

## TABLES

Table 2  
Data submitted by the Department of Fish and Game  
Coho salmon captured at the Egg-taking Station in the South Fork Noyo River

NOYO COHO NUMBERS FOR 1962--63 thru 1998--99 SEASONS

<u>Season</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Grilse</u>	<u>Total</u>
1962--63	775	416	2,501	3,692
1963--64	1,054	2,403	1,483	4,940
1964--65	326	745	1,006	2,077
1965--66	262	291	1,199	1,752
1966--67	951	1,124	925	3,000
1967--68	248	611	1,663	2,522
1968--69	1,120	1,796	166	3,082
1969--70	308	557	473	1,338
1970--71	278	440	1,193	1,911
1971--72	1,245	1,618	170	3,033
1972--73	184	221	1,872	2,277
1973--74	532	871	1,489	2,892
1974--75	888	1,152	496	2,536
1975--76	257	424	1,108	1,789
1976--77	457	620	183	1,260
1977--78*	204	187	120	511
1978--79*	190	200	49	439
1979--80*	103	155	334	592
1980--81*	123	90	125	338
1981--82	431	891	506	1,828
1982--83	214	327	54	595
1983--84	10	17	72	99
1984--85	365	429	230	1,024
1985--86	13	7	26	46

NOYO COHO NUMBERS FOR 1964--65 thru 1996--97 SEASON (continued)

<u>Season</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Grilse</u>	<u>Total</u>
1986--87	227	169	634	1,030
1987--88	1,146	1,424	98	2,668
1988--89	69	85	554	708
1989--90	419	299	294	1,012
1990--91*	57	32	56	145
1991--92	173	179	157	509
1992--93*	74	66	24	164
1993--94 <sup>1</sup>	26	20	81	127
1994--95 <sup>2</sup>	293	316	326	935
1995--96 <sup>2</sup>	137	149	10	296
1996--97 <sup>2</sup>	101	523	1,254	1,878
1997--98	374	753	123	1,250
1998-99	5	11	355	371

\* Drought years

No fish spawned this year--not a complete count

<sup>2</sup> Not a complete count

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT MOST YEARS ARE NOT COMPLETE COUNTS, AND  
SOME NUMBER OF COHO ALWAYS SPAWN DOWNSTREAM OF THE NOYO STATION

**Table 3:** Summary of the results of fish distribution surveys in the upper Noyo River watershed, conducted by Louisiana-Pacific Corporation (now Mendocino Redwood Company) from 1994 to 1996.

Survey Site Location	Survey Site No.	Survey Date	Steelhead Age Class	Steelhead Abundance	Coho Age Class	Coho Abundance
North Fork Noyo	70-6	7/27/94	0+, 1 yr, 2 yr	>40	0+	<10
"	"	6/13/95	0	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	6/20/96	0	<10	0	<10
Marble Gulch	70-7	7/24/96	0	<10	0	<10
"	70-8	7/24/96	0	<10	NF	NF
"	70-9	7/23/96	0,1	<10	NF	NF
Gulch 7	70-10	8/3/94	1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/19/96	1	<10	NF	NF
"	70-11	7/19/96	1	<10	NF	NF
Hayworth Creek	70-12	7/27/94	0,1	10-40	1	<10
"	"	6/14/95	0	<10	NF	NF
"	"	6/19/96	0,1,2	10-40	0	<10
Trib to Hayworth Creek	70-13	7/19/96	0,1	<10	NF	NF
Hayworth Creek	70-14	6/19/96	0,1	10-40	0	10-40
No. Fork Hayworth Creek	70-15	8/3/94	0,1	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	6/14/95	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
"	"	6/19/96	0,1	<10	0	<10
"	70-16	8/3/94	1,2	<10	NF	NF
"	"	6/14/95	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	NF	NF	NF	NF
"	70-17	7/27/96	NF	NF	NF	NF
Hayworth Creek	70-18	8/3/94	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	6/14/95	0	<10	NF	NF
"	"	6/19/96	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
"	70-19	8/4/94	0,1	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	6/14/95	1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/19/96	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
Trib. to Hayworth Creek	70-20	7/19/96	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
Hayworth Creek	70-21	7/19/96	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
Soda Creek	70-22	8/4/94	1,2	<10	NF	NF
"	"	8/3/95	0	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/19/96	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	70-23	7/19/96	NF	NF	NF	NF
North Fork Noyo	70-24	7/27/94	NF	NF	NF	NF
"	"	6/14/95	0	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	6/19/96	0,1	10-40	0	<10
Middle Fork North Fork Noyo	70-25	7/27/94	0,1	10-40	0	<10
"	"	7/14/95	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	0,1	10-40	0	<10
"	70-26	8/4/94	0,1,2	10-40	0	<10
"	"	7/14/95	0,1	2	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
"	70-27	8/25/94	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	8/3/95	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF

