most beneficial pulse flow regime.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Putah Creek	Harvesting and angling impacts affecting adults returning to Putah Creek	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Putah Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Putah Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat affecting juveniles in Putah Creek	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Watershed disturbance affecting embryo incubation in Beegum Creek	Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek Beegum Creek, Stony Creek, Thomes Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the middle Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Clear, Beegum, Stony and Thomes creeks	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Curtail further development in active middle Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Implement projects that acquire strategic floodplain easements to re-establish floodplain connectivity in areas constricted by levees. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage floodplain stewardship. Restore a continuous 100-mile stretch of ecologically viable riparian habitat to flood-prone lands along the river between Red Bluff and Colusa (The Nature Conservancy Website).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the Cottonwood Creek watershed affecting juveniles	Re-establish natural channel morphology by: (1) applying NMFS gravel mining criteria to all gravel mining projects; (2) integrating natural morphological features and functions into bank protection and other stream side development projects; and (3) implementing non-native plant (e.g. Arundo) eradication plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Clear Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover affecting juveniles in Clear Creek	Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Clear Creek floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	SR – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek	Flow fluctuations affecting adults spawning and embryo incubation in Beegum Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Low flows reducing adult attraction into Beegum Creek	Negotiate agreements with landowners and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Beegum Creek	Water temperature affecting adults spawning and juvenile rearing in Beegum Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Thomes Creek	Water temperature affecting adult spawning and embryo incubation in Thomes Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of a catastrophic wildfire, restore meadows to potentially increase summer flows and reduce local water temperatures, or increase riparian shade.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek and Clear Creek	Modify gravel pits and mounds to ensure full drainage of these features to allow flooding while preventing stranding and warm water predator habitat. Curtail further development in active upper Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Putah Creek	Flow conditions affecting embryo incubation and juveniles in Putah Creek	Develop a cooperative program to provide water for target flows in Putah Creek from additional Lake Berryessa releases or reductions in water diversions at Solano Diversion Dam and in the creek downstream of the dam (CALFED 2000).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
San Joaquin River, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek	Loss of tidal marsh habitat in the Bays affecting juveniles produced in Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek and the San Joaquin River	Implement the Blacklock Tidal Marsh Restoration project, the Suisun Marsh Property Acquisition and Habitat Restoration project, and other tidal marsh restoration projects throughout the Bays (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
San Joaquin River, Thomes Creek, Beetle Creek	Loss of tidal marsh habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin River, Thomes Creek and Beegum Creek	Restore and protect tidal wetlands and associated habitats throughout the Delta including: (1) at Brannon Island State Park; (2) along the northeast tip of Sherman Island (3) along Seven-Mile Slough (4) at the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (5) within Sherman Lake (6) in the Hotchkiss and Veale Tracts (7) around Decker Island (8) at Dutch Slough; (9) at Big Break (10) at Frank's Tract (11) along the north shore of the Sacramento River along the Montezuma Hills; and (12) in Sand Mound Slough (CDFG et al. 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Stony Creek, Beegum Creek, Clear Creek, Thomes Creek	Water temperature in the middle Sacramento River affecting adults returning to and juveniles emigrating from Stony Creek, Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek and Clear Creek	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in Sacramento River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the mainstem Sacramento River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek, Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek	Water quality in the middle Sacramento River affecting adults returning to Clear Creek, Thomes Creek and Beegum Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in residential and commercial areas surrounding the watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek	Water quality in the upper Sacramento River affecting adults returning to Clear Creek and Beegum Creek	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in Redding and in surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Improve and maintain containment of contaminants from Iron Mountain Mine.			
Stony Creek	Flow fluctuations affecting spawning and embryo incubation in Stony Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Thomes Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat affecting juveniles in Thomes Creek	Conduct West Tehama riparian and floodplain conditions inventory (AFRP website 2005). Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Thomes Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function affecting juveniles in Thomes Creek	Re-establish natural channel morphology by: (1) applying NMFS gravel mining criteria to all gravel mining projects; (2) integrating natural morphological features and functions into bank protection and other stream side development projects; and (3) implementing non-native plant (e.g. Arundo) eradication plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Putah Creek	Predation on juvenile steelhead in Putah Creek	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Stony Creek	Flow conditions affecting juveniles in Stony Creek	Evaluate water releases from Black Butte Dam, water exchanges with the Tehama-Colusa Canal and interim and long term water diversion solutions at RBDD (USFWS 2001).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Stony Creek	Water quality in Stony Creek affecting spawning and embryo incubation	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas. Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify stream banks with native vegetation.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Stony Creek	Water temperature affecting embryo incubation in Stony Creek	Enhance water temperatures by identifying and implementing projects that would increase stream flows and increase shaded riverine habitat	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek, Beegum Creek, Thomes Creek	Passage impediments/barriers in the Yolo Bypass – Freemont Weir affecting the adults attempting to return to natal tributaries	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Yolo Bypass weirs that impede adult passage (e.g., Freemont Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Thomes Creek	Watershed disturbance affecting embryo incubation in Thomes Creek	Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 1.3 Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Stony Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat affecting juveniles in Stony Creek	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Putah Creek	Loss of natural river morphology in Putah Creek.	Implement actions specified by the Putah Creek Council directed at restoring instream and riparian habitat.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Putah Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover	Implement actions specified by the Putah Creek Council directed at restoring instream and riparian habitat.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Water quality in Beegum Creek affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Eliminate sources of chronic sediment deliver from roads and other near stream development by out-sloping roads, constructing diversion prevention dips, replacing under-sized culverts and applying other storm proofing guidelines. Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Build sediment retention structures; fortify stream banks with native vegetation.			
Thomes Creek, Beegum Creek, Putah Creek, Stony Creek	Food web disruption by non-native aquatic invasive species in the Bay and Delta affecting juvenile rearing	Implement the management actions for addressing aquatic invasive species described in the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (CDFG 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.4: Threats Resulting from Non-native Aquatic Invasive Species
Clear Creek	Predation in Clear Creek	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Cottonwood/Beegum watershed	Predation on juvenile steelhead in the Cottonwood/Beegum watershed	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Thomes Creek	Flow fluctuations affecting spawning and embryo incubation in Thomes Creek	Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Putah Creek	Water quality in Putah Creek affecting the juvenile rearing life stage	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Putah Creek watershed (NMFS 2007b). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met throughout the Putah Creek watershed for all potential pollutants (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Beegum Creek	Loss of floodplain habitat affecting juvenile rearing in Beegum Creek	Implement projects to increase floodplain habitat availability to improve juvenile rearing habitat (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek	Modify gravel pits and mounds to ensure full drainage of these features to allow flooding while preventing stranding and warm water predator habitat. Curtail further development in active upper Sacramento River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the upper Sacramento River affecting juveniles produced in Beegum Creek	The Corps, DWR, CDFG, BLM, USFWS, NMFS, private land owners, and Resource Conservation Districts should continue to focus on retaining, restoring and creating continuous riparian corridors within their jurisdictions. Utilize bio-technical techniques for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Restore the current Lake Red Bluff footprint to riparian habitat.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Beegum Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Sacramento Deep Water Channel affecting the adults attempting to return to natal tributaries	Design and implement a project(s) to eliminate the adverse effects on anadromous species related to the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel. Such projects could include providing upstream passage at the lock gates and/or eliminating flow through the lock gates.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Beegum Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure affecting the adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek	Continue to operate the SMSCS with the boat lock open in order to allow fish passage in and out of Suisun Marsh.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Beegum Creek	Passage impediments/barriers at the Sutter Bypass – Tisdale Weir affecting the adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek	Install effective adult fish passage facilities at Sutter Bypass weirs that currently impede adult passage (e.g., Tisdale Weir).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Putah Creek	Limited instream gravel supply affecting spawning habitat availability in Putah Creek	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Clear Creek	Entrainment of juveniles at Clear Creek diversions	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Clear Creek	Entrainment of juveniles at individual diversions in the upper Sacramento River	Develop an entrainment monitoring program to determine the level of take at individual diversions. Prioritize diversions based on this monitoring and screen those that are determined to have substantial impacts at the population level. Develop and increase application of alternative diversion technologies that eliminate entrainment. Implement projects that consolidate and screen existing diversions where feasible.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Beegum Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in the upper Sacramento River affecting adults attempting to return to Beegum Creek	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in the upper Sacramento River.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameter Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Clear Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Clear Creek affecting adults attempting to return to natal tributaries	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Clear Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Stony Creek	Water temperatures affecting spawning in Stony Creek	Install water temperature recorders at select locations; develop recommendations for minimum instream flow based on temperature needs (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Stony Creek	Harvest/angling impacts in Stony Creek affecting adult spawning	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest of steelhead in Stony Creek.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization

