



# **Upper Carson River Watershed Stream Corridor Condition Assessment**

**Prepared For:**

**Alpine Watershed Group  
and the  
Sierra Nevada Alliance  
P. O. Box 7989  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158**

**Prepared By:**

MACTEC Engineering and Consulting  
1572 East College Parkway, Suite 162  
Carson City, Nevada 89706

Swanson Hydrology & Geomorphology  
115 Limekiln Road  
Santa Cruz, California 95062

River Run Consulting  
P.O. Box 8538  
Truckee, California 96162

C. G. Celio & Sons  
P.O. Box 734  
Minden, Nevada 89423

**June, 2004**

# **Upper Carson River Watershed Stream Corridor Condition Assessment**

Copies of this report may be requested from:

**SIERRA NEVADA ALLIANCE  
P. O. BOX 7989  
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96158  
(530) 542-4546**

**MACTEC ENGINEERING & CONSULTING  
1572 EAST COLLEGE PARKWAY, SUITE 162  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89706  
(775) 888-9992**

Funding for this project has been provided in full or in part through a contract with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) pursuant to the Costa-Machado Water Act of 2000 (Proposition 13) and any amendments thereto for the implementation of California's Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the SWRCB, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Upper Carson River Watershed Stream Corridor Condition Assessment project was performed by a consulting team comprised of MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, River Run Consulting, Swanson Hydrology & Geomorphology, and C.G. Celio & Sons. MACTEC acted as the prime contractor, working directly with representatives of the Alpine Watershed Group and the Sierra Nevada Alliance. MACTEC personnel involved in the project included Charles Zeier who acted as project manager and technical editor of the report, Jacquelyn Picciani (vegetation), Dustin Waters (hydraulics), Dennis Manor (hydraulics), Ron Reno (history), Shannon Hataway (graphics), and Jay Aldean (quality control and assurance). Matt Kiese represented River Run Consulting, while Mitch Swanson and John Dvorsky represented Swanson Hydrology & Geomorphology. Clint Celio of C.G. Celio & Sons assisted with figure preparation and GIS applications.

The assessment team would like to acknowledge the time and energy given to this project by members of the Alpine Watershed Group. The following participants regularly attended Group meetings:

- Jim Austin and Debbi Waldear - Friends of Hope Valley
- Genie Azad and Ed James - Carson Water Subconservancy District
- Mary Bennington and Marie Barry - Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada
- Hal Bird - South Tahoe Public Utility District
- Sally Champion - U.S. Forest Service
- Jason Churchill - Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Joan Clayburgh - Sierra Nevada Alliance
- Brad Davis - Carson River Resort, Alpine Chamber of Commerce
- Donald Jardine, Alpine County Commissioner
- Mark DeMaio, Alpine County Public Works Department
- Brian Peters - Alpine County Planning Department
- Mike Hayes - U.S. Department of Agriculture Service Center
- Dan Kaffer – Natural Resources Conservation Service
- Dick McCleary – Central Sierra Resource Conservation and Development
- John Cassidy, John Craik, Jim Dunn, Patty DeMaio, Margie Evans, Marlena Hellwinkel, and Rich Williams – community members

Members of the Group have served as project participants and as a sounding board for products developed by the assessment team. We would also like to acknowledge the role played by Joan Clayburgh of the Sierra Nevada Alliance and Jason Churchill of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. Both individuals were helpful in providing information and project direction. Representatives from the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the California Department of Forestry, the California Department of Fish and Game, and Alpine County were generous with their time and information.