Survey Site	Survey Site No.	Survey Date	Steelhead Age Class	Steelhead Abundance	Coho Age Class	Coho Abundance
"	"	7/23/96	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
North Fork Noyo	70-29	7/27/94	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	0,1,2	10-40	0	<10
"	"	7/27/94	0,1	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
DeWarren Creek	70-31	8/4/94	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	0,1	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
Trib. to DeWarren Creek	70-32	8/4/94	1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	0,1	10-40	NF	NF
DeWarren Creek	70-33	8/3/94	1,2	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/18/96	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
Noyo River	70-34	7/27/94	0,1,2	10-40	0	<10
"	"	6/13/95	0	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	6/20/96	0,1	<10	0	<10
Trib. to Noyo	70-35	7/25/96	0,1	10-40	0	<10
Fork of trib. to Noyo	70-36	7/25/96	0,1,2	<10	0	<10
Trib. to Noyo	70-37	7/25/96	0,1,2	<10	0	<10
Olds Creek	70-38	7/24/96	0,1	10-40	NF	NF
Trib. to Olds Creek	70-39	7/25/96	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
Olds Creek	70-41	7/25/96	0,1,2	>40	NF	NF
Redwood Creek	70-42	7/28/94	0,1	10-40	0	<10
"	"	7/14/95	0,1,2	10-40	0	10-40
"	"	6/5/96	0,1,2	<10	0,1	>40
"	"	7/28/94	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/22/96	0,1,2	<10	0	<10
70-44	7/28/94	1	<10	NF	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	0	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/22/96	0,1,2	10-40	0	<10
McMullen Creek	70-45	7/28/94	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
Trib. to McMullen	70-46	7/14/95	0	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/22/96	0,1	<10	NF	NF
Noyo River	70-48	7/28/94	0,1	10-40	1	<10
"	"	6/13/95	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
Burbeck Creek	70-49	8/25/94	0,1,2	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	7/14/95	0,1	10-40	NF	NF
"	"	6/5/96	0,1	<10	NF	NF
"	"	7/23/96	1	<10	NF	NF
Noyo River	70-51	8/25/94	0,1,2	<10	NF	NF
"	"	6/13/95	0,2	10-40	0	<10
"	"	6/5/96	0,1	10-40	NF	NF
70-52	7/23/96	0,1,2	>40	NF	NF	NF

NF = no fish  
Shaded area = coho observations

**Table 4: Summary salmonid sitings reported in stream surveys conducted by the Department of Fish and Game in the 1950s and 1960s.**

