



**El Dorado Hydroelectric Project
FERC Project No. 184**

Riparian Vegetation Recruitment Monitoring Plan

EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
2890 Mosquito Road
Placerville, CA 95667

July 2010
Version 1.0

This study plan has been developed to satisfy the riparian vegetation recruitment monitoring requirements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission license for the El Dorado Hydroelectric Project No. 184 (Project 184).

1.0 License Requirements

The Project 184 Monitoring Program¹ defines the specific riparian vegetation recruitment monitoring requirements:

1. Riparian Vegetation Recruitment

Method: Method is described in Riparian Vegetation Establishment and Survival on Caples Creek and Kirkwood Creek, Summer, 2000 (Harris and Lindquist 2000b). Data would be collected at 24 sites on two study reaches as described in Harris and Lindquist 2000b.

Frequency: Every 5 years.

Rationale: The riparian recruitment study provides for evaluation of riparian condition and response to changes in the streamflow regime in the Caples Creek area. Monitoring at the end of each 5-year period provides an index of changes in riparian recruitment conditions over that period of modified streamflow (it should be noted that, depending on the water year cycle that occurs, 5 years may be a relatively short response time for riparian vegetation).

2.0 Background

Riparian vegetation recruitment monitoring was conducted during the Project 184 relicensing process in 2000 and 2002 (Harris and Lindquist, 2000b; EIP, 2002).

Harris and Lindquist (2000b) established monitoring sites on or near fluvial deposits on Caples Creek (regulated streamflows) and Kirkwood Creek (unregulated streamflows) to test the effects of regulated streamflows on willow (*Salix sp*) recruitment and survival. Permanent photopoints were established at each monitoring site. Additionally, observations were recorded on the following: 1) presence or absence of any form of plant regeneration on fluvial deposits; 2) flowering and fruiting of willows; 3) herbivory; and 4) land user impacts. The Harris and Lindquist (2000b) report is included in this monitoring plan as Appendix A because the license specifies that data shall be collected as described in this report.

In 2002, EIP (2002) repeated the monitoring protocol established by Harris and Lindquist (2000b) with similar observations to those observed during the monitoring effort in 2000.

¹ Section 7 of the El Dorado Relicensing Settlement Agreement, U.S. Forest Service 4(e) Condition No. 37, and California State Water Resources Control Board Section 401 Clean Water Act Water Quality Certification Condition No. 13

3.0 Study Plan Objective

The objective of this monitoring effort is to evaluate the status of riparian vegetation recruitment at selected locations to help determine if ecological resource objectives are achievable and being met, as specified in the Project 184 Adaptive Management Program².

The ecological resource objectives identified in Appendix B, Section 1, of the El Dorado Relicensing Settlement Agreement provides the following riparian habitat objective:

1. Riparian Habitat Objective

Maintain or restore riparian resources. Maintain and restore instream flows sufficient to sustain desired conditions of riparian, aquatic, wetland, and meadow habitats.

4.0 Survey Locations

The Project 184 Monitoring Program states that data will be collected at twenty-four sites on two study reaches as described in Harris and Lindquist (2000b). District staff has not been able to locate the photographic exhibit and location map referenced in Harris and Lindquist (2000b). Therefore, the photographic exhibit from 2002 surveys conducted by EIP Associates will be used to relocate photopoints. Sites 1-14 were located on Caples Creek below its confluence with the Caples Lake spillway channel and sites 15-24 (control sites) were located on Kirkwood Creek below Highway 88 (EIP, 2002). The approximate study reaches are depicted in Figure 1.

² Section 8 of the El Dorado Relicensing Settlement Agreement and U.S. Forest Service 4(e) Condition No. 38




Figure 1. Approximate location of Caples Creek and Kirkwood Creek study reaches.

5.0 Schedule

Consistent with the timing of previous surveys, monitoring is planned to occur during the summer when the sites can be safely accessed and when most of the vegetation is identifiable.

6.0 Data Collection

The data to be collected during this monitoring effort include: 1) observations of vegetation recruitment and 2) photographic documentation of established photopoints.