Table 4-4. Southern Sierra Nevada Steelhead Diversity Group Threats and Associated Recovery Actions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
San Joaquin River	Friant Dam blocking access to historic spawning habitat in the San Joaquin River	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above Friant Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Friant Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Friant Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Calaveras River	Bellota Weir affecting adults and juveniles in the Calaveras River	Continue monitoring passage through the retrofitted Bellota weir fish ladder and monitor upstream and downstream passage and stranding. Develop a feasibility study for permanent upstream and downstream passage of salmonids between the Delta and Bellota weir (AFRP website 2005). Implement the Calaveras River fish passage improvement project (AFRP website 2005). Screen unscreened diversions beginning with Bellota weir (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Calaveras River	Multiple Flash Board Dams affecting adults returning to the Calaveras River	Implement Calaveras River fish passage improvement project (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
San Joaquin River, Merced River	Flow conditions limiting juvenile rearing habitat availability in the San Joaquin River affecting juveniles in the San Joaquin River and Merced River	Develop the San Joaquin Basin water supply plan (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Tuolumne River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the Tuolumne River	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan. Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above New Don Pedro Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above New Don Pedro Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above New Don Pedro Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Calaveras River	Flow conditions limiting juvenile rearing habitat availability in the Calaveras River.	Negotiate agreements with landowners, Stockton East Water District (SEWD), Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) and Federal and stage agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Tuolumne River	La Grange and New Don Pedro dams affecting adults returning to the Tuolumne River	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above New Don Pedro, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above New Don Pedro Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above New Don Pedro can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Stanislaus River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the Stanislaus River	Manage releases from New Melones Reservoir in consideration of all steelhead life stages. Implement the Spawning Gravel Augmentation Program (Reclamation); augment spawning gravel in suitable locations upstream of Oakdale (AFRP website 2005). Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above New Melones Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it).	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above New Melones Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above New Melones Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.			
Merced River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the Merced River	Collaborate with Santa Fe Aggregates, CDFG and other landowners to restore the Dredger Tailings Reach; continue to supply spawning-sized gravel to landowners for construction of wing dam diversion structures; implement the Gravel Mining reach Phase II projects; Complete the Merced River Salmon Habitat Enhancement Project (AFRP website 2005). Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above Crocker-Huffman and New Exchequer dams, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dams and emigrating juveniles below them) (assessment of habitat suitability above Crocker-Huffman has been completed). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Crocker-Huffman and New Exchequer dams. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Crocker-Huffman and/or New Exchequer dams can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs, where appropriate. Provide suitable spawning habitat through FERC processes and Section 7 implementation such as providing spawning gravel to compensate for habitat inundated/blocked by dams and habitat degraded through gravel mining practices.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Stanislaus River	New Melones, Tulloch, and Goodwin dams affecting adults returning to the Stanislaus River	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above New Melones Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it).	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above New Melones Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above New Melones Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.		size and population decline.	
San Joaquin River	Flow conditions affecting juveniles in the San Joaquin River	Increase releases from Friant Dam as agreed upon in the San Joaquin River settlement.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria for steelhead and spring-run Chinook salmon Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Calaveras River	Flow fluctuations affecting embryo incubation and spawning in the Calaveras River	Continue implementing the lower Calaveras River Salmonid Life History Limiting Factor Analysis (AFRP) to assess flow requirements for anadromous salmonids; and Phase 1 restoration plan for anadromous fish in the Calaveras River (AFRP website 2005).	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Calaveras River	Low flows reducing adult attraction into the Calaveras River	Negotiate agreements with landowners, SEWD, CCWD and Federal and stage agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005). Evaluate pulse flow benefits for steelhead attraction and passage; if pulse flows are determined to be effective for attracting steelhead, implement the most beneficial pulse flow regime. Provide for flows that are protective of all steelhead life stages through FERC processes and Section 7 implementation. Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to dedicate instream water.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Merced River	Flow conditions limiting juvenile rearing habitat availability and affecting adult immigration in the Merced River	Provide for flows that are protective of all steelhead life stages through FERC processes and Section 7 implementation. Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to dedicate instream water. Work with Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS), Family Water Alliance, Merced Irrigation District (MID), riparian water rights holders, and other stakeholders to coordinate releases and diversions.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Calaveras River	Flow conditions affecting juveniles in the Calaveras River	Continue implementing the lower Calaveras River Salmonid Life History Limiting Factor Analysis (AFRP) to assess flow requirements for anadromous salmonids; and Phase 1 restoration plan for anadromous fish in the Calaveras River (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
San Joaquin River, Calaveras River, Stanislaus River	Water quality in the San Joaquin River affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin and Stanislaus Rivers, and adults attempting to return to the Calaveras and Stanislaus Rivers	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment in residential, commercial, and industrial areas throughout the San Joaquin River watershed (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website). Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007). Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mokelumne River	Camanche Dam affecting adults returning to the Mokelumne River and resulting in competition for spawning habitat.	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above Camanche and Pardee dams, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Camanche and Pardee dams. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Camanche and Pardee dams can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Stanislaus River	Low flows reducing adult attraction into the Stanislaus River and limiting juvenile habitat availability	Evaluate pulse flow benefits for steelhead attraction and passage; if pulse flows are determined to be effective for attracting steelhead, implement the most beneficial pulse flow regime. Provide for flows that are protective of all steelhead life stages through FERC processes and Section 7 implementation. Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to dedicate instream water.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
San Joaquin River	Mendota Dam affecting adults returning to the San Joaquin River	Conduct an anadromous fish passage feasibility study that assesses upstream habitat conditions and operational alternatives.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
San Joaquin River	Sack Dam affecting adults returning to the San Joaquin River	Conduct an anadromous fish passage feasibility study that assesses upstream habitat conditions and operational alternatives.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Stanislaus River	Flow fluctuations affecting embryo incubation and spawning in the Stanislaus River	Adaptively manage releases in consideration of the spatial and temporal distribution of steelhead life stages in the Stanislaus River through the re-operation plan for New Melones Reservoir. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Mokelumne River	Hatchery effects (e.g., competition and predation) affecting juveniles produced in the Mokelumne River	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
San Joaquin River, Stanislaus River, Calaveras River, Tuolumne River, Merced River	Water temperature in the San Joaquin River affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Calaveras, Tuolumne and Merced Rivers, and affecting adults attempting to return to the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers	Conduct a San Joaquin Basin integrated water temperature model and flow study (AFRP website 2005). Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff. Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in San Joaquin River tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the mainstem San Joaquin River.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Mokelumne River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the Mokelumne River	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan. Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above Camanche and Pardee dams, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Camanche and Pardee dams. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Camanche and Pardee dams can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria (for actions involving upstream passage) Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Calaveras River	New Hogan Dam affecting adult immigration and spawning in the Calaveras River	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above New Hogan Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above New Hogan Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above New Hogan Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria (for actions involving upstream passage) Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Calaveras River	Water quality in the Calaveras River affecting the adult immigration and juvenile rearing life stages	Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Tuolumne River	Flow fluctuations affecting embryo incubation in the Tuolumne River	Adaptively manage releases in consideration of the spatial and temporal distribution of steelhead life stages in the Tuolumne River. Develop and implement flow fluctuation criteria protective of anadromous fishes. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Calaveras River, Merced River, San Joaquin River, Mokelumne River	Reverse flow conditions in the Delta affecting juveniles in the Calaveras, Merced, San Joaquin, and Mokelumne rivers	Utilize the head of Old River barrier to minimize entrainment at the Jones and Banks pumping plants. Implement QWEST standard from the 1992 winter-run biological opinions. Maintain the Old and Middle River at less than negative 5,000 cfs. Implement a 35 percent Export to Inflow Ratio in January.	A, P	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 5.3 Threats from Water Diversions

