

Draft Restoration Strategies for the San Joaquin River

February 2003

Prepared for

Friant Water Users Authority

854 N. Harvard Ave
Lindsay, CA 93247

And

Natural Resources Defense Council

71 Stevenson St, Suite 1825
San Francisco, CA 94105

Prepared by

Stillwater Sciences
2532 Durant Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94704



Stillwater Sciences



Draft Restoration Strategies for the San Joaquin River

Prepared for
Natural Resources Defense Council
71 Stevenson Street, Suite 1825
San Francisco, CA 94105
and
Friant Water Users Authority
854 North Harvard Ave.
Lindsay, CA 93247

Prepared by
Stillwater Sciences
2532 Durant Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94704

February 2003

Table of Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|--------------|
| 1 | Purpose | 1-1 |
| 2 | Introduction | 2-1 |
| 2.1 | Planning Area | 2-1 |
| 2.2 | Themes | 2-3 |
| 2.2.1 | <i>Existing Flood Conveyance Capacity Theme (Strategy 1)</i> | 2-3 |
| 2.2.2 | <i>Salmonid-oriented Management Theme (Strategy 2)</i> | 2-4 |
| 2.2.3 | <i>Riparian-oriented Management Theme (Strategy 3)</i> | 2-4 |
| 2.3 | Four Key Issues | 2-4 |
| 2.3.1 | <i>Existing or expanded conveyance capacity</i> | 2-5 |
| 2.3.2 | <i>Salmon rearing focused in Reach 1 or all reaches</i> | 2-6 |
| 2.3.3 | <i>Routing flow, fish, and sediment through or around Mendota Pool and Dam</i> | 2-6 |
| 2.3.4 | <i>Routing flow and fish through a restored mainstem channel in Reach 4B or through an alternative pathway</i> | 2-7 |
| 2.4 | Structure of this Document..... | 2-8 |
| 2.5 | Uncertainty | 2-8 |
| 2.5.1 | <i>Satisfying the restoration objectives</i> | 2-8 |
| 2.5.2 | <i>Water temperatures</i> | 2-10 |
| 2.5.3 | <i>Extirpated salmon populations</i> | 2-12 |
| 2.5.4 | <i>Hydraulic modeling</i> | 2-12 |
| 2.5.5 | <i>Groundwater dynamics</i> | 2-13 |
| 3 | Conceptual Models for Key Ecosystem Components | 3.1-1 |
| 3.1 | Fluvial Geomorphology | 3.1-1 |
| 3.1.1 | <i>Geomorphic Context of the San Joaquin River</i> | 3.1-1 |
| 3.1.2 | <i>Fluvial Geomorphological Functions and Attributes of Alluvial Rivers</i> | 3.1-2 |
| 3.1.2.1 | Bed mobility and scour | 3.1-3 |
| 3.1.2.2 | Sediment budget and continuity..... | 3.1-3 |
| 3.1.2.3 | Channel migration..... | 3.1-4 |
| 3.1.2.4 | Floodplain inundation | 3.1-5 |
| 3.1.3 | <i>Fluvial Geomorphic Targets for the San Joaquin River</i> | 3.1-6 |
| 3.1.3.1 | Bed mobility and scour | 3.1-6 |
| 3.1.3.2 | Sediment supply and transport | 3.1-17 |
| 3.1.3.3 | Channel migration and avulsion | 3.1-22 |
| 3.1.3.4 | Floodplain formation and inundation..... | 3.1-24 |
| 3.1.4 | <i>Summary of Fluvial Geomorphic Targets</i> | 3.1-25 |
| 3.1.4.1 | Reach 1 | 3.1-25 |
| 3.1.4.2 | Reach 2 | 3.1-26 |
| 3.1.4.3 | Reach 3 | 3.1-26 |
| 3.1.4.4 | Reach 4 | 3.1-27 |
| 3.1.4.5 | Reach 5 | 3.1-27 |
| 3.2 | Chinook Salmon Populations | 3.2-1 |
| 3.2.1 | <i>Introduction</i> | 3.2-1 |
| 3.2.2 | <i>Approach</i> | 3.2-2 |