Observations of vegetation recruitment within fluvial deposits at each site will be monitored and recorded in a tabular format and will include the following data:

- Type of landform / substrate
- Presence or absence of any form of plant regeneration on fluvial deposits
- Flowering and fruiting of willows and other species
- Presence of herbivory
- Land-use impacts

Photographic documentation of established photopoints on Caples Creek and Kirkwood Creek will be repeated. The photographic exhibit from the EIP (2002) report, as well as photopoints taken in 2008 along Caples Creek (EID 2009), will be used to help relocate photopoints.

5.0 Data Analysis

The qualitative observations of recruitment collected for this monitoring effort will be compiled into a tabular format similar to the tables prepared in previous reports (Harris and Lindquist, 2000b; EIP, 2002). A summary comparing the data collected for this monitoring effort with the previous monitoring efforts will be prepared. Photographs of the photopoints from 2002 and this monitoring effort will be displayed in a report format.

6.0 Reporting

The data collected under this plan will be compiled into a report and distributed to the FS, ERC, and SWRCB for review and consideration at least two weeks prior to the annual ERC meeting. The report will include discussion appropriate to results and supportive of analyses and conclusions will be provided. All reports will be prepared in a format so that they can easily be reviewed by the ERC and filed with the FERC after approval.

A summary of the findings of the monitoring effort and an electronic copy of the report will be included in the Project 184 annual monitoring report, which the District is required to file with FERC by June 30 of each year. The District will distribute the draft annual monitoring report to the FS, ERC, and SWRCB at least 30 days to review prior to filing with FERC.

6.0 Literature Cited

EID. 2009. Caples Lake Main Dam Emergency Repair Project: Caples Creek Stream Channel and Riparian Community Monitoring Report, November 2008 – July 2009. Prepared by EN2 Resources.

EIP. 2002. Preliminary Draft Technical Memorandum Number 15 – 2002 Riparian Vegetation Recruitment Monitoring. November 11, 2002. Available online at:
http://www.project184.org/doc_lib/documents/2002/1121/TM_15_Willow_Recruitm8FCF7.pdf

Harris and Lindquist. 2000b. Riparian Vegetation Establishment and Survival on Caples Creek and Kirkwood Creek. October 2000.

APPENDIX A

Riparian Vegetation Establishment and Survival on Caples Creek
and Kirkwood Creek
(Harris and Lindquist, 2000b)

RIPARIAN VEGETATION ESTABLISHMENT AND SURVIVAL ON CAPLES CREEK AND KIRKWOOD CREEK, SUMMER, 2000

**Report of a study by Richard R. Harris and Donna Lindquist
October, 2000**

Introduction

In the Project #184 application for new licensing the potential for regulated flows to impair recruitment of riparian vegetation below Caples Lake was discussed. To evaluate this potential effect, a monitoring project was conducted to determine patterns of willow reproduction and recruitment in Caples Meadow and effects of streamflow regulation on it.

Willows present in Caples Meadow include *Salix lemonii* and *Salix lucida ssp. lasiandra*. Both of these are widely distributed throughout the Sierra Nevada (Argus 1997) and are commonly associated with meandering streams. They provide important ecological functions including streambank stabilization and wildlife habitat. Their reproductive behavior has not been studied in detail. Both species flower in May-June, depending on altitude and latitude (Munz and Keck 1973; Weeden 1979). Pollination in willow may be by wind or insects (Sacchi and Price 1988; Douglas 1997). Seed production in willow is generally high (Sacchi and Price 1988; Johnson 1994) but interspecific hybridization, which is common, can produce nonflowering offspring (Mosseller 1990). The interaction between seed dispersal and stream water levels is the process dominating seedling establishment in the Salicaceae (Blom 1999). Seedling establishment depends on soil moisture availability, particularly the effects of spring floods and the rate of flood recession (Rood et al. 1999). Seedling establishment can be extremely variable from year to year (Roelle and Gladwin 1999). Seedlings commonly establish on open sites but some researchers have found greater densities of seedlings on gravel bars with some vegetation cover present (Douglas 1995). First year mortality of seedlings is commonly greater than 90 percent (Sacchi and Price 1992). Studies have shown that specific hydrologic conditions are required for seedling survival, including reduced flooding in the first few years after establishment (McBride and Strahan 1985). Survival rates improve with seedling age (Sacchi and Price 1992). Local microsite characteristics such as topographic relief and sedimentation can affect survival (Merigliano 1998; Taylor et al. 1999).