Special thanks are given to Dick Edwards, Nancy Thornburg, and the Alpine County Museum for allowing us access to their photographic archive.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	i
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	ii
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	v
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	vi
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	vii
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 PROJECT GOALS .....	1
1.2 REPORT FORMAT.....	3
1.3 HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT .....	3
2. Watershed Geomorphic Processes .....	5
2.1 GEOLOGIC INFLUENCES ON GEOMORPHIC PROCESS .....	6
2.1.1 <i>Glacial Morphology</i> .....	10
2.2 HYDROLOGIC INFLUENCES ON GEOMORPHIC PROCESS .....	10
2.2.1 <i>Precipitation</i> .....	10
2.2.2 <i>Peak Flows</i> .....	11
2.2.3 <i>Low Flows</i> .....	17
2.3 EROSION AND SEDIMENT SUPPLY .....	17
2.3.1 <i>Geologic Influence</i> .....	17
2.3.2 <i>Climatological Influences</i> .....	20
2.3.3 <i>Mass Sediment Movement</i> .....	20
2.3.4 <i>Proximity to Sediment Supply</i> .....	21
2.4 NATURAL GEOMORPHIC DYNAMISM .....	21
2.4.1 <i>Equilibrium</i> .....	23
2.4.1.1 Resistance to Change .....	23
2.4.1.2 Resilience Following Disturbance.....	23
2.5 CHARACTERIZING DYNAMISM OF THE HISTORIC CHANNEL.....	23
2.6 CHANNEL SEDIMENT TRANSPORT, EROSION AND DEPOSITION .....	28
2.6.1 <i>Transport Channels</i> .....	28
2.6.2 <i>Confined Response Channels</i> .....	28
2.6.3 <i>Unconfined Response Channels</i> .....	29
2.7 CHANNEL AND FLOODPLAIN MORPHOLOGY.....	29
2.7.1 <i>The Role of Woody Debris</i> .....	32
2.7.2 <i>Beaver</i> .....	33
2.8 VEGETATION DYNAMICS.....	35
3. Preliminary Field Study Results .....	39
3.1 METHODS AND DATA.....	39
3.1.1 <i>Reach Delineation</i> .....	39
3.1.2 <i>Field Data Collection</i> .....	39
3.2 REACH SUMMARIES .....	40
3.2.1 <i>West Fork Carson River</i> .....	40
3.2.1.1 Reach WF1.....	40
3.2.1.2 Reach WF2.....	41
3.2.1.3 Reach WF3.....	42

3.2.1.4	Reach WF4.....	43
3.2.1.5	Reach WF5.....	44
3.2.1.6	Reach WF6.....	45
3.2.1.7	Reach WF7.....	46
3.2.1.8	Reaches WF8 and WF10.....	47
3.2.1.9	Reach WF9.....	49
3.2.1.10	Reach WF11.....	50
3.2.1.11	Reach WF12.....	51
3.2.1.12	Reach WF13.....	52
3.2.1.13	Reaches WF14 and WF15.....	53
3.2.2	<i>East Fork Carson River</i> .....	55
3.2.2.1	Reaches EF1, EF2, EF3, and EF4.....	55
3.2.2.2	Reaches EF5, EF7, and EF9.....	58
3.2.2.3	Reaches EF6, EF8, and EF10.....	61
3.2.3	<i>Wolf Creek</i> .....	64
3.2.3.1	Reach WC1.....	64
3.2.3.2	Reach WC2.....	65
3.2.3.3	Reach WC3.....	66
3.2.4	<i>Markleeville/Hot Springs Creek</i> .....	67
3.2.4.1	Reach MC1.....	67
3.2.4.2	Reach MC2.....	68
3.2.4.3	Reach MC3.....	70
3.2.4.4	Reach MC4.....	71
3.3	PRELIMINARY STUDY RESULTS.....	72
4.	Detailed Field Study Results.....	73
4.1	METHODS AND DATA.....	73
4.1.1	<i>Broad Watershed Characteristics</i> .....	73
4.1.2	<i>Historic Analysis</i> .....	73
4.1.2.1	Historic Ecosystem and Geomorphic Function.....	74
4.1.2.2	Patterns of Human Development.....	74
4.1.2.3	Effects of Human Disturbance on Stream Morphology.....	74
4.1.3	<i>Analysis of Existing Data</i> .....	75
4.1.4	<i>Collection of Field Data</i> .....	75
4.1.4.1	Geomorphology and Aquatic Habitat Analysis.....	75
4.1.4.2	Hydraulic Analysis.....	79
4.1.4.3	Vegetation.....	79
4.2	REACH SUMMARIES.....	82
4.2.1	<i>Reach WF8</i> .....	83
4.2.2	<i>Reach WF10</i> .....	87
4.2.3	<i>Reach WF14</i> .....	92
4.2.4	<i>Reach WF15</i> .....	97
4.2.5	<i>Red Lake Creek – Reference Meadow</i> .....	102
4.2.6	<i>Reach EF6 (Reference)</i> .....	106
4.2.7	<i>Reach EF7</i> .....	110
4.2.8	<i>Reach MC2</i> .....	115
4.2.9	<i>Reach MC4</i> .....	119
4.3	HYDRAULIC ANALYSES.....	123
4.3.1	<i>Hope Valley Bridge</i> .....	123
4.3.2	<i>Highway 88 Bridge at Woodfords</i> .....	125
4.3.3	<i>Markleeville Bridge</i> .....	126
4.3.4	<i>Centerville Flat Bridge</i> .....	127
4.4	AQUATIC BIOLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	129
4.4.1	<i>Existing Data and Studies</i> .....	129
4.4.2	<i>Water Quality Impairment</i> .....	129