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Calaveras River	Water temperature affecting juveniles, embryo incubation and adults in the Calaveras River	Implement Phase 1 restoration plan for anadromous fish in the Calaveras River (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Mokelumne River	Flow fluctuations affecting embryo incubation and spawning in the Mokelumne River	Adaptively manage releases in consideration of the spatial and temporal distribution of steelhead life stages in the Mokelumne River. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Merced River	Flow fluctuations affecting embryo incubation and spawning in the Merced River	Adaptively manage releases in consideration of the spatial and temporal distribution of steelhead life stages in the Merced River. Develop and implement flow fluctuation criteria protective of anadromous fishes. Enhance watershed resiliency by identifying and implementing projects that would reduce the potential for, and magnitude of, a catastrophic wildfire, and restore forested areas within the watershed including riparian areas.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Merced River	Limited instream gravel supply affecting spawning habitat availability in the Merced River	Continue to supply spawning-sized gravel to landowners for construction of wing dam diversion structures; implement the Gravel Mining Reach Phase II projects (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Merced River	New Exchequer Dam, McSwain, Crocker-Huffman, and dams affecting adults returning to the Merced River	Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above Crocker-Huffman and New Exchequer dams, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dams and emigrating juveniles below them) (assessment of habitat suitability above Crocker-Huffman has been completed). If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above Crocker-Huffman and New Exchequer dams.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria (for actions involving upstream passage) Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above Crocker-Huffman and/or New Exchequer dams can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs. Study water treatment systems for the Merced River Hatchery (e.g., ultraviolet); if fish passage is determined to be feasible, install Merced River Hatchery water treatment system.			
Mokelumne River	Flow conditions limiting juvenile rearing habitat availability in the Mokelumne River	Assess salmonid need by life history stage and identify deficits in optimal flow; negotiate water right purchases and/or increase flow releases from Camanche Dam (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
San Joaquin River	Low flow conditions reducing adult attraction into the San Joaquin River	Increase releases from Friant Dam as agreed upon in the San Joaquin River settlement.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria for steelhead and spring-run Chinook salmon Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Tuolumne River	Flow conditions limiting juvenile habitat availability and limiting adult attraction into the Tuolumne River	Provide for flows that are protective of all steelhead life stages through FERC processes and Section 7 implementation. Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to dedicate instream water.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Calaveras River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the Calaveras River	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan Conduct feasibility studies for allowing steelhead access to habitat above New Hogan Dam, including assessing habitat suitability and passage logistics (i.e., getting immigrating adults above the dam and emigrating juveniles below it).	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria (for actions involving upstream passage) Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		If the feasibility studies suggest that fish passage can be successful, then design and conduct an experimental fish passage program evaluating adult distribution, survival, spawning, and production in habitats above New Hogan Dam. If the experimental fish passage program demonstrates that passage above New Hogan Dam can substantively contribute to the long-term viability of the DPS, then develop and implement long-term fish passage programs.		size and population decline.	
Stanislaus River	Flow conditions affecting juveniles in the Stanislaus River	Negotiate agreements with landowners, water districts, and Federal and stage agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
San Joaquin River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover affecting juveniles in the San Joaquin River	Acquire riparian habitat parcels from willing sellers; implement the San Joaquin River National Refuge Riparian Habitat Protection and Floodplain Restoration Project (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Tuolumne River	Water temperature in the Tuolumne River affecting the adult immigration and holding and juvenile rearing life stage	Provide water temperatures that meet steelhead thermal requirements through FERC processes and ESA consultations. Develop an operational approach to manage releases to meet the thermal requirements of steelhead, based on the spatial and temporal distribution of these fish. Develop agreements with landowners, water districts, and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights, and/or restore riparian habitat to promote shading (AFRP website 2005). Study the potential quantity of coldwater available in New Don Pedro Reservoir given a range of climate change scenarios; provide structures to access coldwater pool if needed for the protection of anadromous fishes.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Mokelumne River	Water temperature affecting embryo incubation and spawning in the Mokelumne River	Negotiate agreements with landowners, water districts, and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights, and/or restore riparian habitat to promote shading (AFRP website 2005)	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
San Joaquin River, Stanislaus River, Calaveras River, Tuolumne River, Merced River	Water quality in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Calaveras, and Tuolumne rivers and adults attempting to return to these same rivers as well as to the Merced River	Implement projects that improve wastewater and stormwater treatment throughout the Delta and surrounding residential and commercial areas (NMFS 2007b). Cities, counties, districts, joint powers authority or other political subdivisions of the State involved with water management should implement agricultural drainage management projects to treat, store, convey, and/or dispose of agricultural drainage (SWRCB website). Develop a long-term strategy for monitoring and regulating discharges from agricultural lands to protect waters within the Central Valley, including enforcing the regulations (SWRCB website) Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential (SWRCB 2007). Implement the water quality and reliability improvements of the Delta Improvements Package (CALFED 2007). Implement projects that would reduce anthropogenic inputs of NH_4 to help achieve concentrations below 4 μmol L^{-1} in order to promote increased primary and secondary production (Dugdale *et al*. 2007). Implement tidal marsh restoration projects to promote nitrification and retention of NH_4 (Dugdale *et al*. 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Merced River	Water temperature affecting adults and spawning in the Merced River	Support the Merced River Water Temperature Modeling Studies (CALFED) (AFRP website 2005). Provide water temperatures that meet steelhead thermal requirements through FERC processes and ESA consultations. Develop an operational approach to manage releases to meet the thermal requirements of steelhead, based on the spatial and temporal distribution of these fish. Develop agreements with landowners, water districts, and Federal and State agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights, and/or restore riparian habitat to promote shading (AFRP website 2005). Study the potential quantity of coldwater available in New Exchequer Reservoir given a range of climate change scenarios; provide structures to access coldwater pool if needed for the protection of anadromous fishes.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Calaveras River	Limited instream gravel supply affecting spawning habitat availability in the Calaveras River	Implement Phase 1 restoration plan for anadromous fish in the Calaveras River (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1 Threats to Spawning Habitat
Merced River, Mokelumne River, San Joaquin River Stanislaus River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Merced, Mokelumne, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus rivers	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project and identify and implement similar restoration projects throughout the Delta (CALFED 2007). Implement boat wake restrictions along primary migration corridors in the Delta to prevent bank erosion and promote riparian recruitment and growth. Develop State and national levee vegetation policy to maintain and restore riparian corridors (Corps vegetation management policy and FloodSAFE). Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Promote native riparian (e.g., willows) species through eradication of non-native species (e.g., *Arundo*, tamarisk). Modify vegetation maintenance practices to encourage riparian growth and establish a native vegetated corridor in currently unvegetated/leveed reaches of the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Merced River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the San Joaquin River affecting juveniles produced in the Merced River	Acquire riparian habitat from willing sellers; and implement the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge Riparian Habitat Protection and Floodplain Restoration Project (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
San Joaquin River	Limited spawning habitat availability in the San Joaquin River	Increase releases from Friant Dam as agreed upon in the San Joaquin River settlement; Conduct an instream flow study to identify a spawning habitat-flow relationship and to identify factors (e.g., substrate size and quality, velocity, water depth) limiting spawning habitat availability.	A, P, S, D	ESU-level demographics criteria for steelhead and spring-run Chinook salmon Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mokelumne River, Merced River, San Joaquin River, Stanislaus River, Calaveras River, Tuolumne River	Entrainment at Jones and Banks Pumping Plants affecting juveniles produced in the Mokelumne, Merced, Stanislaus, Calaveras, Tuolumne and San Joaquin rivers	Install and maintain fish screens meeting NMFS fish screen criteria at the Jones and Banks pumping facilities in an effort to minimize entrainment. Conduct fish screen inspections and develop and implement a collection and release program, designed to provide for the survival of fish salvaged at the facility. Evaluate alternatives to conveyance of SWP and CVP water south of the Delta that minimize/eliminate entrainment at existing facilities and implement the preferred alternative.	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Calaveras River	Loss of natural river morphology and function affecting juveniles in the Calaveras River	Implement Phase 1 restoration plan for anadromous fish in the Calaveras River (AFRP website 2005). Curtail further development in active Calaveras River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mokelumne River	Low flow conditions in the Mokelumne River affecting the adult immigration and holding and juvenile rearing and outmigration life stage	Evaluate pulse flow benefits for steelhead attraction and passage; if pulse flows are determined to be effective for attracting steelhead, implement the most beneficial pulse flow regime. Provide for flows that are protective of all steelhead life stages through FERC processes and Section 7 implementation. Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to dedicate instream water.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Merced River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover affecting juveniles in the Merced River	Collaborate with Santa Fe Aggregates, CDFG and other landowners to restore the Dredger Tailings Reach. Federal, State, and local agencies should use their authorities to develop and implement programs and projects that focus on retaining, restoring and creating river riparian corridors within their jurisdiction. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Calaveras River, San Joaquin River	Predation in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Calaveras and San Joaquin rivers	Implement studies to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species throughout the Delta. The steelhead predation study being conducted by DWR et al. in Clifton Court Forebay is one example of such a study. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at irrigation diversions and junctions and gate/barrier structures (e.g., DCC gates, South Delta barriers, and potential False River and Three-Mile River barriers to Frank's Tract) throughout the Delta, including the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Stanislaus River, San Joaquin River, Tuolumne River, Calaveras River, Merced River	Water temperature in the Delta affecting adult immigration to native tributaries and juveniles produced in the Stanislaus River, San Joaquin River, Tuolumne River and Merced River.	Implement agricultural practices that would eliminate or minimize thermal loading associated with agricultural runoff (e.g., rice water). Implement actions designed to decrease water temperatures in the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and tributaries during late-spring through early fall, thereby decreasing thermal loading to the Delta.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
San Joaquin River, Merced River, Stanislaus River, Tuolumne River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin, Merced, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne rivers	Implement habitat improvement projects throughout the Delta including, but not limited to: (1) Liberty Farms and Hastings Tract Restoration Project; (2) Little Holland Tract Restoration Project; and (3) Eastern Egbert Tract Restoration Project (see Four Pumps Delta Fish Agreement Amendment – Ongoing Actions to Address State Water Project Impacts). Restore floodplains and establish floodplain habitat in Snodgrass and Georgiana sloughs, near the mouths of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, and in the McCormick-Williamson Tract (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Implement restoration projects for Lindsey and Barker sloughs (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Evaluate the potential effects of reconnecting Elk Slough to the Sacramento River, and if the evaluation suggests that habitat conditions for salmonids would improve, then implement a project to carry out the reconnection (Siegel 2007). Manage Elk, Sutter, and Steamboat Sloughs for salmon passage and habitats (Siegel 2007). Re-establish hydrologic connectivity between historical Stone Lakes floodplain and the Sacramento River with a design that minimizes juvenile stranding (Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007). Enhance the Yolo Bypass by re-configuring Fremont and Sacramento weirs to target inundation frequency, duration, and magnitude levels that best match natural, historic conditions. Implement additional projects to: (1) improve fish passage through Fremont weir for multiple species; (2) enhance lower Putah Creek floodplain habitat; (3) improve fish passage along the toe drain/Lisbon weir; and (4) enhance floodplain habitat along the toe drain (Siegel 2007). Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection (including bank relocation) and ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Replace and modify the Lisbon Weir to improve fish habitats (and passage) and management flexibility (CDFG *et al*. 2008). Restore tidal wetlands and associated habitats at Brannan Island State Park, northeast tip of Sherman Island, along Seven-Mile slough, and the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (CDFG *et al.* 2008). Implement projects to restore native riparian vegetation along channel margins and set-back levees (*CDFG et al. 2008*).			
San Joaquin River, Merced River, Stanislaus River, Tuolumne River	Loss of floodplain habitat in the San Joaquin River affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin, Merced, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne rivers	Acquire riparian habitat parcels from willing sellers; implement the San Joaquin River National Refuge Riparian Habitat Protection and Floodplain Restoration Project (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
San Joaquin River	Loss of tidal marsh habitat in the Bays affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin River	Implement the Blacklock Tidal Marsh Restoration project, the Suisun Marsh Property Acquisition and Habitat Restoration project, and other tidal marsh restoration projects throughout the Bays (CALFED 2007).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
San Joaquin River	Loss of tidal marsh habitat in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin River	Restore and protect tidal wetlands and associated habitats throughout the Delta including: (1) at Brannon Island State Park; (2) along the northeast tip of Sherman Island (3) along Seven-Mile Slough (4) at the southwest tip of Twitchell Island (5) within Sherman Lake (6) in the Hotchkiss and Veale Tracts (7) around Decker Island (8) at Dutch Slough; (9) at Big Break (10) at Frank's Tract (11) along the north shore of the Sacramento River along the Montezuma Hills; and (12) in Sand Mound Slough (CDFG et al. 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Mokelumne River	Limited instream gravel supply affecting spawning habitat availability in the Mokelumne River	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Tuolumne River	Low flows affecting the adult immigration and holding life stage in the Tuolumne River	Evaluate pulse flow benefits for steelhead attraction and passage; if pulse flows are determined to be effective for attracting steelhead, implement the most beneficial pulse flow regime. Provide for flows that are protective of all steelhead life stages through FERC processes and Section 7 implementation. Work with State and Federal water acquisition programs to dedicate instream water.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1: Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of Habitat or Range
Calaveras River	Harvest/Angling impacts affecting adult immigration and embryo incubation (wading on top of redds containing incubating embryos)	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest/angling impacts on steelhead in the Calaveras River. Modify sport fishing regulations to minimize the impact of anglers wading in the river during steelhead embryo incubation. Implement outreach projects to educate the public regarding the steelhead life cycle including how to identify a steelhead redd.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Stanislaus River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Stanislaus River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration	Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection or ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Work with local land owners to restore riparian habitats.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
San Joaquin River, Tuolumne River	Predation on juvenile steelhead occurring in the San Joaquin River affecting juveniles produced in the San Joaquin and Tuolumne rivers	Implement a study designed to develop quantitative estimates of predation on steelhead by non-native species in the San Joaquin and Tuolumne rivers. Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
San Joaquin River	Limited instream gravel supply affecting spawning habitat availability in the San Joaquin River	Develop and implement a spawning gravel augmentation plan.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Mokelumne River	Harvest/Angling impacts affecting adult immigration and embryo incubation	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest/angling impacts on steelhead in the Mokelumne River. Modify sport fishing regulations to minimize the impact of anglers wading in the river during steelhead embryo incubation. Implement outreach projects to educate the public regarding the steelhead life cycle including how to identify a steelhead redd.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Stanislaus River	Harvest/Angling impacts affecting adult immigration, spawning and embryo incubation	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest/angling impacts on steelhead in the Stanislaus River. Modify sport fishing regulations to minimize the impact of anglers wading in the river during steelhead embryo incubation. Implement outreach projects to educate the public regarding the steelhead life cycle including how to identify a steelhead redd.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
San Joaquin River	Harvest/Angling impacts affecting adult immigration and embryo incubation	Modify sport-fishing regulations to further minimize harvest/angling impacts on steelhead in the San Joaquin River. Modify sport fishing regulations to minimize the impact of anglers wading in the river during steelhead embryo incubation. Implement outreach projects to educate the public regarding the steelhead life cycle including how to identify a steelhead redd.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 2.1: Threats to Overutilization
Calaveras River	Predation in the Calaveras River	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Tuolumne River	Predation in the Tuolumne River	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Mokelumne River, Tuolumne River	The Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel presents an impediment to adult steelhead migrating to natal spawning tributaries	Identify and implement projects designed to improve passage and habitat conditions at the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Merced River, Calaveras River, Tuolumne River, Mokelumne River Stanislaus River	Loss of natural morphology and function in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Merced River, Calaveras River, Tuolumne River, Mokelumne River and Stanislaus River	Implement the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project (CALFED 2007). Restore dendritic channel systems in areas where this habitat feature existed historically. Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active Delta floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Merced River, Tuolumne River, Stanislaus River, San Joaquin River	Loss of natural river morphology and function in the San Joaquin River affecting juveniles produced in the Merced River, Tuolumne River, Stanislaus River and San Joaquin River	Make set-back levees and ecosystem restoration integral components of the Corp's and the California State Plan for flood control (FloodSAFE) authorized bank protection projects efforts (NMFS 2006). Implement bank revetment removal programs and projects and breach or remove abandoned levees during set-back levee projects. Utilize bio-technical techniques that integrate riparian restoration for river bank stabilization instead of conventional rip rap. Curtail further development in active San Joaquin River floodplains through zoning restrictions, county master plans, and other Federal, State, and county planning and regulatory processes. Increase monitoring and enforcement of illegal rip rap applications. Develop education and outreach programs to encourage river stewardship.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Tuolumne River	Water quality affecting adult immigration and holding in the Tuolumne River	Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
San Joaquin River, Merced River, Stanislaus River	Food web disruption by non-native aquatic invasive species in the Bay and Delta affecting juvenile rearing	Implement the management actions for addressing aquatic invasive species described in the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (CDFG 2008).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 5.4: Threats Resulting from Non-native Aquatic Invasive Species