Streamflow regulation by dams commonly causes increased recruitment of willows and other pioneer riparian species on alluvial streams (Williams and Wolman 1984; Harris et. al. 1987; Johnson 1994). This is caused by dampening of scouring peak flows and stabilization of low flows, both of which create conditions conducive to survival of seedlings. In the case of Caples Lake, low flows are not just stabilized but they are augmented in late summer and fall. Theoretically, flow augmentation could cause seedling inundation or scouring if at sufficient magnitudes.

Methods

The general hypothesis that we sought to test was whether or not regulated streamflows affect the recruitment and survival of willows on Caples Creek. To test this, data were collected at Caples Creek and a control (unregulated) stream. The data collection spanned the period when recruitment should have been occurring and when flows were both reduced (late spring and summer) and then augmented (early fall) below Caples Lake.

The area affected by regulated flows we studied was the reach of Caples Creek below the confluence of the Caples Lake spillway channel. This reach has experienced significant aggradation due to spillway channel erosion and other causes. The control area was Kirkwood Creek below Highway 88. This area was taken as a control because Kirkwood Creek does not have a major dam on it. Both study areas are grazed to a limited extent by horses passing through. Neither is currently used as a pasture. Both have similar composition of willow species, primarily *Salix lemonii*.

Twenty-four sites were chosen on the two study reaches (see map in accompanying photographic exhibit). These were chosen because they were on or near fluvial deposits where recruitment would be expected or most likely. Nearly all such sites on the two reaches were included.

Permanent photopoints were located at each site. Methods of Platts et. al. (1987) were generally followed. Each site was photographed across, downstream and upstream from the photopoints on three dates. The first date was June 28, 2000 corresponding to the time when seed production should have commenced; the second date was August 15, 2000 corresponding to the time when willow seedlings or sprouts should be present; and the third date was September 11-12, 2000 when Caples Lake was releasing and streamflow was augmented as compared to natural flows. The study areas were visited on June 21 and July 17 as well and general observations were made.

In addition to the photography at each site, observations were recorded on the following: 1) presence or absence of any form of plant regeneration on fluvial deposits; 2) flowering and fruiting of willows; 3) herbivory; and 4) land user impacts. These observations were recorded either photographically or in field notes.

Results

Streamflow conditions in Caples Creek for the three sample dates are summarized in Table 1. No streamflow data are available for Kirkwood Creek:

Table 1: Streamflow Data for Three Monitoring Dates, 2000

Date	Estimated Natural Flow Average and (Range) (1972-1997) (CFS)	Operational Releases from Caples Lake(2000) (CFS)	Actual Gaged Flows in Caples Creek Below Caples Lake(CFS)
6/28	92.3 (8.7-360.4)	8	75.3
8/15	14.2 (0.9-78.1)	33	32.6

9/12	5.1 (0.3-20.1)	55	56.1
------	----------------	----	------

It should be noted that these flow data included contributions from the Caples Lake spillway in June (no spills occurred in August or September) but they did not include the contributions of Kirkwood Creek or the small amount of flow from the spillway in August or September. These amounted to much less than 10 cfs on both dates. These data indicate that in June, Caples Lake was releasing very little water and flows were below estimated natural flows. In August and September, releases from Caples Lake caused flows to exceed average estimated natural flows by up to an order of magnitude. This regulated flow regime was comparable to how the project has operated over its history.

Below, a site by site tabulation is presented. In general, on both Caples Creek and Kirkwood Creek, flowering and seed production by willows was nearly absent this year. The implications of this are that the only potential sources of seed for both places were drift from upstream or wind dispersal from other streams. Neither of these sources was considered a significant source of seed. No willow seedlings were observed in either study area. It is unknown if this was typical or anomalous.

The only willow regeneration that was observed in either study area consisted of root layering from terraces onto terrace banks or into the interface with fluvial deposits. Over the course of this study, less than a dozen instances of layering were observed at both streams combined. The only significant plant recruitment was herbaceous, consisting of annual forbs and grasses, horsetail and sedges. Even this was generally sparse on open sites and tended to concentrate on a few bar littoral edges and in protected areas behind woody debris (see accompanying photographic exhibit).