| | | |
|---------|---|--------|
| 3.2.3 | <i>Sources of parent stock</i> | 3.2-2 |
| 3.2.3.1 | Spring-run chinook salmon..... | 3.2-2 |
| 3.2.3.2 | Fall-run chinook salmon..... | 3.2-4 |
| 3.2.3.3 | Comparison of spring-run chinook salmon and fall-run chinook salmon..... | 3.2-5 |
| 3.2.3.4 | Introducing parent stock..... | 3.2-6 |
| 3.2.4 | <i>Chinook salmon life histories and habitat considerations</i> | 3.2-6 |
| 3.2.4.1 | Upstream migration..... | 3.2-6 |
| 3.2.4.2 | Adult holding..... | 3.2-8 |
| 3.2.4.3 | Spawning..... | 3.2-10 |
| 3.2.4.4 | Incubation..... | 3.2-13 |
| 3.2.4.5 | Freshwater rearing..... | 3.2-14 |
| 3.2.4.6 | Smoltification and outmigration..... | 3.2-18 |
| 3.2.5 | <i>Population dynamics</i> | 3.2-20 |
| 3.3 | Steelhead Populations..... | 3.3-1 |
| 3.3.1 | <i>Introduction</i> | 3.3-1 |
| 3.3.2 | <i>Potential sources of parent stock</i> | 3.3-2 |
| 3.3.3 | <i>Steelhead life histories and habitat considerations</i> | 3.3-3 |
| 3.3.3.1 | Upstream migration..... | 3.3-3 |
| 3.3.3.2 | Adult holding..... | 3.3-3 |
| 3.3.3.3 | Spawning..... | 3.3-3 |
| 3.3.3.4 | Freshwater rearing..... | 3.3-4 |
| 3.3.3.5 | Smoltification and outmigration..... | 3.3-5 |
| 3.4 | Resident Fish Populations..... | 3.4-1 |
| 3.4.1 | <i>Introduction</i> | 3.4-1 |
| 3.4.2 | <i>Overall vision and objectives for resident fish communities</i> | 3.4-1 |
| 3.4.3 | <i>Assumptions governing development of strategies for resident fish communities</i> | 3.4-2 |
| 3.4.4 | <i>Approach used to develop restoration strategies to benefit native fish</i> | 3.4-4 |
| 3.4.5 | <i>Restoration strategy considerations for analysis species</i> | 3.4-6 |
| 3.4.5.1 | Habitat requirements held in common by several analysis species..... | 3.4-6 |
| 3.4.5.2 | Pacific lamprey and Kern brook lamprey..... | 3.4-7 |
| 3.4.5.3 | Sacramento pikeminnow..... | 3.4-8 |
| 3.4.5.4 | Hardhead..... | 3.4-9 |
| 3.4.5.5 | Sacramento splittail..... | 3.4-9 |
| 3.4.5.6 | Hitch..... | 3.4-10 |
| 3.4.5.7 | Tule perch..... | 3.4-10 |
| 3.4.5.8 | Sacramento perch..... | 3.4-10 |
| 3.4.6 | <i>Restoration strategy measures anticipated to benefit native resident fish</i> | 3.4-13 |
| 3.4.6.1 | Inundating floodplains in the spring..... | 3.4-13 |
| 3.4.6.2 | Creating perennial wetlands on floodplains..... | 3.4-14 |
| 3.4.6.3 | Creating opportunities for Sacramento perch reintroduction..... | 3.4-14 |
| 3.4.6.4 | Flow management to reduce abundance and distribution of non-native fishes..... | 3.4-15 |
| 3.4.6.5 | Establishing a native fish community in Mendota Pool..... | 3.4-16 |
| 3.4.6.6 | Improving habitat connectivity..... | 3.4-16 |
| 3.5 | Riparian and Wetland Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat..... | 3.5-1 |
| 3.5.1 | <i>Overview of riparian and wetland vegetation and wildlife habitat restoration goals</i> | 3.5-1 |
| 3.5.2 | <i>Assumptions governing development of strategies for riparian and wetland vegetation and wildlife habitat</i> | 3.5-2 |
| 3.5.3 | <i>Riparian hydrograph components</i> | 3.5-3 |
| 3.5.3.1 | Indexing Flow Planning to Water Year Type..... | 3.5-4 |