Assess. Area	Location	Observation
HAA	Mainstem	1957: Steelhead and salmon noted throughout. Size and abundance increased farther up mainstem to headwaters. Past stocking noted at Northspur and in reach between the confluence with Redwood Creek up to Shake City.
	Redwood Creek	1957: Numerous 1-4 inch fish 1966: 112 salmon, 1.5-2.5 inches (avg. 2.25 inches) 496 steelhead, 1.5-7 inches (avg. 2 inches) Surveyor estimated stream producing about 3,700 silver salmon and 1,500 steelhead trout. No known past stocking.
NFAA	North Fork Noyo River	1957: 3-7 inch salmonids, not that numerous. 1966: 112 coho (avg. 2.25 inches) 238 steelhead (avg. 2 inches). Surveyor estimated stream producing 11,200 coho and 23,800 steelhead.
	Middle Fork of North Fork Noyo River	1967: Abundant coho and steelhead (150 of each per 100 feet of stream). Steelhead average 1.5 inches and coho average 2 inches.
	Hayworth Creek	1957: Fish up to 7 inches long above waterfall. 1967: 117 coho (avg. 2.25 inches) 582 steelhead (avg. 2 inches) Surveyor estimated stream producing 2,340 coho and 11,600 steelhead.
SFAA	South Fork Noyo River	1957: Steelhead and salmon "good" 1959: Coho most abundant followed by steelhead and then stickleback. Coho 1-2.5 inches (avg. 2 inches). Steelhead 2-24 inches (avg. 2 inches). 1967: Observed silver salmon, steelhead and sticklebacks. Coho ranged from 2-4 inches. Steelhead ranged from 2-7 inches.
	North Fork of South Fork Noyo River	1957: Steelhead and coho 2-6 inches (avg. 2 inches). Abundant and in "good" condition. 1959: Steelhead and coho 1-7 inches with 1-3 inch fish common.
	Parlin Creek	1957: Steelhead and salmon 1-6 inches. 1959: Coho and steelhead observed. Steelhead ranged from 2-7 inches (avg. 2 inches) and coho ranged from 1-2 inches (avg. 1.5 inches).
	Kass Creek	1957: Steelhead and coho 1-3 inches. Abundant and "good" success. 1959: Coho and steelhead observed throughout creek. 1966: 408 coho, 1.25-3 inches (avg. 1.75 inches) 0 steelhead Surveyor estimated stream producing 6,800 coho and no steelhead.
MAA	Mainstem	1957: Steelhead and salmon observed with lengths ranging from 1-4 inches. Adult steelhead ranging in size from 14-30 inches observed several miles east of estuary in February.

**Table 5: Summary of in-stream data collected by Mendocino Redwood Company in the Noyo River watershed**

Stream Name	Assess. Area	Segment	% pools by stream length	% pools > 3'	Shelter rating	% embeddedness	Key LWD (bf/100m)	% fines <0.85 mm (mean)—as dry weight
Noyo	HAA	1	42	81	27	25-50	0.5	7%
North Fork Noyo	NFAA	3	34	20	14	25-50	0.4	NR
Marble Gulch	NFAA	12	50	13	25	<25	0.9	NR
Marble Gulch	NFAA	23	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7%
Gulch #7	NFAA	48	26	0	11	<25	0.0	NR
Noyo	HAA	56	38	16	55	<25	0.5	NR
Olds Creek	HAA	57	23	31	34	<25	0.0	NR
Unnamed trib	HAA	63	37	0	30	<25	3.2	NR
Unnamed trib	HAA	64	2	0	25	<25	0.3	NR
Burbeck Creek	HAA	80	5	0	150	<25	5.6	NR
Redwood Creek	HAA	92	55	13	30	25-50	1.2	NR
Redwood Creek	HAA	92(2)	64		16	<25	0.0	NR
Hayworth Creek	NFAA	104	63	59	93	<25	1.8	NR
Hayworth Creek	NFAA	106		7	36	25-50	1.3	7%
North Fork Hayworth	NFAA	112	50	0	90	25-50	0.0	NR
Hayworth Creek	NFAA	118	32	0	17	25-50	1.0	NR
Soda Creek	NFAA	119	31	0	25	<25	2.9	NR
North Fork Noyo	NFAA	152	79	21	39	<25	0.5	NR
North Fork Noyo	NFAA	152(2)	45	12	86	25-50	2.1	NR
Middle Fork North Fork Noyo	NFAA	153	34	0	15	<25	1.4	9%
Middle Fork North Fork Noyo	NFAA	153(2)	26	0	43	25-50	0.0	NR
Middle Fork North Fork Noyo	NFAA	156	70	0	34	<25	3.4	NR
North Fork Noyo	NFAA	159	24	0	24	25-50	9.8	10%
North Fork Noyo	NFAA	159(2)	23	0	45	25-50	14.2	NR
DeWarren Creek	NFAA	161	39	9	53	>50	10.5	NR