In August, during the lowest flows, bars were the most exposed on Caples Creek. On Kirkwood Creek, bars gradually exposed as flows receded over the course of the summer. On both streams it is evident that these bars were deposited at much higher flows during the 1997 flood, and at the present time, would only be inundated during bankful or higher discharges. This probably has implications both for accessibility to seed or willow sprouts and moisture availability for establishment.

Field observations indicated that Caples meadow has been subjected to extensive alterations by beaver for many years. At the present time, beaver are active both above and in the study reach. Browsing reduces both the cover and height of willows adjacent to the stream (see accompanying photographic exhibit). There have been no studies of the effects of beaver on the ability of willows to produce flowers and seed. Since seed production is also limited on Kirkwood Creek where beaver are absent, other factors may be at play, including hybridization, inbreeding depression, or absence of pollinators (Sacchi and Price 1988; Mosseller 1990; Douglas 1997).

Finally, both sites are subjected to horse traffic and grazing. Trampling on bars and barren trails are evident (see accompanying photographic exhibit). It did not appear that horses have a significant impact overall on willow recruitment.

Site Comparisons Over Time. The accompanying photographic exhibit shows conditions at each sample site for the three measurement periods. Table 2 summarizes observed conditions.

Table 2: Conditions Observed at Monitoring Sites, Caples Creek and Kirkwood Creek

Sample Site	Landform and Substrate	Willow Seedlings or Sprouts Present?	Herbaceous Vegetation Present/Cover	Comments
Caples 1	Gravel bar	No	Yes <10 %	None.
Caples 2	Debris bar, sand/silt	No	Yes >50 %	Willow layering on banks above bar.
Caples 3	Gravel-sand bar	No	No	Horse trampling.
Caples 4	Mid-channel bar, sand/silt	No	Yes>80 %	None.
Caples 5	Point bar, gravel	Yes, layering (<10 sprouts)	Yes on back of bar >50 %	Layering at back of bar.
Caples 6	Gravel-sand bar	No	Yes >50 %, less towards water's edge	None
Caples 7	Floodplain, sand/silt	No	Yes >80 %	Adjacent bar had herbaceous recruitment in littoral zone and layering of willows at terrace bank.
Caples 8	Point bar, gravel	No	Negligible	Horsetail recruitment at terrace bank.

Caples 9	Point bar, gravel	Yes, layering (<5 sprouts)	No	Layering at back of bar.
Caples 10	Gravel bar with silt drape	Yes, layering (<5 sprouts)	Yes >20 %	None
Caples 11	Point bar, gravel	No	Yes <10 %	None
Caples 12	Gravel-sand bar	No	Yes <10 %	None
Caples 13	Debris bar, gravel	No	Yes <20 %	Vegetation present in protected area behind debris.
Caples 14	Sand-silt bar	No	Yes >20 %	Adjacent mid-channel bar had limited recruitment of sedges.
Kirkwood 15/16	Gravel bar/floodplain	No, but dense mature willow and sedge	Yes >80 %	Adjacent bars barren.
Kirkwood 17	Gravel bar	No, but dense mature willow and sedge	Yes >80 %	Adjacent bar barren.
Kirkwood 17A	Gravel bar	No	Yes on back of bar >80%	Horsetail dominant.
Kirkwood 18	Floodplain	No, but dense mature willow and sedge	Yes on back of adjacent bar >50 %	Horsetail dominant.
Kirkwood 19	Gravel bar/floodplain	No, but dense willow and sedge	Yes >80 %	Adjacent sand bar barren
Kirkwood 20	Floodplain	No, but dense sedge	Yes >80 %	Adjacent gravel bar barren
Kirkwood 21	Gravel bar	No	No	None
Kirkwood 22	Gravel bar/floodplain	No, but dense mature willow and sedge	Yes >80 %	Adjacent to Site21.
Kirkwood 23/24	Gravel bar/floodplain	No	Yes on floodplain >50 %	None

As may be seen in the accompanying photographic exhibit, exposed fluvial surfaces experienced very little change over the period of study.