| | | |
|----------|--|---------------|
| 3.5.3.2 | Interannual flow planning | 3.5-6 |
| 3.5.3.3 | Seedbed preparation flows | 3.5-7 |
| 3.5.3.4 | Recruitment flows | 3.5-7 |
| 3.5.3.5 | Seedling maintenance flows..... | 3.5-10 |
| 3.5.3.6 | Encroachment prevention flows..... | 3.5-10 |
| 3.5.4 | <i>Approach used to develop strategies for riparian and wetland vegetation and wildlife habitat.....</i> | <i>3.5-11</i> |
| 3.5.4.1 | Preservation of existing habitat..... | 3.5-12 |
| 3.5.4.2 | Promoting natural recruitment | 3.5-14 |
| 3.5.4.3 | Riparian and wetland considerations during floodplain reconstruction | 3.5-15 |
| 3.5.4.4 | Horticultural restoration | 3.5-15 |
| 3.5.4.5 | Landscape-level linkages and riparian habitat connectivity..... | 3.5-18 |
| 3.5.4.6 | Management of non-native invasive plant species | 3.5-20 |
| 3.5.5 | <i>Restoration targets for specific vegetation and habitat types.....</i> | <i>3.5-23</i> |
| 3.5.5.1 | Riparian forest and scrub | 3.5-23 |
| 3.5.5.2 | Valley oak woodland | 3.5-27 |
| 3.5.5.3 | Freshwater marsh and wetlands | 3.5-30 |
| 3.5.5.4 | Alkali scrub and associated habitats | 3.5-33 |
| 3.5.5.5 | Elderberry savanna..... | 3.5-35 |
| 3.5.5.6 | Central california sycamore alluvial woodland..... | 3.5-37 |
| 3.5.5.7 | Vernal pools..... | 3.5-38 |
| 4 | Restoration Elements Common to All Strategies..... | 4-1 |
| 4.1 | Reach 1 | 4-1 |
| 4.1.1 | <i>Reconstruct channel through gravel mining pits in Reach 1</i> | <i>4-1</i> |
| 4.1.2 | <i>Augment gravel in Reach 1 at existing riffles to increase chinook salmon spawning habitat.....</i> | <i>4-4</i> |
| 4.1.3 | <i>Increase chinook salmon spawning habitat in Reach 1A</i> | <i>4-6</i> |
| 4.1.4 | <i>Reduce fine sediment input to the mainstem channel of Reach 1A.....</i> | <i>4-8</i> |
| 4.1.5 | <i>Reduce the volume of fine sediment stored in the channel</i> | <i>4-9</i> |
| 4.1.6 | <i>Restrict ramping rates following high flows to reduce fine sediment infiltration of gravels in spawning riffles</i> | <i>4-9</i> |
| 4.1.7 | <i>Conserve and enhance the stand of sycamore alluvial woodland on Little Dry Creek</i> | <i>4-10</i> |
| 4.1.8 | <i>Conserve and expand existing valley oak woodland in Reach 1A.....</i> | <i>4-10</i> |
| 4.2 | Reach 2 | 4-11 |
| 4.2.1 | <i>Conserve existing elderberry patches at Chowchilla Bypass</i> | <i>4-11</i> |
| 4.3 | Reach 3 | 4-11 |
| 4.3.1 | <i>Management of Mendota Pool.....</i> | <i>4-11</i> |
| 4.4 | Reach 4B2 and 5..... | 4-12 |
| 4.4.1 | <i>Conserve and enhance existing mixed riparian habitat</i> | <i>4-12</i> |
| 4.4.2 | <i>Conduct 10-acre pilot alkali scrub habitat restoration project.....</i> | <i>4-13</i> |
| 5 | Strategy 1: Existing Conveyance Capacity strategy..... | 5-1 |
| 5.1 | Actions Based on Key Issues..... | 5-1 |
| 5.1.1 | <i>Flood conveyance capacity and operational rules for flow routing</i> | <i>5-1</i> |
| 5.1.2 | <i>Juvenile chinook salmon rearing.....</i> | <i>5-5</i> |
| 5.1.3 | <i>Mendota Pool flow routing.....</i> | <i>5-7</i> |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 5.1.4 | <i>Reach 4B flow routing</i> | 5-8 |
| 5.2 | Additional Strategy-specific Actions | 5-11 |
| 5.2.1 | <i>Horticultural restoration</i> | 5-11 |
| 5.2.1.1 | Wetland restoration within existing or proposed levees and canals | 5-11 |
| 5.2.1.2 | Riparian forest and scrub restoration within existing or proposed levees and canals | 5-13 |
| 5.2.1.3 | Horticultural restoration outside of existing or proposed levees and canals | 5-15 |
| 5.2.1.4 | Horticultural restoration of key sites within Reach 1 | 5-16 |
| 5.2.2 | <i>Habitat Connectivity</i> | 5-18 |
| 5.3 | Hydrographs | 5-20 |
| 5.3.1 | <i>Early fall flows for spring-run chinook salmon spawning</i> | 5-22 |
| 5.3.2 | <i>Late fall flows for fall-run chinook salmon spawning</i> | 5-25 |
| 5.3.3 | <i>Winter baseflows</i> | 5-29 |
| 5.3.4 | <i>Spring flows for spring-run chinook salmon adult immigration and juvenile outmigration</i> | 5-30 |
| 5.3.5 | <i>Late spring flows for fall-run chinook salmon outmigration</i> | 5-35 |
| 5.3.6 | <i>Riparian recruitment flows</i> | 5-38 |
| 5.3.7 | <i>Summer baseflows for spring-run chinook salmon holding</i> | 5-41 |
| 6 | Strategy 2: salmonid-oriented management strategy | 6-1 |
| 6.1 | Actions based on Key Issues | 6-1 |
| 6.1.1 | <i>Flood conveyance capacity and operational rules for flow routing</i> | 6-1 |
| 6.1.2 | <i>Juvenile chinook salmon rearing</i> | 6-5 |
| 6.1.3 | <i>Mendota Pool flow routing</i> | 6-6 |
| 6.1.4 | <i>Reach 4B flow routing</i> | 6-11 |
| 6.2 | Additional Vegetation- and Wildlife-oriented Actions | 6-13 |
| 6.2.1 | <i>Horticultural restoration</i> | 6-13 |
| 6.2.1.1 | Wetland restoration within existing or proposed levees and canals | 6-13 |
| 6.2.1.2 | Riparian forest and scrub restoration within existing or proposed levees and canals | 6-14 |
| 6.2.1.3 | Horticultural restoration outside of existing or proposed levees and canals | 6-16 |
| 6.2.1.4 | Horticultural restoration of key sites within Reach 1 | 6-17 |
| 6.2.2 | <i>Habitat Connectivity</i> | 6-17 |
| 6.3 | Hydrographs | 6-20 |
| 6.3.1 | <i>Early fall flows for spring-run chinook salmon spawning</i> | 6-22 |
| 6.3.2 | <i>Late-fall flows for fall-run chinook salmon spawning</i> | 6-22 |
| 6.3.3 | <i>Winter baseflows</i> | 6-23 |
| 6.3.4 | <i>Early spring flows for spring-run chinook adult immigration and juvenile outmigration, and splittail spawning</i> | 6-23 |
| 6.3.5 | <i>Late spring flows for fall-run chinook salmon outmigration</i> | 6-27 |
| 6.3.6 | <i>Riparian recruitment flows</i> | 6-29 |
| 6.3.7 | <i>Summer baseflows for spring-run chinook salmon holding</i> | 6-33 |
| 7 | Strategy 3: Riparian-oriented management strategy | 7-1 |
| 7.1 | Actions Based on Key Issues | 7-1 |
| 7.1.1 | <i>Flood conveyance capacity and operational rules for flow routing</i> | 7-1 |
| 7.1.2 | <i>Juvenile chinook salmon rearing</i> | 7-4 |
| 7.1.3 | <i>Mendota Pool flow routing</i> | 7-5 |
| 7.1.4 | <i>Reach 4B flow routing</i> | 7-5 |

