

SOUTH MENDOCINO COAST CREEKS - Table 1

SYP unit		SYP (3/11/97)	L-P '94-96 surv COHO	L-P '94-96 surveys Steelhead	Other evidence	MRC surv 98-00	303 (d)	D F G	Survey notes	Historical	temp (SYP p.8)	temp (L-P '94-96)	shade (SYP)	pool (SYP)
84	Greenwood Creek	Coho in upper & lower (p.8)	Coho: 0	Steelhead: <10 - 40+ (9 of 9 sites)	Coho '96 Tib ref 42; J Russell '75	Un-known	no	✓	L-P '94-96 surv differ from Tib #42. Mamu '95-99.	1920-30s-Coho "ganged up" in the estuary	<64° F	60+ days: 16-20° C	L: 7.1% M: 8.7% H: 84.3%	low LWD; poor pools
87	Elk Creek ¹	Coho in upper & lower (p.8)	Coho: <10 (so. fork '95- site 87-3)	Steelhead: <10 - 40+ (17 of 19 sites)	3 upper tribs-Coho '79, absent '95 (Tib ref 10,42)	NO COHO IN '00 (THP 1-00-363M)	no	✓	Coho extinction between '95 and '00?	1920-30s-wagons full of Coho for winter's food supply	no data??	81 days: 15-16.5° C	L: 64% M: 20% H: 16%	poor data
89	Alder Creek ²	No comment on Coho. 39.6 mi. of Class I (p.8)	Coho: 0	Steelhead: <10 - 40+ (10 of 15 sites)		Un-known	no	?	Mamu ('94-95?)	Steelhead jumped falls several miles up	<64° F	51-65 days: 17-20+° C	L: 18% M: 11.5% H: 69.9	poor data
89	Mallo Pass Creek ²	Coho currently present (p.8)	Coho: 0	Steelhead: <10 - 40+ (2 of 2 sites)		Un-known	no	✓			<64° F		L: 18% M: 11.5% H: 69.9	poor data
91	Brush Creek	Historical Coho (not since '76) (p.6)	no survey data	no survey data	(Tib ref 10?)	Un-known	no	✓			no data		no data	no data
94	Schooner Gulch	Coho in some streams (p.7)	Coho: 0	Steelhead: <10 up to 40 (2 of 4 sites)		Un-known	no	✓	Steelhead-Schoon.G & Hall Cr '94-96		no data		L: 3.1% M: 6.6% H: 90.3%	LWD-good; gravel-fair; pools-fair;

Notes: 1. 87/Elk Creek (upper area) includes Three Springs Cr, Sulphur Fk & Soda Fk. 2. 89/Alder Creek watershed includes Bee Tree, John, Tin Can & Nye Creeks. 89/Alder Creek WWAA includes Mallo Pass Creek (a separate drainage) and sometimes averages the data. *Primary reference:* SYP 95-003: Louisiana Pacific March 11, 1997. The SYP was never approved by CDF. MRC abandoned the SYP process in early 2000 and provides no salmonid information in Option A nor in "MRC Management Plan, Policies and Targets (August 2000)". *Tiburon Lab/NMFS report:* "Historical and Current Presence/Absence of Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) in the Central Calif. Coast ESU, 4/99, by Peter B. Adams et al, Admin. Report SC-9902, SW Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz/Tiburon Lab, NMFS (3150 Paradise Drive, Tiburon, CA 94920). Ref. #42 is unpublished L-P data. Ref. #10 Sherr-Griffin '79, Hassler '88. *Historical:* "Reminiscences of a Town with Two Names (Greenwood/Elk)," W. Matson, 1980. Jesse Russell (fisherman) decl. 1990.