Biosample Database)

Stream	Date	Steelhead trout populations			Coho salmon populations			Shelter ratings				
		Density (fish/m <sup>2</sup> )	Biomass (kg/ha)		Density (fish/m <sup>2</sup> )	Biomass (kg/ha)		Turbulence	Instream object	Undercut bank	Vegetation	Total
Redwood Creek (HAA)	5/12/89	0.46	5.17		0.02	0.14		60	70	5	1	136
South Fork Noyo River (SFAA)	9/13/83	0.17	11.35		0.01	0.39		NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
South Fork Noyo River (SFAA)	9/12/86	NR	NR		NR	NR		0	10	2	1	13
Kass Creek (SFAA)	10/4/83	0.42	6.85		0.28	9.10		NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
North Fork South Fork Noyo River (SFAA)	9/12/86	NR	NR		NR	NR		1	10	25	1	37
Duffy Gulch (MAA)	6/25/86	0.88	9.50		NR	NR		60	50	0	0	110
Little North Fork Noyo River (MAA)	8/22/84	1.16	26.92		0.09	4.00		5	25	20	15	65



**Table 7:** Summary of the logging activity permitted by Timber Harvest Plans submitted to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection from 1986-1998 in the Novo River Watershed.

LANDOWNER	HEADWATERS			NORTH FORK NOYO		SOUTH FORK NOYO		MAINSTEM NOYO		TOTAL
	ACRES	%	ACRES	%	ACRES	%	ACRES	%	ACRES	%
Barnum Timber	0	0	1243	10	0	0	0	0	1242	3
Congaree River Ltd.	2381	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	2391	5
Georgia-Pacific Corp.	0	0	0	0	2206	20	5969	49.48	8174	18
Harwood Investment	904	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	904	2
Louisiana-Pacific Corp./ Mendocino Redwood Co.	2938	31	9770	80	209	2	515	4.27	13431	30
Rex Timber Company	0	0	0	0	505	5	4170	34.56	4674	10
San Francisco Boys and Girls Club	0	0	238	2	3	0	667	5.53	908	2
State of California-- JDSF	0	0	0	0	7862	70	0	0.00	7862	17
Bill Stone	0	0	530	4	0	0	1	0.00	531	1
Robert Whitaker	1026	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1026	2
Subtotal	7250	77	11791	96	10784	96	11320	93.84	41150	92
Other small THPs	2216	23	445	4	407	4	743	6.16	3812	8
TOTAL HARVEST	9466	100	12236	100	11191	100	12063	100.00	44956	100
TOTAL ACRES AND PERCENT ACRES HARVESTED	17390	54	16045	76	17574	64	21314	55.81	72323	62

**Table 8:** Summary of silvicultural practices used in the Noyo River watershed as derived from Timber Harvest Plans submitted to the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection from 1986 to 1998.

Silvicultural Management	Prescription	Headwaters Assessment Area			North Fork Assessment Area			South Fork Assessment Area			Mainstem Assessment Area		
		Acres	% of total		Acres	% of total		Acres	% of total		Acres	% of total	
Evenage	Clearcut	78	1		573	5		1,496	13		4,158	35	
	Shelterwood	3,245	34		6,035	64		1,379	12		2,878	34	
	Seed Tree	287	3		421	3		558	5		698	6	
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>3,610</b>	<b>34</b>		<b>7,029</b>	<b>58</b>		<b>3,432</b>	<b>31</b>		<b>7,734</b>	<b>65</b>	
Unevenage	Selection	2,422	26		1,777	15		3,790	34		3,608	22	
	Transition	235	2		378	3		1,497	14		952	8	
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>2,658</b>	<b>28</b>		<b>2,155</b>	<b>18</b>		<b>5,287</b>	<b>47</b>		<b>4,560</b>	<b>38</b>	
Intermediate	Commercial Thinning	289	3		308	3		2,030	18		285	2	
	Sanitation Salvage	45	0		194	2		3	0		0	0	
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>502</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>2,033</b>	<b>18</b>		<b>285</b>	<b>2</b>	
Special	Rehabilitation	314	3		463	4		0	0		0	0	
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>463</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
Alternative	Alternative	2,551	27		1,449	12		438	4		340	3	
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>2,551</b>	<b>27</b>		<b>1,449</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>439</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>340</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>9,466</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>12,199</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>11,191</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>11,919</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Table 9:** Summary of yarding statistics for timber harvest activity in the Noyo River watershed as compiled from Timber Harvest Plans submitted to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection from 1986-1998.