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Calaveras River, San Joaquin River	Passage impediments/barriers at the Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure affecting the adults attempting to return to the Calaveras and San Joaquin rivers	Continue to operate the SMSCS with the boat lock open in order to allow fish passage in and out of Suisun Marsh.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats to Spawning Habitat
Stanislaus River	Predation in the Stanislaus River	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators. Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation
Mokelumne River	Hatchery effects in the Delta affecting juveniles produced in the Mokelumne River	Control hatchery release timing, numbers and locations to minimize adverse effects to wild stock (NMFS 2007b).	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.1: Threats Resulting from Artificial Propagation
Merced River	Flow conditions in the Central Delta affecting the juveniles produced in the Merced River	Operate the DCC gates consistent with recommendations from the CALFED Operations Group, SWRCB D-1641, and the Salmon Decision Process in order to minimize the number of juvenile steelhead being diverted into the central Delta (NMFS 2004).	A, P	Criteria indirectly addressed include effective population size and population decline	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Merced River	Predation in the Merced River	Implement programs and measures designed to control non-native predatory fish (NMFS 2007b), including eradication programs for non-native predators (e.g., striped bass, largemouth bass, and smallmouth bass). Implement projects to minimize predation at weirs, diversion dams, and related structures. Improve nearshore refuge cover for salmonids to minimize predatory opportunities for striped bass and other non-native predators.	A, P	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 3: Predation

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
		Remove striped bass from the CVPIA-AFRP doubling goals.			
Mokelumne River	Water quality in the Mokelumne River affecting the embryo incubation life stage	Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality
Calaveras River	Entrainment at diversions in the Calaveras River affecting the juvenile rearing and outmigration life stages	Develop a Calaveras River Watershed Assessment, including recommendations for improving channel connectivity and minimizing entrainment at diversions (AFRP Website 2005).	A, P	Effective population size. Population decline	ST – 5.3: Threats Resulting from Water Diversions
Stanislaus River	Water temperature in the Stanislaus River affecting the spawning and juvenile rearing life stages	Negotiate agreements with landowners, water districts, and Federal and stage agencies to provide additional instream flows or purchase water rights, and/or restore riparian habitat to promote shading (AFRP website 2005).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2 Threats to Water Quality ST – 5.2: Threats Resulting from Climate Change
Mokelumne River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Mokelumne River affecting juvenile rearing	Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection or ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Work with local land owners to restore riparian habitats.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity
Calaveras River	Loss of riparian habitat and instream cover in the Calaveras River affecting juvenile rearing	Make set-back levees integral components of the Corp's authorized bank protection or ecosystem restoration efforts (NMFS 2006). Work with local land owners to restore riparian habitats.	A, P, S, D	Criteria indirectly affected include, effective population size and population decline.	ST – 1.3: Threats to Habitat Quality and Complexity

Population(s)	Threat	Recovery Action(s)	Primary Population Viability Parameters Addressed (A, P, S, D)	Biological Recovery Criteria Addressed	Threat Abatement Recovery Criteria Addressed
Stanislaus River	Water quality in the Stanislaus River affecting the spawning and juvenile rearing life stages	Develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality throughout the watershed to identify areas of concern. Encourage voluntary landowner participation in educational opportunities such as water quality short courses, field demonstrations and distribution of water quality "Fact Sheets". Pursue grant funding or cost-share payments for landowners to inventory, prepare plans and implement best-management practices that reduce water quality impacts. Increase monitoring and enforcement to ensure that the water quality criteria established in the Central Valley Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) are met for all potential pollutants excluding water temperature (SWRCB 2007).	A, P, S, D	Effective population size Population decline	ST – 1.2: Threats to Water Quality

5.0 LITERATURE CITED

AFRP. Cow Creek: Develop a Watershed Management Plan - Appendix 1, Scope of Work. Available at http://www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/AFRP/project. Accessed on November 9, 2007.

AFRP. Appendix B - FY 2006 AFRP Restoration and Research Gap Analysis. Available at www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/AFRP/documents/FY05_Gap_Analysis.pdf. Accessed on

AFRP. Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Workplan for Fiscal Year 2007. Available at www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/AFRP/planningdocs.asp. Accessed on October 25, 2007.

CALFED. 2000. Final Programmatic EIS/EIR for CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

CALFED. 2007. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Year 8 and Year 8 Annotated Budget (State FYs 2007-08; Federal FY 2008).

CDFG. 2008. California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan. Funded in Part by the Ocean Protection Council, State Coastal Conservancy, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. January 2008.

DWR and USACE. 2003. Stakeholder Review Draft for Daguerre Point Dam Fish Passage Improvement Project 2002 Fisheries Studies. Annalysis of Potential Benefits to Salmon and Steelhead From Improved Fish Passage at Daguerre Point Dam. Prepared by Entrix, Inc. and Jud Monroe.

Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group 2007. Memorandum to the Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force Dated August 21, 2007 - Preliminary Recommendations Report. http://deltavision.ca.gov/DeltaVisionStakeholderCoordinationGroupHome.shtml

NMFS. 2004. Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan. Prepared by National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region.

NMFS. 2006. Biological Opinion for the Sacramento River Flood Control Project Critical Levee Erosion Repair Project.

NMFS. 2007a. Central Valley Steelhead Recovery Breakout Group Notes. Notes from Central Valley Steelhead Recovery Workshop, May 21, 2007.

NMFS. 2007b. Summary of Threats and Recovery Actions for Spring-Run and Winter-Run Chinook Salmon. Notes from Sacramento Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Workshop, May 22, 2007.

The Nature Conservancy. Sacramento River. Available at http://www.nature.org. Accessed on October 26, 2007.

USFWS. 2001. Final Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program: A Plan to Increase Natural Production of Anadromous Fish in the Central Valley of California. Prepared for the Secretary of the Interior by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service with assistance for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Core Group under authority of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

Water Forum. 2001. Initial Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat Management and Restoration Plan for the Lower American River. A Product of the Lower American Fisheries and In-Stream Habitat (FISH) Working Group. Prepared by SWRI. Available at http://www.waterforum.org.

COUNCIL STAFF COMMENTS ON THE CO-MANAGER DRAFT CENTRAL VALLEY SALMON RECOVERY PLAN

Council Staff has prepared comments on the Co-Manager draft Endangered Species Act Central Valley Recovery Plan (CVRP) for Sacramento winter Chinook. Comments for Central Valley spring Chinook were not specifically developed; however, it appears that many of the sections were similar to those for winter Chinook.