SOUTH MENDOCINO COAST CREEKS – Table 2

SYP unit		Basal area sq ft/ac		WHR tree diameters (dbh) %/aver. stands		Late seral	Current Logging ¹	Current Logging acreage ¹	Total watershed acreage	L-P/MRC ownership	% L-P /MRC	Other activities	History/ notes	Current silvi-culture ²
		conif	hw	1-21"	24"+									
84	Greenwood Creek	122	79	95%	5%	5% 488 ac	23 THPs	2,727*	16,448	9,682	58%	42% other logging; ranch, vineyard etc	logged since early 1900s	80% even-age
87	Elk Creek	133	80	92%	8%	9% 1,169 ac	23 THPs	3,163	18,000	14,000	77%	4,000 ac-other logging	1.25 mi uninhab coastline	"
89	Alder Creek	130	86	91.7%	8.3%	8% 743 ac	15 THPs	2,234	19,155	7,971	42%	46% other logging (some range)	Historical logging	"
89	Mallo Pass Creek	(130)	(86)	no data	no data	(8%)	unknown		8,742	2,501	28.6%	"	Historical logging	
91	Brush Creek	108	82	90%	10%	10% 68 ac	unknown		11,373	659	5.8%	83% logging in watershed	Historical logging	
94	Schooner Gulch	(90) p.2		97%	3%	3% 65 ac	unknown		12,922	2,161	16.7%	mostly smaller loggers	Historical logging	
	Entire ownership	aver. 10,000 bf/ac ⁴		97%	3%			22,000 estimate '97-00		215,000				
	Source of info.	SYP ³ p2	"	SYP (RCWA tables)	"	SYP p.2	RCWA research (CDF files)	"	SYP p. 1	SYP p. 1	SYP p. 1	SYP p. 1	SYP p. 1; local	RCWA (CDF files)

Notes: 1. 1996-2000 active THPs (RCWA research of CDF files). The logging figures in this table are mostly for the MRC (former L-P) ownership, but do include some smaller landowners. The other figures are taken from the SYP. 2. MRC logging is primarily even-age, i.e., various forms of clearcutting, including "shelterwood" (3-stage clearcut), "seed tree" (2-stage clearcut), "traditional" clearcuts (100%), "alternative prescription" clearcuts (90%), transition, rehab, etc. 3. Primary reference for these tables: Louisiana Pacific SYP 95-003, March 11, 1997. Note: The SYP was never approved by CDF. Mendocino Redwood Co. (which took over in July 1998) abandoned the SYP process in early 2000 and provides no watershed or site-specific logging information in any management document. 4. MRC's Option A alleges timber inventory of 10,000 bf/ac. It is likely smaller. MRC's total annual logging goal is 40+ million bf/yr (Option A).

*Includes all owners.

SOUTH MENDOCINO COAST CREEKS – Table 3

SYP unit		Road density mi/mi ²	% High/chronic shallow landslide potential	% of land in Extreme EHR	Miles of Class I streams	Road/stream crossing density: no./sq mi	Road within 100' of streams: mi/mi ²	Road within 100' of streams: length in miles	Surface soil erosion hazard	No. of landslides	Predicted average increase in total erosion: yd ³ /ac/entry	Predicted average sediment yield: yd ³ /ac/entry	x logging acreage (table 2) = yd ³ sediment	Notes
84	Greenwood Creek	2.3 mi	7.9%	22.3%	37.1 mi	7.9	0.6 mi	8.5 mi	Extreme: 22.3% High: 56.5%	22	15.3	3.1	8,453 yd ³	2a 2b
87	Elk Creek	2.8 mi	6.5%	14.8%	35.9 mi	4.8	0.4 mi	7.8 mi	Extreme: 14.8% High: 45.6%	20	13.4	1.8	5,700 yd ³	
89	Alder Creek	1.2 mi	8.0%	38.4%	39.6 mi	3.6	0.3 mi	1.1 mi	Extreme; high	30	21.8	4.4	9,829 yd ³	
89	Mallo Pass Creek	2.7 mi	8.0%	38.4%	14.0 mi	(3.6)	(0.3 mi)	2.6 mi	"	(30)	(21.8)	(4.4)		1
91	Brush Creek	1.3 mi	7.5%	0	25.3 mi	no info	no info	no info	High; mod.	no data	no info	no info		
94	Schooner Gulch	5.4 mi	4.6%	48.1%	28.1 mi	7.1	0.4 mi	1.4 mi	Extreme; mod.	no data	14.3	2.9		
	WWAA pg in SYP	p.1	p.2	p.2	p.2	p.2	p.2	p.6 table	p.5	p.4	p.5	p.6	See table 2	3