Conclusions

This year, willow flowering and seed production were minimal on both the regulated and the control stream. Although we did not put out seed traps to quantify seed rain, we were present on the sites when seed production should have been peaking. Virtually no seed was observed. Willow seed transport by wind or water from upstream or other streams did not appear to be a major factor at these sites. In the absence of natural regeneration, attempts to increase willow recruitment at Caples Creek would have to depend on artificial propagation.

The only willow regeneration observed in either study area was vegetative layering from established plants or plant parts. This amounted to fewer than 20 sprouts. Over time, this regeneration could have some positive effects on channel form recovery at Caples Creek. More rapid recovery could be achieved through artificial propagation.

Exposed bar surfaces generally had little or no recruitment of any kind, probably because of deficiencies in soil moisture. Protected areas behind woody debris, backs of bars, and portions of bars with finer substrate were more likely to have herbaceous recruitment.

At no time did regulated flows inundate higher bars or floodplains on Caples Creek during the period of observation. No mobilization of sediment due to flow augmentation was observed. However, we did not observe the full range of potentially augmented flows. Nevertheless, most instream bars were apparently created during the extreme flow of January 1997 and would only be inundated or mobilized by flows of similar magnitude.

Beaver, especially, and to a much lesser extent, horses, are reducing the cover and extent of existing willows on Caples Creek. Insect herbivory studies have shown significant effects on willow reproduction. There is some evidence that herbivores may selectively feed on male or female plants, thereby changing population sex ratios and seed production. Herbivory also affects susceptibility of willows to drought stress (Bach 1994). If restoration efforts were to be implemented at Caples Creek consideration must be given to controlling herbivory.

Literature Cited

Argus, G.W. 1997. Notes on the taxonomy and distribution of California *Salix*. *Madrono* 44:115-136.

Bach, C.E. 1994. Effects of herbivory and genotype on growth and survivorship of sand-dune willow (*Salix cordata*). *Ecological Entomology* 19:303-309.

Blom, C.W.P.M. 1999. Adaptations to flooding stress: from plant community to molecule. *Plant Biology* 1:261-273.

Douglas, D.A. 1995. Seed germination, seedling demography, and growth of *Salix setchelliana* on glacial river bars in Alaska. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 73:673-679.

- Douglas, D.A. 1997. Pollination, capsule damage and the production of seeds in *Salix setchelliana*, an Alaskan glacial river gravel bar willow. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 75: 1182-1187.
- Harris, R.R., Fox, C.A. and Risser, R.J. 1987. Impacts of hydroelectric development on riparian vegetation in the Sierra Nevada region, California, USA. *Environmental Management* 11:519-527.
- Johnson, J.W. 1994. Woodland expansion in the Platte River, Nebraska: patterns and causes. *Ecological Monographs* 64:45-84.
- McBride, J.R., and J. Strahan. 1985. Establishment and survival of woody riparian species on gravel bars of an intermittent stream. *The American Midland Naturalist* 112:235-245.
- Merigliano, M.F. 1998. Cottonwood and willow demography on a young island, Salmon River, Idaho. *Wetlands* 18:571-576.
- Mosseller, A. 1990. Hybrid performance and species crossability in willows. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 68:2329-2338.
- Munz, P.A. and D.D. Keck. 1973. *A California Flora and Supplement*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.
- Platts, W.S., C. Amour, G.D. Booth, M. Bryant, J.L. Bufford, P. Cuplin, S. Jensen, G.W. Lienkaemper, G.W. Minshall, S.B. Monsen, R.L. Nelson, J.R. Sedell, and J.S. Tuhy. 1987. Methods for evaluating riparian habitats with applications to management. U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report INT 221, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, Utah.
- Roelle, J.E. and D.N. Gladwin. 1999. Establishment of woody riparian species from natural seedfall at a former gravel pit. *Restoration Ecology* 7:183-192.
- Rood, S. B., K. Taboulchanas, C.E. Bradley, and A.R. Kalischuk. 1999. Influence of flow regulation on channel dynamics and riparian cottonwoods along the Bow River, Alberta. *Rivers* 7: 33-48.
- Sacchi, C.F. and P.W. Price. 1988. Pollination of the arroyo willow, *Salix lasiolepis*: role of insects and wind. *American Journal of Botany* 75:1387-1393.
- Sacchi, C.F. and P.W. Price. 1992. The relative roles of abiotic and biotic factors in seedling demography of arroyo willow, *Salix lasiolepis*. *American Journal of Botany* 79:395-405. Taylor et al. 1999
- Weeden, N.F. 1979. *A Sierra Nevada Flora*. Wilderness Press, Berkeley, California.