These comments focus primarily on the ranked matrix of identified stressors and the proposed recovery actions. Overall, it appears that the stressor matrix ranks ocean harvest effects as a greater threat to recovery of winter Chinook than can be supported by the available data or the recovery actions. For example, the stressor matrix places ocean harvest in the highest quartile (very high stressor), while there are no actions identified in the Recovery Strategy section that address ocean harvest, and there is a statement that overutilization for commercial or recreational purposes no longer appears to have a significant impact on winter Chinook (CVRP page 84).

The ranking system used to develop the stressor matrix should be reevaluated, in particular the identification of the number of individual stressors. The number of stressors is generally a reflection of the geographic distribution of stressors, and includes upper, middle, and lower Sacramento River, the Delta and the Bay. Only one stressor, harvest impacts, included the ocean environment. Other stressors (e.g., juvenile flow conditions) have divisions within the Delta environment, which further demonstrate the somewhat arbitrary use of the number of specific stressors as a multiplier in the stressor matrix.

The CVRP appropriately focuses on human caused threats in the freshwater and estuarine environment. The CVRP does a relatively good job of linking recovery measures to identified threats; however, there are some areas that need further development. In particular, the lack of stressors other than harvest in the ocean environment is a serious shortfall of the analysis. The ocean environment has a dramatic effect on salmon abundance and productivity, and the CVRP appears to largely overlook this. At a minimum, the effects of predation in the ocean environment should be considered. Also largely overlooked is the potential for food web disruption from pollution.

Specific comments are attached in the format requested by the National Marine Fisheries Service.

PFMC
8/20/08

DRAFT RECOVERY PLAN COMMENT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS:
Please fill out your Agency/Tribe and Contact Information. *We appreciate receiving only one submittal per agency and would prefer to receive comments electronically, but certainly welcome hard copy formats as well.* If your agency is submitting comments from multiple reviewers, please indicate each reviewer's name in the fourth column.

Commenting Agency/Tribe

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Commenting Agency/Tribe Contact Information

Name	Chuck Tracy, Salmon Staff Officer
Phone	503-820-2280
Email	Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov

Comment Type (General,Chapter Title, Appendix Title, or Attachment Title)	Section Name	Page #	Reviewer	Comment
Executive Summary	Background	ES-2; first paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*Three of the more important stressors include continued commercial and recreational harvest, predation from introduced species such as striped bass, and high demand for limited water supply resulting in reduced instream flows and highly altered hydrology in the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta*. Habitat loss should be included here, as it was just discussed in detail above and is a bigger factor than harvest (and probably striped bass).
Executive Summary	Recovery Strategy	ES-3; first paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*This Recovery Plan establishes a "directional" strategic approach to recovery.* Explain what this means. Why is it "directional"? "Stepwise" might be a better description.
Executive Summary	Recovery Strategy	ES-4; first bullet	PFMC - Staff	*No population should be allowed to deteriorate in its probability of persistence.* Is there a clearer way of saying this? No population should be allowed to decline? All populations should remain viable?

Comment Type (General,Chapter Title, Appendix Title, or Attachment Title)	Section Name	Page #	Reviewer	Comment
Executive Summary	Recovery Strategy	ES-4; third bullet	PFMC - Staff	*Individual populations within a Diversity Group should have persistence probabilities consistent with a high probability of Diversity Group persistence.* There must be a clearer way to express this. Within a Diversity Group, the viability of individual populations should be consistent with that of the Diversity Group? (I'm not even sure what this means).
Executive Summary	Recovery Strategy	ES-4; second paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*would substantial ly improve*
Executive Summary	Recovery Goals, Objectives, and Criteria	ES-5; second full paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*allow s confirmation*
Executive Summary	Recovery Goals, Objectives, and Criteria	ES-5; second full paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*Implement conjunctive use program where appropriate* -Explain what this is for readers who aren't familiar with this term.
Executive Summary	Recovery Goals, Objectives, and Criteria	ES-7 to ES-9;	PFMC - Staff	Some items in this list seem redundant – for example, *Reclaim/restore floodplain and riparian habitat throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, and the Delta* and *Replenish spawning gravel and restore riparian habitat below dams* and *implement programs to restore access to properly functioning habitat that was historically available.* It would be helpful to divide this list into categories (for example, "Habitat Restoration," "Non-native Species," "Irrigation screening") and then number the recommendations so that they are easier to refer to.
Executive Summary	Recovery Actions	ES-10; first paragraph	PFMC - Staff	R*educed ocean harvest needed to recover CV salmonids*. Determine basis for this statement, contrast with statement: *improved water conservation, flow and temperature conditions likely required for recovery* (this statement grammatically incorrect), *and recovery unlikely without restoring functional habitat and access.* Harvest and striped bass have been around a long time and the stocks weren't listed until water development occurred, so it seems the threats are improperly emphasized. You could eliminate ocean harvest and striped bass and still not recover the stocks.
Executive Summary	Implementation and Cost Estimates	ES-10;second paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*This change can only be accomplished with effective outreach and education, strong partnerships, focused recovery strategies and solution-oriented thinking that can shift agency and societal attitudes, practices and understanding.* This is a good point and emphasizes the need for social science knowledge (as opposed to just biological/technical knowledge) as a part of the recovery effort.
Executive Summary	Implementation and Cost Estimate	ES-10; third paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*generally and specifically…* delete.

Comment Type (General,Chapter Title, Appendix Title, or Attachment Title)	Section Name	Page #	Reviewer	Comment
Executive Summary	Implementation and Cost Estimate	ES-10; third paragraph	PFMC - Staff	Are NMFS 2006 and the PRD Strategic Plan the same thing? If so then use the same terminology, if not, cite the PRDSP and list in references. (1st and 2nd sentence: …*(NMFS 2006). This document also outlines…*)
Executive Summary	Implementation and Cost Estimate	ES-10; fifth paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*to other entities that implement actions that ~~may~~ impact the species' recovery*.
Introduction	Salmon and Steelhead at Risk	Page 3 last paragraph	PFMC - Staff	list of factors should include pollutants (toxins, pesticides, etc.) and ecological effects on prey species. A need to improve habitat is indicated, not a likely need to improve habitat (see above).
Introduction	The Recovery Planning Process	Page 4 fourth and fifth paragraph	PFMC - Staff	inconsistent referencing of NMFS 2006
Background	Winter Ruyn Chinook Salmon Brief Overview	Page 8 last paragraph	PFMC - Staff	*(3) continued threats ~~to~~ <u>from</u> the "take" of winter Chinook …* Should define "take" here.
Background	Winter Run Chinook Salmon Brief Overview	Page 9	PFMC - Staff	no threats from harvest identified, all spatial, diversity, water quality/quantity, diversions, future development, habitat degradations, and water demand.
Background	Reasons for Listing	Page 26	PFMC - Staff	high ocean harvest rates identified as contributing to the decline (presumably to listing?).
Recovery Strategy	Applied strategic framework; Winter Chinook	Page 72	PFMC - Staff	*The population easily satisfies the low risk criteria for population size.* So why is ocean harvest a very high stressor? Harvest isn't even mentioned in this section.
Recovery Strategy	Recovery Plan Strategy	Pages 74-75	PFMC - Staff	Harvest issues are not identified in either short- or long-term approaches. This indicates ocean harvest not a serious problem.
Recovery Goals, Objectives and Criteria	Factor WR-2	Page 84	PFMC - Staff	Overutilization no longer a significant impact on winter Chinook, i.e., threat removed.
Recovery Goals, Objectives and Criteria	Criterion WR-2.1	Page 84	PFMC - Staff	CVRP recommends monitoring/assessment, improved models, reporting, etc. While these recommendations could provide some useful management information, they don't seem to address any specific threat from fishing.
Recovery Actions	General Recovery Actions	Pages 98-100	PFMC - Staff	*no particular order.* Should attempt some organization, e.g., spring/fall Chinook spawning isolation should be near hatchery operations, should be near Fishery management, etc.

Comment Type (General,Chapter Title, Appendix Title, or Attachment Title)	Section Name	Page #	Reviewer	Comment
Implementation and Cost Estimates	Section 7	Page 105	PFMC - Staff	*adopt emergency no-incidental take policy for winter-run Chinook...* This seems drastic, what specific threat does this address? Does this include fisheries?
Implementation and Cost Estimates	Section 7	Page 105	PFMC - Staff	*Develop a mitigation policy ...* This should include a policy to enforce past mitigation agreements, including fish production.
Appendix A	2.3.1.2	Page 2-12	PFMC - Staff	Ocean harvest reduction based on CVI harvest index reductions, not winter Chinook exploitation rate reductions. Seasonal closures should have had greater effect on winter Chinook ER's than on CVI harvest index. Also there is a difference between the CVI and the CVI harvest index: The CVI is an index of abundance, the CVI harvest index is ocean harvest south of Point Arena divided by the CVI.
Appendix A	2.3.8.1	Page 2-44	PFMC - Staff	*…release of ~~adipose fin clipped~~ coded wire tagged…*
Appendix A	2.4.2	Page 2-50	PFMC - Staff	The list should be in prioritized order, ocean harvest should not appear second.
Appendix A	2.3.8.1	Page 2-44	PFMC - Staff	The CVI harvest index also fell because the ESA consultation standard for California Coastal Chinook constrained ocean harvest (≤ 16.0% ag-4 ocean harvest rate on Klamath River fall Chinook). But regardless, winter run effects were greater because seasons exclude them more than Sacramento fall Chinook. Also, averages are better representations than ranges or single years (e.g., CVI HI averaged 63% from 1991-2000 and 40% from 2001-2007).
Attachment A	Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix	Page A-1-5	PFMC - Staff	There are seven specific stressors for Adult immigration and holding: Passage Impediments/Barriers, not six.
Attachment A	Juvenile Rearing and Outmigration: Predation	Page A-1-5	PFMC - Staff	No stressor for the ocean?
Attachment A	Adult immigration and holding	Page A-1-5	PFMC - Staff	No stressor for the river or ocean?
Attachment A	Embryo Incubation	Page A-1-5	PFMC - Staff	No stressor for flows (redd dewatering, scouring), or Short-term Inwater Construction (sedimentation, turbidity, hazardous spills, etc).