| | | |
|---------|---|------|
| 7.2 | Additional Vegetation- and Wildlife-oriented Actions | 7-7 |
| 7.2.1 | <i>Horticultural restoration</i> | 7-7 |
| 7.2.1.1 | Wetland restoration within existing or proposed levees and canals | 7-7 |
| 7.2.1.2 | Riparian forest and scrub restoration within existing or proposed levees and canals ... | 7-9 |
| 7.2.1.3 | Restoration of higher-elevation vegetation types | 7-10 |
| 7.2.1.4 | Horticultural restoration outside of existing or proposed levees and canals | 7-11 |
| 7.2.1.5 | Horticultural restoration of key sites within Reach 1 | 7-12 |
| 7.2.2 | <i>Habitat Connectivity</i> | 7-13 |
| 7.3 | Hydrographs | 7-16 |
| 7.3.1 | <i>Early fall flows for spring-run chinook salmon spawning</i> | 7-18 |
| 7.3.2 | <i>Late fall flows for fall-run chinook salmon spawning</i> | 7-19 |
| 7.3.3 | <i>Winter baseflows</i> | 7-19 |
| 7.3.4 | <i>Early spring flows for spring-run chinook salmon adult immigration and juvenile outmigration, and splittail spawning</i> | 7-20 |
| 7.3.5 | <i>Late spring flows for fall-run chinook salmon outmigration</i> | 7-23 |
| 7.3.6 | <i>Riparian recruitment and wetland recharge flows</i> | 7-25 |
| 7.3.7 | <i>Summer baseflows for spring-run chinook salmon holding</i> | 7-30 |