Notes: 1. The SYP combines some statistics in WWAA 89 for Alder Creek and Mallo Pass Creek, indicated here by parentheses or dittos. 2a. The predicted sediment yield in the last column is determined by multiplying the SYP predicted average sediment (yd³/ac/entry) for the watershed by the total acreage of current logging in table 2 (in this case, THPs '96-00—approximately 3 years of activity). The table 2 logging acreage figures are: WWAA 84: 2727 ac; WWAA 87: 3163 ac; WWAA 89: 2234 ac. 2b. WWAA 84-Greenwood Creek contains unrelated small drainages in "Cuffey's Point." We have generally omitted Cuffey's Point from these tables (see WWAA 84, p. 1.). 3. *Primary reference:* Louisiana Pacific SYP 95-003 (March 11, 1997).

SOUTH MENDOCINO COAST CREEKS: Temperature data – L-P 1994-96 Stream Temperature surveys

Temp surv site	Location	From	To	Range – min/max	No. of days high temp	Range of high temp	
84-3	Greenwood Cr	6/10/94	9/22/94	11.5 – 18.5 C	63 days at	16 – 18.5 C	
84-3	Greenwood Cr	7/6/95	9/29/95	12.25 – 20.5 C	51 days at	16 – 20.5 C	
84-1	Greenwood Cr	7/6/95	9/29/95	12.75 – 20.9 C	65 days at	17 – 20.9 C	
87-1	Elk Creek	6/10/94	9/22/94	max range 14 – 16.5 C	81 days at	15 - 16.5 C	no min. given
89-1	Alder Creek	6/28/94	9/22/94	12.5 – 18.5 C	79 days at	15.75 – 18.5 C	
89-1	Alder Creek	7/6/95	10/3/95	13.5 – 21 C	34 days at	18 - 21 C	
89-1	Alder Creek	6/17/96	10/7/96	12.5 – 19.25 C	57 days at	17 – 19.25 C	
89-2	Alder Creek	7/11/95	10/3/95	12.5 – 21.5 C	69 days at	17 – 21.5 C	
89-2	Alder Creek	6/17/96	10/4/96	12 – 22.5 C	58 days at	19 – 22.5 C	

Note: L-P set the temperature thresholds of concern very high in the Stream Temperature monitoring report ('94-96). The SYP consistently states, regarding these creeks, that they remained under the 64° F threshold. As the actual data reveals, the temperatures were consistently lethal to salmonids. Inexplicably, the SYP used Fahrenheit while the L-P Stream Temperature report (and data logging) used Celsius.

Mendocino Redwood Company THPs: GREENWOOD CREEK as of 5/01 – page 1 of 2

THP MRC	Total acres	Silviculture						high- est eros. haz.	new road mi	slides, road probs, x-ings	area of water shed	Notes (All plans have winter ops) (Watershed: 16,400 acres MRC ownership: 9,700 ac)
		"altern. prescrp" clearcut	ac	other form of clearcut	ac	other silvi- culture	ac					
1-01-078	131			trans	71	sel	60	mod	.25	3 big s	m	heart of watershed spawn/rear hab. re-entry of lower 96-514. from west: 01-078/96-514, 01-070, 98-042 (OG), 95-315 (OG Barn G.), 00-312, 94-351, & (x creek) 99-188, 99-227—all very close. big slide probs. doesn't say no coho, inclu "7 proofs" no coho, excludes other evidence. Cooper's Hawk. NSO nr adj.
1-01-070	86	(very confusing)	est:	grp sel cc ap-tran rehab	15 40 11	sel	20	high	.25	8s; big probs	m	see 01-078. Van Fleet, nr Grnwd Rd; says no coho, says 'debate' about coho, does not inclu '7 Proofs.' says mamu likely in Gr Crk. big slide probs - T Best report. nr NSO
1-01-020	166	cc	103	trans	63			mod	.75	7rp	u	OG DF (unit 6/late seral deleted by L-P from lawsuit plan 97-352); near 3 NSO; Cliff Ridge viewshed adj lawsuit resubmission 00-228; inclu but debunks mamu '95/99; says coho/stlhd ESU but gives zero info, no '7Proofs,' nada.
1-00-357	77	cc	77					high	.5	9rp,9x, high s area	u	Restoration projects at risk-bridge, many waterbars (Sky Ranch)-no mention ; inclu '7 Proofs' of no coho; CDF says coho jump 140' at Cuffey's Pt but steelh can't jump 15' waterfall below bridge/So Fork; LP found stlh in So Fork '96; SYP, NMFS report L-P '95, fisherm '75; history bk '20s-30s--all say coho in Gr Crk.
1-00-312	132			grp sel cc trans	29 20	sel	83	high		4s, rp, 13x,	m	see 01-078. adj to 95-315 (Barn Gulch) to east; average 11,600 bf/ac. vital spawn/rear hab.
1-00-228	101	cc	101					high	3	rp, xp	u	see 01-020, 97-352. adds 5 unmapped acres to lawsuit plan 97-352. subj to injunction (Return on the Writ). Road #2 collapsed into Gr Crk '97. fish pond.