Comment Type (General,Chapter Title, Appendix Title, or Attachment Title)	Section Name	Page #	Reviewer	Comment
Attachment A	Winter-run Chinook Salmon Stressor Matrix	Page A-1-5	PFMC - Staff	Number of individual stressors is arbitrary, and heavily influences categorization, e.g., there is only one stressor listed for the ocean (harvest). Lumping freshwater and ocean fisheries results in multiplication by 6, separating them would result in much different classifications. Fishing is not the only thing in the ocean environment that stresses salmon.
Appendix B	Table 2-1	Page 2-5	PFMC - Staff	An ecosystem based model would provide additional information on winter Chinook life history factors, but wouldn't necessarily provide any additional protection. The current management regime already prohibits fishing in most time/area cells where winter Chinook are present in the Ocean.

SALMON TECHNICAL TEAM REPORT ON THE CENTRAL VALLEY RECOVERY PLAN

The Council requested that the Salmon Technical Team (STT) provide comments on the co-manager review Draft Recovery Plan For The Evolutionarily Significant Units of Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and the Distinct Population Segment of Central Valley Steelhead. The STT has three general comments on this document, and refers to more specific comments developed by Council staff.

In the Recovery Plan narrative, harvest impacts on winter run Chinook are generally noted to be small. The document asserts that changes in ocean harvest regulations since 1995 have significantly reduced harvest and that "…overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific or educational purposes no longer appears to have a significant impact on winter run Chinook salmon populations…" (p.84). However, this assessment is in contrast to the winter run stressor matrix (Attachment A) which ranks ocean harvest as a very high stressor. The STT noted no analysis that clearly indicated that harvest impacts had changed since 1995, or that harvest impacts have a significant effect on winter run Chinook presently. The "very high" stressor ranking of ocean harvest appears to be a product of (1) the high weight of the ocean harvest specific stressor and (2) the large number of harvest/angling impact stressors from other areas of the Sacramento River system, Delta, and San Francisco Bay. It is not clear whether the ocean harvest "very high" stressor ranking is due primarily to the construction method of the winter run stressor matrix or whether the ocean harvest stressor ranking is robust to matrix construction details. The STT would prefer additional analysis of available winter run ocean harvest data that allows for resolution of the differences in the narrative of the report and the winter run stressor matrix.

The second comment from the STT concerns the omission of non-harvest ocean factors in the winter run stressor matrix. Ocean conditions can have a profound effect on salmon abundance, a key factor in population viability. However, this factor is not listed in the stressor matrix. The STT notes that winter run Chinook run size decreased sharply in the late 1970s, a time when ocean conditions are thought to have changed from favorable to unfavorable for salmon in the California Current. The opposite is true in the late 1990s, when winter run Chinook abundance increased somewhat. In the winter run Chinook stressor matrix, the only specific stressor listed for the ocean was harvest/angling impacts. The STT believes that ocean climate and ecosystem factors should be added to the winter run Chinook matrix and given attention in the report narrative.

The third comment concerns the Central Valley Technical Recovery Team recommendation for all hatchery fish to be marked in some way to allow for reliable estimation of hatchery straying to natural spawning areas. The STT notes that 100 percent marking is not strictly necessary for estimating stray rates. The recent implementation of constant fractional marking (p. 67) will allow for reliable estimation of hatchery stray rates, given adequate escapement monitoring. Without adequate escapement sampling, even 100 percent marking cannot provide reliable estimation of hatchery straying.

In addition to these general comments, the STT acknowledges and agrees with the list of specific comments from Council staff, located in Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 2.

PFMC
8/20/08

SALMON ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON SALMON METHODOLOGY REVIEW

A list of priority candidate items that the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) may consider for the 2008 Salmon Methodology Review was adopted by the Council at the April meeting. The current status of these items is described as follows:

1. Sensitivity analysis of Chinook and Coho Fishery Regulation Assessment Models (FRAM) to major assumptions, including sensitivity to parameters related to mark-selective fisheries.
   - The Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) recommends review of the FRAM sensitivity analysis at this year's review.

2. Development of a new stock abundance forecast for Sacramento River fall Chinook.
   - The SAS recommends review of the Sacramento stock abundance forecast at this year's review.

3. Harvest forecast model for Sacramento River fall Chinook.
   - The SAS requests the Salmon Technical Team incorporate September and October fisheries in the harvest forecast model.

4. Lower Columbia River natural (LCN) coho Endangered Species Act consultation standard.
   - The SAS requests Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife develop a recovery plan for LCN coho as quickly as possible to facilitate reconsultation.

5. September 1 maturity boundary ("birth date") for Klamath River fall Chinook (KRFC).
   - The SAS requests the Salmon Technical Team proceed with this topic as soon as practical and also incorporate September and October fisheries in the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model.

The SAS also requests that coded-wire tag (CWT) information used by California Department of Fish and Game for KRFC run reconstruction for the return years 2005-2007 be made available to the SAS immediately, and for future years as it becomes available prior to the March Council meeting.

PFMC
09/07/08

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON SALMON METHODOLOGY REVIEW

Dr. Robert Kope indicated that reports will be available for three of the five items previously identified for possible review this fall:

1. Sensitivity analysis of Chinook and Coho Fishery Regulation Assessment Models to major assumptions including sensitivity to parameters related to mark-selective fisheries (this will be a preliminary report).

2. Development of a new stock abundance forecast for Sacramento River fall Chinook.

3. Harvest forecast model for Sacramento River fall Chinook.

Reports will not be available for the other two:

4. September 1 maturity boundary ("birth date") for Klamath River fall Chinook.

5. Lower Columbia River natural coho Endangered Species Act consultation standard.

While there is still considerable interest in these last two topics, the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) understands that the emergent nature of the second and third topics placed those at a higher priority. The SSC looks forward to reviewing the reports on the first three topics at the November meeting. As always, the SSC requires good documentation and ample review time to make efficient use of the SSC Salmon Subcommittee's time. Materials to be reviewed should be submitted at least two weeks prior to the scheduled review. Agencies should be responsible for ensuring that materials submitted to the SSC are technically sound, comprehensive, clearly documented, and identified by author.

PFMC
09/08/08

Agenda Item D.2.b
West Coast Salmon Work Group Progress Report PowerPoint
September 2008

NOAA Fisheries Sponsored Working Group to Assess the Causes of Recent Salmon Decline

Churchill B. Grimes
NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center
and
John E. Stein
NMFS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center

What's the Problem/Why was the Working Group Formed?

The Central Valley Index = Chinook ocean harvest South of Pt. Arena + CV Chinook spawner escapement

CV Chinook: SRFC + SJFC + SRLFC + SRWC + CVSC



Composition of the Scientific Working Group

- Co-chairs– Churchill Grimes (SWFSC) and John Stein (NWFSC)
- NOAA members – Daniel Bottom (NWFSC), John Ferguson (NWFSC) , Peter Lawson (NWFSC), Steven Lindley (SWFSC), Bruce McFarland (SWFSC), William Peterson (NWFSC), Carlos Garza (SWFSC), Michael Mohr (SWFSC), Brian Wells (SWFSC), Robert Kope (NWFSC), Robin Webb (OAR, ESRL), Tracy Collier (NWFSC), and Frank Schwing (SWFSC)
- PFMC – Chuck Tracy
- CDFG – Alice Low, Melodie Palmer-Zwahlen, and Allen Grover
- ODFW –Kelly Moore
- WDFW – Craig Busak
- USFWS-CA – James Smith
- Academia – Loo Botsford, UC Davis, David Hankin, Humboldt State University, and James Anderson, University of Washington.

Charge to the Working Group

- Consider potential causes of the recent collapse of SRFC, and what may be a broader depression of salmon productivity for stocks involved in west coast fisheries from the Sacramento River north to Puget Sound.
- Specifically examine potential factors provided in a PFMC list that could have contributed to the low survival of the 2004 and 2005 brood years in the attempt to identify possible causative factors.
- Assess whether the performance of current stock predictors can be improved by incorporating ocean environmental information.
- Develop research and monitoring recommendations for improving the understanding of causes of decline and stock forecasts.
- Produce an interim and final report to PFMC and submit a paper for publication in a peer reviewed journal.

Process and Schedule – Completed

(1) **First Working Group Meeting** (July 28-29, 2008): Internal organizational meeting to confirm the approach, further develop TOR for conducting analysis and synthesis of available information, identification of information gaps, organize how the report will be developed and method to collect existing data, etc.

(2) **First Formal Working Group Meeting** (August 29, 2008 in Sacramento, California): Conduct a public meeting to seek data and input on the issue from interested individuals and agencies. Knowledgeable parties will be invited and asked to bring data on subjects pertinent to assessing the possible causes for the decline.

(3) **Attend NCEAS Pelagic Organism Decline Working Group Meeting** (September 2-4, 2008 in Santa Barbara): Participate in ongoing work group to assess impacts of water quality on pelagic organisms in the delta to determine if this work group has information suggesting impacts to Sacramento River fall Chinook.

(3) **Status Report to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council** at the September 7-12, 2008 meeting in Boise, Idaho. The status report will summarize progress to date. The report is expected to yield analysis that some potential factors listed above are not likely explanations for the decline of the SRFC stock, and will be eliminated from further examination.