5.	Human Interaction With the Watershed.....	130
5.1	HISTORIC PERIOD HUMAN INTERACTION WITH THE WATERSHED .....	130
5.1.1	<i>Prehistoric Land Use</i> .....	130
5.1.2	<i>Euro-American Exploration</i> .....	131
5.1.3	<i>Transportation</i> .....	131
5.1.4	<i>Settlement</i> .....	133
5.1.5	<i>Mining</i> .....	134
5.1.6	<i>Logging</i> .....	136
5.1.7	<i>Agriculture</i> .....	137
5.1.8	<i>Irrigation</i> .....	139
5.1.9	<i>Forest Condition and Function</i> .....	140
5.2	GEOMORPHIC EFFECTS OF HUMAN DISTURBANCE ON STREAMS.....	145
5.2.1	<i>Hydrologic Responses</i> .....	145
5.2.2	<i>Sediment Supply</i> .....	146
5.2.2.1	Charity Valley Creek Watershed Sediment Survey .....	147
5.2.2.2	Changes in Sediment Supply Potential.....	153
5.2.3	<i>Riparian and Channel Modifications</i> .....	153
5.2.3.1	Lower West Fork (Reaches WF1-7).....	153
5.2.3.2	Upper West Fork (Reaches WF8-15).....	153
5.2.3.3	Lower East Fork (Reaches EF1-4).....	154
5.2.3.4	Middle and Upper East Fork (Reaches EF 5-10).....	155
5.2.3.5	Wolf Creek (Reaches WC1-3).....	156
5.2.3.6	Hot Springs and Markleeville Creeks (Reaches MC1-4).....	156
5.3	CHANNEL AND RIPARIAN RESPONSE TO LAND USE IMPACTS.....	157
5.3.1.1	West Fork Carson River.....	157
5.3.1.2	East Fork.....	161
5.3.1.3	Wolf Creek.....	163
5.3.1.4	Markleeville and Hot Springs Creeks .....	163
5.4	AQUATIC BIOLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	166
5.4.1	<i>Existing Data and Studies</i> .....	166
5.4.2	<i>Water Quality Impairment</i> .....	166
5.4.2.1	West Fork.....	166
5.4.2.2	East Fork.....	167
5.5	SUMMARY.....	168
6.	Restoration and Management Recommendations.....	170
6.1	ROADS.....	172
6.1.1	<i>Detailed Road Assessment</i> .....	172
6.1.2	<i>Conduct a Demonstration Project</i> .....	174
6.2	STREAM RESTORATION .....	175
6.2.1	<i>Conduct Bio-technical Stream Bank Restoration</i> .....	175
6.2.2	<i>Stabilize Faith Valley</i> .....	180
6.2.3	<i>Selected Placement of Woody Debris</i> .....	180
6.3	FLOODPLAIN ENHANCEMENT .....	182
6.3.1	<i>Conduct Limited Floodplain Construction</i> .....	182
6.3.2	<i>Support Floodplain Restoration in Markleeville</i> .....	182
6.3.3	<i>Support Floodplain Restoration along the East Fork</i> .....	182
6.4	WATER QUALITY.....	184
6.4.1	<i>West Fork Flow Diversion</i> .....	184
6.4.2	<i>Support Efforts to Remediate Effects of Past Mining Activities</i> .....	184
6.4.3	<i>Support Efforts to Minimize Indian Creek Wastewater Export Impacts</i> .....	184
6.5	LAND USE IMPACTS .....	185
6.5.1	<i>Grazing Management</i> .....	185
6.5.2	<i>Recreation</i> .....	186
6.5.3	<i>Forest Structure and Fire</i> .....	186

6.6	MONITORING AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT .....	188
6.6.1	<i>Watershed-wide Baseline Monitoring</i> .....	188
6.6.2	<i>Monitor Streambed Degradation at Selected Bridge Locations</i> .....	189
7.	References Cited .....	190