Assessment Area	LOGGED AREA YARDED BY TRACTOR		LOGGED AREA YARDED BY CABLE SKYLINE		LOGGED AREA YARDED BY HELICOPTER		TOTAL LOGGED AREA
	Acres	% of logged area yarded by tractor	Acres	% of logged area yarded by cable	Acres	% of logged area yarded by helicopter	Acres
Headwaters (HAA)	7141	75	1550	16	775	8	9466
North Fork Noyo (NRAA)	10072	83	2052	17	75	1	12199
South Fork Noyo (SFAA)	4667	42	6313	56	212	2	11191
Mainstem Noyo (MAA)	7623	64	4295	36	0	0	11919
Total	29503	66	14209	32	1063	2	44774

**Table 0: Summary of road length and density data derived from Timber**  
 986-1998. Plans submitted to the Department and Fire Protection during the period of

ROAD TYPE	HEADWATERS SUB-BASIN (27.17 mi2)		NORTH FORK NOYO SUB-BASIN (25.07 mi2)		SOUTH FORK NOYO SUB-BASIN (27.46 mi2)		MAINSTEM NOYO SUB-BASIN (33.30 mi2)		NOYO RIVER WATERSHED (113.00 mi2)	
	Length (mi)	Density (mi/mi2)	Length (mi)	Density (mi/mi2)	Length (mi)	Density (mi/mi2)	Length (mi)	Density (mi/mi2)	Length (mi)	Density (mi/mi2)
Primary route	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Secondary route	2	0	0	0	11	0	11	0	24	0
Existing permanent	13	1	11	0	19	1	57	2	101	1
Existing seasonal	115	4	147	6	96	3	184	6	542	5
Existing temporary	12	0	7	0	6	0	1	0	26	0
Proposed permanent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposed seasonal	14	1	18	1	26	1	2	0	59	1
Proposed temporary	0		0	0	5	0	0	0	5	0
Bridge	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Abandoned seasonal	0		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>758</b>	<b>7</b>

TABLE II

**NOYO RIVER WATERSHED SEDIMENT SOURCE ANALYSIS**  
**Preliminary Sediment Budget**

PERIOD YEAR	INPUTS							OUTPUTS		
	MASS WASTING (tons)	SURFACE EROSION		ROAD (tons)	FLUVIAL EROSION BANK EROSION (tons)		CHANGE IN STORAGE (tons)	TOTAL INPUTS (tons)	OUTFLOW SSL AND BL (tons)	YIELD (tons/ml2/yr)
		BACKGROUND (tons)	SKID ROADS (tons)							
1933-1942	220,000	84,800	500	27,500	226,000			558,000	1,080,000	955
1943-1952	52,600	84,800	4,600	31,300	226,000			399,000	695,000	615
1953-1957	148,000	42,400	10,900	40,500	113,000	-30000		385,000	824,000	1458
1958-1963	243,000	50,900	21,500	66,900	136,000	-36000		554,000	508,000	749
1964-1965	116,000	17,000	15,200	22,300	45,200	-12000		228,000	643,000	2845
1966-1978	61,200	110,000	24,100	233,000	294,000	-78000		800,000	1,880,000	1283
1979-1988	356,000	84,800	13,900	178,000	226,000			858,000	984,000	871
1989-1996	56,300	67,800	16,900	172,000	181,000			494,000	797,000	882
1997-1999	23,700	25,400	7,300	64,600	67,800			189,000		
TOTAL	1,276,800	567,900	114,900	836,100	1,515,000	-146,000		4,465,000	7,411,000	Mean Yield 979