Accomplishments- First Working Group Meeting (July 28-29, 2008)

Presentations and Discussions :

1. Biology of Central Valley Fall Chinook and Local Patterns and Trends (Lindley)
2. Biology of Coastal Coho and Regional Patterns and Trends (Lawson)
3. Central Valley Freshwater and Estuarine System and Recent Trends (Smith)
4. Central Valley Freshwater and Delta Survival Studies (McFarlane)
5. West Coast Regional-Scale Freshwater Events (CA to Canada) (Webb, via webcast)
6. California Current Large Marine Ecosystem Recent Conditions, Trend, and Forecasting: Northern CA Current (B. Peterson)
7. California Current Large Marine Ecosystem Recent Conditions, Trend, and Forecasting: Southern CA Current (B. Wells)
8. Current PFMC Predictors of Ocean Stock Abundance and Recent Trends (Mohr)
9. Review of list of possible causes of decline

Accomplishments- First Working Group Meeting (July 28-29, 2008)

Organization and Assignments:

- Developed draft outline of the report
- Developed list of data needs and gaps
- Established three work teams: (1) Grimes, Stein, Tracy, Mohr, Kope and Grover (2) Peterson, Moore, Lawson, Busack, Webb and Schwing and (3) Lindley, Ferguson, Botsford, Wells, Smith, Low, Palmer-Zwahlen, Bottom, MacFarlane and Collier).
- Each team developed a list of assignments to complete

Potential Causes of Failure of the 2004 and 2005 Broods of Sacramento River Fall Chinook Salmon

Freshwater Biological Focus

- *Was the level of parent spawners too low, for natural or hatchery populations?*
- *Was the level of parent spawners too high, for natural or hatchery populations?*
- *Was there a disease event in the hatchery or natural spawning areas?*
- Was there a disease event in the egg incubation, fry emergence, rearing, or downstream migration phases?
- *Was there any disease event during the return phase of the 2 year old jacks?*
- *Were there mortalities at the time of trucking and release of hatchery fish?*
- *Was there a change in the pattern of on-site release of hatchery fingerlings compared to trucked downstream release?*
- Was there a change in recovery, spawning and/or release strategies during hatchery operations?
- *Did thermal marking occur for any hatchery releases? What were the effects of this or other studies (e.g. genetic stock identification of parental broodstock)?*
- Was there a change in the methodology or operations of the San Francisco Bay net pen 'acclimation' program for trucked hatchery fish?
- Were there any problems with fish food or chemicals used at hatcheries?

Potential Causes of Failure of the 2004 and 2005 Broods of Sacramento River Fall Chinook Salmon

Freshwater Habitat Areas Focus

- Were there drought or flood conditions during the spawning, incubation, or rearing phases?
- Was there any pollution event where juveniles were present?
- Was there anything unusual about the flow conditions below dams during the spawning, incubation, or rearing phases?
- Were there any in-water construction events (bridge building, etc.) when this brood was present in freshwater or estuarine areas?
- Was there anything unusual about the water withdrawals in the rivers or estuary areas when this brood was present?
- *Was there an oil spill in the estuary when the 2005 brood was present, as juveniles or jacks?*

Potential Causes of Failure of the 2004 and 2005 Broods of Sacramento River Fall Chinook Salmon

Freshwater Habitat Areas Focus (cont.)

- Was there any unusual temperature or other limnological conditions when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?
- Was there any unusual population dynamics of typical food or prey species used by juvenile Chinook salmon in the relevant freshwater and estuarine areas?
- Was there anything unusual, in the same context as above for juvenile rearing and outmigration phases, about habitat factors during the return of the 2 year olds from this brood?
- *Were there any deleterious effects caused by miscellaneous human activities (e.g., construction, waterfront industries, pollution) within the delta and San Francisco bay areas?*
- Was there a change in the recovery of juvenile outmigrants observed in the USFWS mid-water trawl surveys and other monitoring programs in the Delta.

Potential Causes of Failure of the 2004 and 2005 Broods of Sacramento River Fall Chinook Salmon

Freshwater Species Interactions Focus

- *Was there any unusual predation by bird species when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?*
- *Was there any unusual sea lion abundance or behavior when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?*
- Was there any unusual striped bass population dynamics or behavior when this brood was in freshwater or estuarine areas?
- *Were northern pike present in any freshwater or estuarine areas where this brood was present?*
- Is there a relationship between declining Delta smelt, longfin smelt, and threadfin shad populations in the Delta and Central Valley Chinook survival?
- *Was there additional in-river competition or predation with increased hatchery steelhead production?*

Potential Causes of Failure of the 2004 and 2005 Broods of Sacramento River Fall Chinook Salmon

Marine Biological Focus

- Was there anything unusual about the ocean migration pattern of the 2004 and 2005 broods?
- Was there anything unusual about the recovery of tagged fish groups from the 2004 and 2005 broods the ocean salmon fisheries?
- *Has the bycatch in non-salmonid fisheries (e.g., whiting, groundfish) increased?*

Potential Causes of Failure of the 2004 and 2005 Broods of Sacramento River Fall Chinook Salmon

Marine Habitat Focus

- Were there periods of reduced upwelling or other oceanographic physical conditions during the period of smolt entry into the marine environment, or during the period of marine residence up to the return to freshwater of the jacks?
- *Were there any effects to these fish from the 'dead zones' reported off Oregon and Washington in recent years?*
- Were plankton levels depressed off California, especially during the smolt entry periods?
- *Was there a relationship to an increase in krill fishing worldwide?*
- Oceanography: temperature, salinity, upwelling, currents, red tide, etc.
- *Were there any oil spills or other pollution events during the period of ocean residence?*
- *Was there any aquaculture occurring in the ocean residence area?*
- *Was there any offshore construction in the area of ocean residence, for wave energy or other purposes?*

Potential Causes of Failure of the 2004 and 2005 Broods of Sacramento River Fall Chinook Salmon

Marine Species Interactions Focus

- Were there any unusual population dynamics of typical food or prey species used by juvenile Chinook salmon in marine areas? (plankton, krill, juvenile anchovy or sardines, etc.)
- Was there an increase in bird predation on juvenile salmonids caused by a reduction in the availability of other forage food?
- *Was there an increase of marine mammal predation on these broods?*
- *Was there predation on salmonids by Humboldt squid?*
- Was there increased predation on salmonids by other finfish species (e.g., lingcod)?

Cumulative Ecosystem Effects Focus

- factors?
- Were there other ecosystem effects?
- Were there synergistic effects of significant

Accomplishments- First Formal Working Group Meeting (August 29, 2008 in Sacramento, California)

Attendance

Name	*Affiliation*
Anderson , Jim	Half Moon Bay
Brandes, Pat	USFWS
Chappell, Erin	DWR
Duran , Joe	CDFG – Ocean Salmon Project
Fosmark , Kathy	PFMC council member
Goldenberg, David	California Salmon Council
Hannon, John	USBOR
Hashagen , Ken	Hanson Environmental
Israel, Josh	UC Davis
Kuivila, Kathryn	USGS
Lee , Dennis P.	Craimer Fish Sciences
Lee , G. Fred	G. Fred Lee and Associates
MacLean, Duncan	SAS PFMC
McIsaac, Don	PFMC
Obegi, Doug	NRDC
Pierce , Paul	SAS PFMC
Rosenfield, Jon	The Bay Institute
Van Ruiten , Anthony J.	Best, Best and Krieger
Webb, Kim	USFWS
Williams , John	independent consultant
Witalis, Shirley	NMFS
Workman, Michelle	EBMUD

Workgroup Members in attendance

Anderson, Jim	University of Washington
Botsford, Louis	U. C. Davis
Collier, Tracy	NWFSC-Seattle
Ferguson, John	NWFSC-Seattle
Garza, Carlos	SWFSC-Santa Cruz
Grimes, Churchill	SWFSC-Santa Cruz
Lindley, Steve	SWFSC-Santa Cruz
Low, Alice	CDFG
MacFarlane, Bruce	SWFSC-Santa Cruz
Mohr, Michael	SWFSC-Santa Cruz
Smith, Jim	USFWS
Stein, John	NWFSC-Seattle
Tracy, Chuck	PFMC-Portland
Williams, Tommy	SWFSC-Santa Cruz

Presentations

- Brandes- Temporal trends in juvenile abundance in the delta
- Williams- Temporal trends in hatchery and natural production

Process and Schedule – To Do

(4) **A public comment meeting in California** (January 2009): This meeting will provide an opportunity for constituent input and comment.

(5) **Draft Final Report** presented formally at the April 4-9, 2009 Council meeting in Millbrae, California.

(6) **Submission of a manuscript** to a scientific journal describing results of the working group analysis and conclusions, Spring 2009.

Extra

Outline of Report

I. SRFC collapse

II. Regional forcing and response

III. Unusual Events
   - 04/05/06 brood years

IV. Conclusions (recent collapse)

V. Biocomplexity

VI. Recommendations
   - research and management

HABITAT COMMITTEE REPORT ON PROGRESS REPORT ON CAUSES OF THE 2008 SALMON FAILURE

The Habitat Committee (HC) reviewed both the workgroup report on Sacramento fall Chinook and the recovery plan for Central Valley winter and spring Chinook and steelhead. The HC noted several topics common to both reports. Since both processes are occurring in the same system, there is an opportunity for integration and cooperation of the two processes. The HC recommends this Sacramento fall Chinook progress report in particular needs to focus on actions that the Council can take to address the decline in stocks, rather than only enumerating potential causes of stock decline.

While the HC supports eliminating topics from the "laundry list" of potential causative factors, it is difficult to support deletions from the list without knowing the reasoning behind the deletion. The HC also advises the authors to ensure that seemingly minimal factors are not eliminated from an analysis of cumulative impacts.

The HC has the following comments:

- We would like to see more inquiry into hatchery/wild interactions. For example, it is critical to differentiate between hatchery and wild fish on the spawning grounds, and to understand variations in survival between the two groups that could be important for forecasting.
- There appears to be a large gap in information on survival and passage below the Delta and into San Francisco Bay. Estuary survival can be an extremely important component of stock performance.
- It is not clear whether observer data from non-salmon fisheries (for example, whiting) were examined in order to rule out this potential source of Sacramento fall Chinook mortality.
- When considering unusual population dynamics of prey species in the ocean, the authors should also consider harvest impacts to prey species. The Council controls harvest on many salmon prey species and this seems to be a "low-hanging fruit" item in terms of short-term Council actions.
- The HC notes that pollution events have been deleted from the list of potential causal factors. Pesticides and herbicides pose as much or more of a threat at the "background" levels seen in salmon streams. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and National Marine Fisheries Service are obligated as a result of litigation to examine the effects of over 30 pesticides and herbicides found in salmon streams for their effects on these fish. The results of this evaluation might be of importance to the workgroup.
- The HC is encouraged to see that revisions to forecasting and harvest impacts modeling for Sacramento fall Chinook are already underway, and that existing assumptions about fish/habitat interactions will be challenged in those models.