1-00-172	174	cc	102			sel ct	16 56	high	.5	9s,4rp, 20 skid	l	w of 99-339. doesn't mention '95/'99 mamu; says no mamu in NSO BAA, says no potential hab in 'the area' (fails to disclose 339 hab); doesn't say no coho but inclu '7 Proofs' of no coho.
1-99-451	142	cc	76			sel	66	mod	.25	3s, rp	m	
1-99-339	75	cc	75					high	.5	9px	l	DF w 1-2' d limbs; mamu '95/ 99 suppressed; start of effort to "prove" no coho & 'Cuffey's Pt idiocy
1-99-227	164	cc	21	grp sel cc str-step	39 30	sel	73	high	1.5	3s 17p/x	m	
1-99-188	86	cc	67			sel	19	extrm	1	big s	m	OG; thin spur ridge
1-99-127	103	cc	95	swr-step	8			high	1.5	0?	u	Sky Ranch So Fork Rd, n. of bridge/restoration. used Signal Ridge Rd for exit.
1-98-042	192			trans	23	sel	169	high	1	rp	m	see 01-078. OG; Fashauer Ranch. MRC 'showcase' plan
1-97-352	0	cc								rp	u	Permanent Injunction (96 acres of cc) – 5/00. See 00-228, 01-020.
1-96-514	136			sw-seed step	136							see 01-078. re-entry.
1-96-208	166	100% cc ap-swp	47 64	swr str	8 25	rehab	15	high	.25	21p/x	u	nr headwaters/ no Fork. Russian G. trib (restoration proj work nr. Gr Crk)
1-96-042	172	cc	8	str sw-prep	147 17	ct	13	high	1.5		u	adj lawsuit plans 97-352 & 00-228 to the east. OG-DF (150+ yr)
1-95-315	161			grp sel cc	161			high	1	s,rp,x's	m	see 01-078. Barn Gulch; am. #10 ('99) from ct to grp sel cc; 16 strip clearcuts; OG-RW logged 12/99.

Totals	2,264		836		843		590		13.75			74% cc or cc-type. entry-23% ownrshp, 14% watershed
--------	-------	--	-----	--	-----	--	-----	--	-------	--	--	---