Attachment One Upper Carson River Watershed GIS Framework

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Assessment Area Location .....	2
Figure 2.1	Controls on the Morphology of River Beds ... ..	5
Figure 2.2	Sub-Watershed Delineation with Channel Slope .....	7
Figure 2.3	Geological Formation Types and Mine Locations .....	8
Figure 2.4	Mean Monthly Precipitation Values at Selected Locations .....	12
Figure 2.5	Average Annual Hydrographs at Selected Locations .....	13
Figure 2.6	Summary of Annual and Monthly Mean Flows at Selected Locations .....	14
Figure 2.7	Peak Discharge Values at Selected Gages .....	16
Figure 2.8	The Influence of Sediment Supply on Channel Form .....	18
Figure 2.9	Easily Eroded Areas in the Assessment Area .....	19
Figure 2.10	Types of Equilibrium over Different Time Scales in River Systems .....	22
Figure 2.11	Wolf Creek, 1963 and 1997 .....	25
Figure 2.12	East Fork at the Wolf Creek Confluence, 1963 and 1997 .....	26
Figure 2.13	Channel Classification .....	27
Figure 2.14	Stages in Three General Channel Types .....	31
Figure 4.1	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Reach WF8 .....	84
Figure 4.2	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Reach WF8 .....	85
Figure 4.3	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Reach WF10 .....	88
Figure 4.4	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Reach WF10 .....	89
Figure 4.5	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Reach WF14 .....	93
Figure 4.6	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Reach WF14 .....	94
Figure 4.7	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Reach WF15 .....	98
Figure 4.8	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Reach WF15 .....	99
Figure 4.9	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Red Lake Creek .....	103
Figure 4.10	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Red Lake Creek .....	104
Figure 4.11	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Reach EF6 .....	107
Figure 4.12	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Reach EF6 .....	108
Figure 4.13	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Reach EF7 .....	111
Figure 4.14	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Reach EF7 .....	112
Figure 4.15	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Reach MC2 .....	116
Figure 4.16	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Reach MC2 .....	117
Figure 4.17	Longitudinal Profile and Cross-sectional Geometry, Reach MC4 .....	120
Figure 4.18	Discharge Versus Shear and Stage for Reach MC4 .....	121
Figure 5.1	Hope Valley, 1934 and 2004 .....	142
Figure 5.2	Markleeville in About the 1870s and in 1935 .....	143
Figure 5.3	Silver City Photo Pair, the 1860s and 2003 .....	144

Figure 5.4	Charity Valley Photo Point Locations .....	148
Figure 5.5	Charity Valley Creek Sediment Survey Photos .....	150
Figure 5.6	Charity Valley Creek Sediment Survey Photos .....	151
Figure 5.7	Charity Valley Creek Sediment Survey Photos .....	152
Figure 5.8	Log Jam along the East Fork of the Carson River, late 1800s .....	154
Figure 5.9	Hope Valley Gravel Pit Photo Pair, 1866 and 2004 .....	158
Figure 5.10	Faith Valley Aerial Photos .....	160
Figure 5.11	Curtz Dam Photo Pairs .....	162
Figure 5.12	Highway 89 Flood Photo Pairs .....	164
Figure 5.13	Markleeville Flood Photo Pairs .....	165
Figure 6.1	Brush Mattress as Bioengineered Treatment for Bank Stabilization .....	176
Figure 6.2	Live Posts and Brush Layering as Bioengineered Treatment for Bank Stabilization .....	177
Figure 6.3	Facine as Bioengineered Treatment for Bank Stabilization .....	178
Figure 6.4	Brush Packing as Bioengineered Treatment for Bank Stabilization .....	179

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	General Sub-Watershed Characteristics .....	9
Table 2.2	Selected Flood Recurrence Interval Values .....	15
Table 4.1	Pebble Count Results for Sample Locations in Selected Study Reaches .....	76
Table 4.2	Estimated Flood Recurrence Values for Selected Study Reaches .....	78
Table 4.3	Bed Mobility to Discharge Relationships for Selected Study Reaches .....	81
Table 4.4	Reach WF8 Successional Status Data .....	86
Table 4.5	Reach WF10 Successional Status Data .....	90
Table 4.6	Reach WF14 Successional Status Data .....	95
Table 4.7	Reach WF15 Successional Status Data .....	100
Table 4.8	Reach Red Lake Creek Successional Status Data .....	105
Table 4.9	Reach EF6 Successional Status Data .....	109
Table 4.10	Reach EF7 Successional Status Data .....	113
Table 4.11	Reach MC2 Successional Status Data .....	118
Table 4.12	Reach MC4 Successional Status Data .....	122
Table 4.13	Hope Valley Bridge Flows by Recurrence Interval .....	124
Table 4.14	Highway 88 Bridge Flows by Recurrence Interval .....	126
Table 4.15	Markleeville Bridge Flows by Recurrence Interval .....	127
Table 4.16	Centerville Flat Bridge Flows by Recurrence Interval .....	128
Table 5.1	Grazing Data for Alpine County, 2004 .....	139
Table 5.2	Reservoirs and Lakes in the Alpine County Portion of the Carson River Watershed .....	140