List of Tables

- Table 2-1. Exceedances of water temperature criteria in the Tuolumne River, 1987–1997.
- Table 2-2. Discharge and water temperature in the San Joaquin River at Fremont Ford Bridge.
- Table 3.1-1. Average channel gradients in gravel bedded reaches of sample rivers in California and the Pacific Northwest.
- Table 3.1-2. Descriptions of locations in Reach 1 with relatively high shear stresses.
- Table 3.2-1. Run Timing of Spring Chinook in Sacramento River Tributaries.
- Table 3.2-2. Spawning Timing of Spring Chinook in Sacramento River Tributaries.
- Table 3.4-1. Criteria used in selection of analysis species and results for selected analysis species.
- Table 3.4-2. Habitat requirements of native fish analysis species.
- Table 3.5-1. Primary riparian flow management objectives, by water year type.
- Table 3.5-2. Location and extent of non-native invasive plant species within the planning area.
- Table 5-1. Selected approaches to key issues under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-2. Rated and assumed conveyance capacities by reach under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-3. Sites proposed for horticultural wetland restoration inside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-4. Sites proposed for horticultural riparian forest and scrub restoration inside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-5. Sites proposed for horticultural restoration outside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-6. Key sites proposed for horticultural restoration in Reach 1 under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-7. Sites proposed for preservation and horticultural restoration to provide habitat connectivity under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-1. Selected approaches to key issues under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-2. Rated and assumed conveyance capacities by reach under Strategy 1.

- Table 5-3. Sites proposed for horticultural wetland restoration inside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-4. Sites proposed for horticultural riparian forest and scrub restoration inside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-5. Sites proposed for horticultural restoration outside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-6. Key sites proposed for horticultural restoration in Reach 1 under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-7. Sites proposed for preservation and horticultural restoration to provide habitat connectivity under Strategy 1.
- Table 5-8. Proposed timing and discharge for four water year types under Strategy 1, for restoration of both spring- and fall-run chinook salmon.
- Table 5-9. Proposed timing and discharge for four water year types under Strategy 1, for restoration without fall-run chinook salmon.
- Table 5-10. Predicted riparian vegetation benefits of the hypothetical wet year riparian recruitment flow hydrograph (both runs scenario) developed for Strategy 1, by Reach.
- Table 5-11. Predicted riparian vegetation benefits of the hypothetical wet year riparian recruitment flow hydrograph (without fall-run scenario) developed for Strategy 1, by Reach.
- Table 6-1. Selected approaches to key issues under Strategy 2.
- Table 6-2. Rated and assumed conveyance capacities by reach under Strategy 2.
- Table 6-3. Sites proposed for horticultural wetland restoration inside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 2.
- Table 6-4. Sites proposed for horticultural riparian forest and scrub restoration inside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 2.
- Table 6-5. Sites proposed for horticultural restoration outside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 2.
- Table 6-6. Key sites proposed for horticultural restoration in Reach 1 under Strategy 2.
- Table 6-7. Sites proposed for preservation and horticultural restoration to provide habitat connectivity under Strategy 2.
- Table 6-8. Proposed timing and discharge for four water year types under Strategy 2, for restoration of both spring- and fall-run chinook salmon.
- Table 6-9. Proposed timing and discharge for four water year types under Strategy 2, for restoration without fall-run chinook salmon.
- Table 6-10. Predicted riparian vegetation benefits of the hypothetical wet year riparian recruitment flow hydrograph developed for Strategy 1, by Reach.
- Table 7-1. Selected approaches to key issues under Strategy 3.
- Table 7-2. Rated and assumed conveyance capacities by reach under Strategy 3.
- Table 7-3. Sites proposed for horticultural wetland restoration inside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 3.
- Table 7-4. Sites proposed for horticultural riparian forest and scrub restoration inside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 3.
- Table 7-5. Sites proposed for horticultural restoration of higher-elevation plant communities under Strategy 3
- Table 7-6. Sites proposed for horticultural restoration outside of existing or proposed levees and canals under Strategy 3.
- Table 7-7. Key sites proposed for horticultural restoration in Reach 1 under Strategy 3.
- Table 7-8. Sites proposed for preservation and horticultural restoration to provide habitat connectivity under Strategy 3.
- Table 7-9. Proposed timing and discharge for four water year types under Strategy 3, for restoration of both spring-run and fall-run chinook salmon.
- Table 7-10. Proposed timing and discharge for four water year types under Strategy 3, for restoration without fall-run chinook salmon.