Each of the above comments reinforces the ecosystem-based approach to improving fish management.

PFMC
9/9/08

SALMON ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON PROGRESS REPORT ON CAUSES OF THE 2008 SALMON FAILURE

The Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) had two members attend the biological technical meeting in Sacramento, CA on August 19, but was disappointed with the attendance and participation by relevant agencies. The SAS hopes that information from those agencies and others will be forwarded to the Work Group through their information collection email address at salmon.decline.data@noaa.gov. The SAS is concerned that the schedule and timeline are ambitious, and encourages the Work Group to allow adequate time for additional public feedback into the process.

In addition to these general comments, the SAS acknowledges and agrees with the list of specific comments from Council staff, located in Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 2.

PFMC
9/7/08

Agenda Item D.2.d
Supplemental SSC Report
September 2008

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON PROGRESS REPORT ON CAUSES OF THE 2008 SALMON FAILURE

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed progress of the Scientific Working Group to Evaluate the Decline in Sacramento River Fall Chinook Salmon and Other West Coast Salmon in discussion with Dr. Robert Kope and Mr. Chuck Tracy. The SSC considered the revised list of possible causes and agreed that it was valuable to eliminate as many items as possible. However, the SSC could not evaluate the list as presented because there were no rationales provided for the deleted items. With regard to the remaining items, the SSC is concerned that data may not be available to address all of them. Even for those items with adequate data the working group will be challenged to provide rigorous analyses between now and April. The SSC recommends that the working group consider whether the recent failure was an acute event or the result of a chronic problem, as this will have bearing on the appropriate management response in the event of future failures. For example, if the resilience of the stock has been reduced, this may affect the response of the stock to climate fluctuations or other stressors.

The SSC will review the working group's draft document in April, 2009.

PFMC
9/08/08

Agenda Item D.3.b
Supplemental NMFS PowerPoint
September 2008

Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan Update

Maria Rea
Supervisor
Sacramento Area Office
National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA Fisheries
(916) 930-3600

NMFS Priorities in Central Valley

- Using best science: "viable salmonid population"
- Recovery Plan: working in partnerships
- Long-term OCAP Consultation
- Bay Delta Conservation Plan
- FERC and Levee consultations
- Hatcheries
- San Joaquin River Restoration

Recovery Plan
Timeline

- Species include Winter- and Spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead
- Draft for co-manager review distributed in Mid May. 45 Day review period
- Independent Peer Review in October
- Public Review Draft expected to be released in November – 60 day review
- Final Recovery Plan by early to mid 2009

Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon Distribution




Winter-run Chinook Salmon
Number of Spawners
60000
50000
40000
30000
20000
10000
0
1970
1973
1976
1979
1982
1985
1988
1991
1994
1997
2000
2003
2006

Spring-run Chinook Salmon Distribution




Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon
Mill, Deer, Butte Creek Populations
Spawning Escapement
24,000
22,000
20,000
18,000
16,000
14,000
12,000
10,000
8,000
6,000
4,000
2,000
0
1960
1963
1966
1969
1972
1975
1978
1981
1984
1987
1990
1993
1996
1999
2002
2005

Central Valley Steelhead Distribution


Central Valley Steelhead
18000
16000
14000
12000
10000
8000
6000
4000
2000
0
Total Hatchery
Total Wild
1967
1970
1973
1976
1979
1982
1985
1988
1991
1994
1997
2000

"VSP" = Viable Salmonid Population



Recovery Plan
Definition of Recovery

- Recovery is defined as… "the process by which listed species and their ecosystems are restored and their future is safeguarded to the point that protections under the ESA are no longer needed."*

*NMFS Interim Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Planning Guidance, October 2004

Recovery Strategy

Foundational Principles

1. Recovery must address the entire natural (freshwater, estuarine, and ocean) and cultural ecosystem (human developments);
2. Sustained salmonid productivity requires a network of complex and interconnected habitats, which are created, altered, and maintained by natural physical process;
3. Life history diversity, genetic diversity, and metapopulation organization are ways that salmonids adapt to complex and connected habitats under changing environmental conditions (Williams 2006).

Recovery Plan
Components

- Population Identification
- Assessment of Threats
- Conservation Efforts
- Recovery/Conservation Strategy
- Recovery Goals/Objectives: precursor to recovery criteria
- Population/ESU/DPS recovery criteria
- Site-specific Management Actions
- Objective Measurable Criteria
- Implementation Schedule/Costs

Recovery Plan

Threats Assessment

A "threat" or "stressor" is a factor, typically anthropogenic, that may have adverse effects on species – water quality, high temperatures, dams and passage, fishing, hatcheries and genetics, etc.

- Threats assessment forms scientific foundation
- Prioritization of threats = prioritization of recovery actions

Threats Assessment Development

Identify and Rank Stressors

Primary Stressors

- Passage Impediments/Barriers
- Angling/Harvest Impacts
- Water Temperature
- Water Quality
- Flow Conditions
- Loss of Riparian Habitat and Instream Cover
- Loss of Natural River Morphology
- Loss of Floodplain Habitat
- Loss of Tidal Marsh Habitat
- Spawning Habitat Availability
- Invasive Species/Food Web Changes
- Entrainment
- Predation
- Hatchery Effects
- Short-term Inwater Construction
- Ocean Conditions

- Individual primary stressors affecting each life stage were ranked
  - Criteria for Ranking Stressors
    - Scope (geographic)
    - Severity
    - Frequency (temporal)
    - Persistence
    - Likelihood
  - Stressors include only those that act on specific life stages and can potentially be alleviated through specific recovery actions.

Threats Assessment Development

Identify Spring-run Chinook salmon Populations

- Diversity Groups
  - NW California
  - Basalt and Porous Lava
  - Northern Sierra Nevada

(Lindley *et al*. 2007)



Threats Assessment Results

Threats Common to all Diversity Groups



Threats Assessment Results

Basalt and Porous Lava Diversity Group



Northern Sierra Nevada Diversity Group

Northwestern California Diversity Group

Recovery Actions

Central Valley

- Second population of winter run in Battle Creek
- Conduct a Central Valley-wide assessment of keystone dams and passage opportunities
- Promote Federal, State and local initiatives and programs to improve water conservation, water re-use, and conjunctive use
- Decrease ocean harvest of listed stocks
- Implement a program to re-establish a more naturally-functioning Delta
- Implement programs to control non-native predators
- Develop and support public education and outreach programs

Recovery Criteria

ESU-level Criteria

1. Diversity Group population demographics as informed by modeling results, indicating that the ESU is viable
2. Two or more viable populations within each Diversity Group

Population-level Criteria

1. The effective population size must be > 500 or the population size must be > 2,500
2. The population growth rate must show that a decline is not apparent or probable
3. There must be no apparent or minimal risk of a catastrophic disturbance occurring
4. Hatchery influence must be low, as determined by levels corresponding to different amounts, durations and sources of hatchery strays (Lindley *et al*. 2007)

Recovery Strategy

Implementation

1. Stakeholder Cooperation
2. Local Initiatives
3. Public Support
4. Adaptive Management and Monitoring

Implementation Teams

1. Keep momentum going
2. Track and guide progress

HABITAT COMMITTEE COMMENTS ON CENTRAL VALLEY SALMON RECOVERY PLAN

The Habitat Committee (HC) reviewed the recovery plan for Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook, Central Valley (CV) spring Chinook, and Central Valley steelhead (Agenda Item D.3). The HC found the table of impacts helpful, and we agreed with the general near-term strategic approach to recovery, but we believed that the longer-term strategic approach to recovery lacked detail.

The HC notes that long-term recovery criteria at the population level do not appear to accommodate any kind of harvest.

While the plan provides a good summary of the socio-political background and limiting factors and threats, it does not identify specific ways to achieve actions identified for recovery. For example, the Recovery Plan needs to specify how many miles and types of habitat need to be recovered for rearing and migration and what changes are needed in water management.

The HC recommends that the Recovery Plan actions:

- Delineate water use and management recommendations intended to recover the species. For example, the Recovery Plan needs to specify flow regimes needed to ensure water during critical times in life history (juvenile and adult migration, spawning) for each species;
- Identify habitat restoration activities and locations in the CV including mainstem, tributaries and estuarine habitat;
- Investigate genetic introgression effects due to hatchery straying as related to off-site release strategies;
- Investigate predator interactions, especially with regard to exotic species (stripped bass and fresh water bass);
- Document and enumerate actions needed to reduce bycatch of listed stocks in non-salmon (e.g., whiting) fisheries; and
- Improvements to estuarine passage and survival rates are called for in the Recovery Plan. However, the HC notes that existing monitoring programs are insufficient to pinpoint bottlenecks or measure improvements in survival and passage.

PFMC
09/09/08

SALMON ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON THE CENTRAL VALLEY SALMON RECOVERY PLAN

The Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) briefly reviewed the materials on the co-manager review Draft Recovery Plan for the Evolutionarily Significant Units of Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and the Distinct Population Segment of Central Valley Steelhead (Central Valley Recovery Plan; CVRP).

The SAS recommends that a natural hydrograph be a higher priority than pulsed flows, which can have detrimental effects such as dewatering redds and juvenile stranding.

The SAS feels that the introduction of chemical herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers are a significant threat to recovery of Central Valley salmonids, and recommends that the CVRP require agricultural application of these substances be regulated under the Clean Water Act, and monitored by appropriate state and/or Federal agencies, as opposed to industry self monitoring.

The SAS wants to emphasize its agreement with staff comments that it appears that the CVRP cites ocean harvest effects as a greater threat to recovery of winter Chinook than can be supported by the available data or the recovery actions.

In addition to these specific comments, the SAS acknowledges and agrees with the list of comments from Council staff, located in Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 2.

PFMC
9/7/08