## Notes:

- All values rounded to three significant figures
- Mass Wasting derived from landslides mapped from aerial photographs taken at the end of each budget period. Certain areas were not covered by the photographs in 1942, 1952, 1957, and 1999. See text for details.
- Background rates (containing creep, surface erosion by sheetwash and rilling, and deep-seated landslide components) based on work of Roberts and Church (1986) and Cafferata/Stillwater Sciences (pers. Comm. 1999).
- Skid roads based on measured harvest areas on the 1942, 1957, 1965, and 1978 aerial photographs, delineated into 3 classes of skid road density. Harvest areas after 1986 are computed from GIS coverages developed by CDF.
- Road erosion computed from measured road miles in 1942, 1952, 1957, 1965, 1978 aerial photographs, and 1985 USGS topographic maps. Roads after 1985 are based on GIS coverage developed from THP submitted to CDF.
- Bank erosion is based on a rate of 200 tons/mi<sup>2</sup>/yr, and includes bank erosion and small streamside mass movements generally under the canopy and not visible on aerial photography. Adjusted from data by MRC (C. Surfleet, pers. Comm. 1999) and USDA (1972).
- Change in storage represents estimates of loss of storage through LWD removal between 1950-1980. Rate of 100 tons/mi<sup>2</sup> based on calculations by Cafferata/Stillwater Sciences (pers. comm. 1999). Computed for 60 mi<sup>2</sup> of tributary basins.
- Sediment Outflow computed from regional suspended sediment and bedload transport equations developed as described in the text and applied to the USGS gage#11468500 for the period 1952-1997. Pre-1952 values based on correlation with annual precipitation.

**Table 12: Summary of sediment inputs to the Noyo River watershed as derived from data presented by Matthews (1999)**

Time period	Background Sediment Delivery (tons/mi2/yr)			Management-related Sediment Delivery (tons/mi2/yr)						Total (tons/mi2/yr)
	Mass wasting	Surface erosion	Stream bank erosion*	Mass wasting-- Railroad	Mass wasting-- Harvest	Mass wasting-- Roads	Surface erosion-- Roads	Surface erosion-- Skid trails	Fluvial erosion-- Roads	
<b>HAA (27.17 mi2)</b>										
1933-1957	24	75		0	2	0	41	18	?	160+
1958-1978	67	75		8	25	83	156	46	?	460+
1979-1999	140	75		9	8	106	162	17	?	517+
<b>NFAA (25.07 mi2)</b>										
1933-1957	6	75		0	0	6	11	1	?	99+
1958-1978	145	75		0	35	78	142	55	?	530+
1979-1999	157	75		0	5	106	182	21	?	546+
<b>SFAA (27.46 mi2)</b>										
1933-1957	305	75		13	9	14	74	3	?	493+
1958-1978	94	75		7	2	19	132	5	?	334+
1979-1999	98	75		0	5	18	148	13	?	357+
<b>MAA (33.3 mi2)</b>										
1933-1957	46	75		157	0	2	17	2	?	299+
1958-1978	40	75		100	0	37	118	4	?	374+
1979-1999	22	75		12	53	76	201	13	?	452+
<b>NOYO RIVER WATERSHED</b>										
1933-1957	95	75	200	49	3	5	35	6	?	468+
1958-1978	83	75	200	33	14	53	136	26	?	620+
1979-1999	99	75	200	6	20	76	175	16	?	667+
1933-1999	91	75	200	31	12	42	111	15	?	577+

\*Stream bank erosion was estimated by applying a regional figure to all but about 30% of Noyo River watershed stream miles. The 30% excluded from the calculation represent the Noyo River itself that from limited observation appears to have relatively stable banks. The calculation was not broken down by assessment area. As such, the total sediment delivery for each assessment area does not include streambank erosion and is therefore underestimated. The total estimates of sediment delivery per assessment area and for the whole watershed are also lacking figures for fluvial erosion from roads. For this reason, too, the calculation results are underestimates.

\*\* Any discrepancies between Table 11 and Table 12 are the result of rounding numbers up and down.