Table 7-11. Predicted riparian vegetation benefits of the hypothetical wet year riparian recruitment flow hydrograph developed for Strategy 1, by Reach.

List of Figures

- Figure 2-1. San Joaquin River Restoration Project planning area.
- Figure 2-2. Summary of key issues and themes governing each of the three restoration strategies.
- Figure 3.1-1. Surface grain size distribution for Reach 1A of the San Joaquin River.
- Figure 3.1-2. Periodicity of historical bed mobilization and scour for Reach 1.
- Figure 3.1-3. Peak flow recurrence in Reach 1 of the San Joaquin River.
- Figure 3.1-4. Pools within Reach 1 disrupt bedload routing (assuming a median grain size of 40 mm).
- Figure 3.1-5. Pools in Reach 1 as gravel sinks.
- Figure 3.1-6. Sediment mobility and scour for a median grain size of 30 mm using local shear stresses.
- Figure 3.1-7. Estimated historical sediment transport regime in Reach 2, based on Brownlie's bed material equation (Brownlie 1982).
- Figure 3.1-8. Mobility of sand for a range of flows.
- Figure 3.1-9. Restoring sediment supply and routing in Reach 2B.
- Figure 3.2-1. Cyclical escapement patterns of fall-run chinook salmon in San Joaquin tributaries.
- Figure 3.2-2. Last river mile for which 5-day average temperature is below threshold.
- Figure 3.2-3. Daily maximum, average, and minimum water temperatures in a spring Chinook holding pool in Butte Creek, summer 2001.
- Figure 3.2-4. Emigration calendars for spring-run chinook salmon.
- Figure 3.5-1. Hypothetical wet year design hydrograph and example Millerton inflows and Friant outflows from 1998.
- Figure 3.5-2. Hypothetical dry year design hydrograph and example Millerton inflows and Friant outflows from 1988.
- Figure 4-1. Schematic of Reach 1 channel design.
- Figure 4-2. Schematic diagram showing conceptual design of creating potential spawning habitat between existing topographic control streams.
- Figure 4-3. Sample location of gravel introduction to increase potential salmon spawning habitat
- Figure 5-1. Conveyance Capacity under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-2. Densities of macroinvertebrate taxa likely consumed by juvenile salmonids, in the Tuolumne and San Joaquin rivers.
- Figure 5-3. Schematic of Reach 4B1 channel design.
- Figure 5-4. Potential hydrograph for a dry water year type under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-5. Potential hydrograph for a normal-dry water year type under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-6. Potential hydrograph for a normal-wet water year type under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-7. Potential hydrograph for a wet water year type under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-8. Potential recruitable area versus peak establishment flow (cfs) for all reaches combined under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-9. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 5,000 cfs under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-10. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 8,000 cfs under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-11. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 10,000 cfs under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-12. Total width of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different categories for all transects and reaches combined at 13,500 cfs under Strategy 1.
- Figure 5-13. Potential recruitable width of woody riparian vegetation along riparian transects for a wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 1, with a root growth rate of 0.1 ft/day.

Figure 5-13A. Potential recruitable width of woody riparian vegetation along riparian transects for a wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 1 without fall-run, with a root growth rate of 0.1 ft/day.

Figure 5-14. Potential recruitable area of woody riparian vegetation by mile for all soils and low salinity soils only for a wet water year flow scenario under Strategy 1, with a root growth rate of 0.1 ft/day.