Williams, G.P. and M.G. Wolman. 1984. Downstream effects of dams on alluvial rivers. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1286, Washington, DC.

134 FERC ¶ 62,113
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

El Dorado Irrigation District

Project No. 184-217

ORDER APPROVING RIPARIAN VEGETATION RECRUITMENT
MONITORING PLAN UNDER ARTICLE 401(A)

(Issued February 7, 2011)

1. On January 27, 2011, El Dorado Irrigation District (licensee) filed its Riparian Vegetation Recruitment Monitoring Plan, pursuant to Article 401(a) of the El Dorado Hydroelectric Project license.¹ The project is located on the South Fork of the American River and its tributaries in El Dorado, Alpine, and Amador Counties, California, and occupies federal lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS).
2. Article 401(a) of the project license requires that the licensee file for Commission approval, various plans found in the USFS's Final 4(e) Terms and Conditions and the California State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board) Section 401 water quality certification. The State Water Board's certification Condition No. 13 and USFS 4(e) Condition No. 37 require that the licensee file for Commission approval, various monitoring and study plans. Among these plans, the licensee is required to file a plan to monitor the recruitment of riparian vegetation, in order to evaluate riparian conditions and its response to changes in streamflow regime in the Caples Creek area. Monitoring is to be conducted every five years at 24 sites on two study reaches. The plan should be developed in consultation with, and approved by the USFS, the Ecological Resource Committee (ERC), and the State Water Board.
3. The licensee proposes to monitor the recruitment of riparian vegetation at 24 sites along Caples Creek and Kirkwood Creek. Surveys would occur during the summer every five years, and collected data would include: the type of landform/substrate at the site; presence of absence of any form of plant regeneration on fluvial deposits; flowering and fruiting of willows and other species; presence of herbivory; land use impacts; and photographic documentation of each sample site. Collected data would be compiled into a tabular format for comparison with previous monitoring efforts. The licensee proposes to submit monitoring data and a discussion of the results to the USFS, the ERC, and the State Water Board at least two weeks prior to its annual ERC meeting. Following a 30-day agency review and comment period, the licensee proposes to file a final monitoring

¹ See 117 FERC ¶ 62,044. Order Issuing New License (Issued October 18, 2006).

report with the Commission by June 30 of each year following monitoring, as part of its annual project monitoring report.

4. The licensee submitted a final draft of the plan to the USFS, the ERC, and the State Water Board on October 28, 2010. Individual members of the ERC approved the plan by separate correspondence dated November 10, November 11, December 23, and December 27, 2010. The State Water Board formally approved the plan by letter dated November 9, 2010. The USFS also approved the plan by letter dated January 3, 2011.

5. The licensee's plan includes a proposal to conduct riparian vegetation recruitment monitoring along two study reaches, every five years, and to file corresponding monitoring reports with the Commission each year following monitoring. The licensee's plan is consistent with the requirements of the project license and should adequately assess the effects of project operations on riparian vegetation recruitment and aid in determining if management goals are being met, and should be approved.

The Director Orders:

(A) El Dorado Irrigation District's (licensee) Riparian Vegetation Recruitment Monitoring Plan, filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on January 27, 2011, pursuant to Article 401(a) of the El Dorado Hydroelectric Project license, is approved.

(B) This order constitutes final agency action. Any party may file a request for rehearing of this order within 30 days from the date of its issuance, as provided in section 313(a) of the FPA, 16 U.S.C. § 8251 (2006), and the Commission's regulations at 18 C.F.R. § 385.713 (2010). The filing of a request for rehearing does not operate as a stay of the effective date of this order, or of any other date specified in this order. The licensee's failure to file a request for rehearing shall constitute acceptance of this order.

Thomas J. LoVullo
Acting Chief, Aquatic Resources Branch
Division of Hydropower Administration
and Compliance

Document Content(s)

P-184-217[1].DOC.....1-2