Figure 5-14A. Potential recruitable area of woody riparian vegetation by mile for all soils and low salinity soils only for a wet water year flow scenario under Strategy 1 without fall-run, with a root growth rate of 0.1 ft/day.

Figure 5-15. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined for a wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 1, with a root growth rate of 0.1 ft/day.

Figure 5-15A. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined for a wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 1 without fall-run, with a root growth rate of 0.1 ft/day.

Figure 6-1. Strategy 2: Salmonid-Oriented Strategy

Figure 6-2. Mean abundance of drifting chironomids that may potentially be prey items for juvenile salmonids (per 500 m³).

Figure 6-3. Mean abundance of zooplankton in the drift that may potentially be prey items for juvenile salmonids (per 500 m³).

Figure 6-4. Potential Mendota Pool bypass channel alignment.

Figure 6-5. The proposed bypass channel longitudinal profile, including the drop structures.

Figure 6-6. Schematic of Mendota Pool Bypass channel.

Figure 6-7. Potential fish passage in the Eastside Bypass.

Figure 6-8. Potential hydrograph for a dry water year type under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-9. Potential hydrograph for a normal-dry water year type under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-10. Potential hydrograph for a normal-wet water year type under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-11. Potential hydrograph for a wet water year type under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-12. Potential recruitable area versus peak establishment flow (cfs) for all reaches combined under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-13. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 5,000 cfs under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-14. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 8,000 cfs under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-15. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 10,000 cfs under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-16. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 13,500 cfs under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-17. Potential recruitable width of woody riparian vegetation along riparian transects for a hypothetical wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-18. Potential recruitable area of woody riparian vegetation by mile for all soils and low salinity soils only for a hypothetical wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 2.

Figure 6-19. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined for a hypothetical wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 2.

Figure 7-1. Strategy 3: Riparian-Oriented Strategy.

Figure 7-2. Conceptual channel design for Reach 4B1.

Figure 7-3. Potential hydrograph for a dry water year type under Strategy 3.

Figure 7-4. Potential hydrograph for a normal-dry water year type under Strategy 3.

Figure 7-5. Potential hydrograph for a normal-wet water year type under Strategy 3.

Figure 7-6. Potential hydrograph for a wet water year type under Strategy 3.

- Figure 7-7. Potential recruitable area versus peak establishment flow (cfs) for all reaches combined under Strategy 3.
- Figure 7-8. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 5,000 cfs under Strategy 3.
- Figure 7-9. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 8,000 cfs under Strategy 3.
- Figure 7-10. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 10,000 cfs under Strategy 3.
- Figure 7-11. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined at 13,500 cfs under Strategy 3.
- Figure 7-12. Potential recruitable width of woody riparian vegetation along riparian transects for a hypothetical wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 3.
- Figure 7-13. Potential recruitable area of woody riparian vegetation by mile for all soils and low salinity soils only for a hypothetical wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 3.
- Figure 7-14. Total length of potential recruitable woody riparian vegetation in different width categories for all reaches combined for a hypothetical wet water year hydrograph under Strategy 3.

List of Appendices

- Appendix A. Geomorphic Composite Maps
- Appendix B. Salmonid Maps, Tables and Figures
- Appendix C. Morphology Maps
- Appendix D. Riparian Composite Maps
- Appendix E. Riparian Model Output
- Appendix F. Species Names
- Appendix G. Riparian Appendices

This report has been prepared to assist the parties with pending settlement negotiations in NRDC v. Rodgers and to develop a consensus-based restoration plan for the San Joaquin River. While the authors have attempted to offer as much information as possible, certain limitations must be noted.

This report was assembled quickly under strict deadlines, and all the parties would have preferred more time. Therefore, this report in no way should be viewed as a final and complete restoration plan for the San Joaquin River. Instead, it contains the information regarding certain restoration strategies that could be developed in the time allowed. This report should be viewed as a reconnaissance and planning level study, intended to facilitate the process of identifying alternatives, actions, opportunities, constraints and uncertainties affecting San Joaquin River restoration. Potential implementation measures and areas of further study are identified in the report, and it is understood that a final, long-term restoration plan must be supported by the requisite level of scientific study and experimental actions.

This report is solely the work product of the authors, not the parties to NRDC v. Rodgers. There should be no inference that the analysis and conclusions contained in this report have been endorsed by any of the litigants.