Greenwood Creek THPs – South Mendocino Coast

THP (Mendocino)	Acreage	Notes	
Mendocino Redwood Co.			
1-00-357	77	ap-cc	threatens fish hab. restor. project; big bridge & culvert – Class I's
1-00-312	132	grp sel cc 29,trans 20,sel 83	adj to 95-315 (OG logged in '99)
1-00-228	101	ap-cc	lawsuit THP 97-352; adds 5 unmapped acres
1-00-172	172	ap-cc, sel, ct	near '95 Mamu site
1-99-451	142	sel/ap	Middle watershed
1-99-339	75	ap-cc	beginning of RPF campaign to "prove" no Coho in Greenwood Cr; Mamu '95 & '99 suppressed
1-99-227	164	cc	Middle watershed
1-99-188	86	ap-cc,sel	OG; thin spur ridge
1-99-127	103	swr,ap-cc	Sky Ranch so fk rd
1-98-042	192	sel,trans	OG; Fashauer Ranch
1-97-352	0	cc	declared illegal 5/00
1-96-514	136	sw-seed step	
1-96-208	166	cc,swr,strt,ap	nr headwaters
1-96-042	172	str,ct,sw-prep,a/cc	adj THP 97-352 & 00-228
1-95-315	161	grp sel cc	amended from ct-OG logged in 12/99
		subtotal	1,879 – MRC/L-P
others:			(14 THPs)
1-99-210	19	sel	
1-99-NTMP-025	72	sel	
1-98-190	60	str	
1-98-161	199	rehab,sel,ap	
1-98-142	137	sel,rehab,trans	
1-98-010	38	sel,trans	
1-98-121	30	conversion	
1-97-NTMP0007	100	sel	
1-97-080	193	sel	
			848 ac – others tot
			(9 THPs)
TOT THP ACREAGE			

See detail on MRC plans

Elk Creek THPs – South Mendocino Coast

MRC: 1-00-363, 1-00-249, 1-00-159, 1-00-027, 1-99-437, 1-99-163, 1-99-161, 1-99-156, 1-99-141, 1-98-019, 1-97-316, 1-97-156, 1-97-020, 1-96-427, 1-96-209, 1-95-515, 1-97-445 (partial; 1-98-266 (Burch) , others 1-00-045, 1-99-060, 1-98-190, 1-98-179, 1-97ntmp-018

THP - Mendocino	Acreage	Silviculture	notes
1-00-363	167	ap-cc,trans,grp sel	ap-cc 39,trans 25,grp sel 103
1-00-249	162	ap-cc,swr,sel	
1-00-159	72	ap-cc,ct	
1-00-027	151	ap-cc,str	
1-99-437	80	ap-cc,swr	inclu partial Alder cr
1-99-163	100	ap-cc	
1-99-161	240	cc,grp sel,sel	lower E Cr
1-99-156	147	ct	lower
1-99-141	81	ap-cc	
1-98-019	113	cc	L-P-transferred to MRC
1-97-316	221	cc,sel	"sec 27"
1-97-156	41	ap, cc	lower so "sulpher"
1-97-020	63	cc	lower w "sulpher"
1-96-427	111	cc,sr	upper E Cr
1-96-209	104	cc,ct	"sulpher" cr
1-95-515	63	ap	"upper twin bridges"
	1916 subtotal		total L-P-MRC 97-00
1-97-445	56		partially op'ed
	1972 subtotal		MRC total 14% of W.
1-97-445	550		stayed by court
	2522 subtotal		CDF approved 18% of W.
1-98-266	402		Roger Burch plan (lower E Cr – near 445)
	2924 subtotal		
1-00-045	20		others
1-99-060?	79		
1-98-190	70		
1-98-179	40		
1-97ntmp-018	30		
	239		
	2924 subtotal		
Total Elk Creek THP acres	3163		tot CDF approved for W. - 17.5% '97-00

Alder Creek THPs – South Mendocino Coast

Lower Alder Creek including tributaries Nye, Tin Can & John Creeks

Mendocino- Region 1

year	THP	Acreage	Notes
00	307	141	ap-sel, ap-cc
00	127	128	
99	323	210	
99	110	187	
99	139	94	
99	038	165	
96	528	262	
95	247	111	
			tot. 1298

Alder Creek - north fork (8,499 ac WAA)

Mendocino- Region 1

year	THP	Acreage	Notes:
00	326	98	ap- cc
99	315	34	
99	060	3	
97	385	90	
96	427	40	
96	231	102	
95	009	569	NTMP
			tot 936

		Lower Alder Cr	1298
		No. Fork Alder Cr	936
		TOTAL THP AC	2234

Alder

00-307 temp data: summer 1994 6/28, 9/22

1 site – range bet 13 Celsius & 18.5 C,

3 lined graphs – max, min, mean

mean 14 to 17 – lots of up and down

1995 – same – added 3 degrees of temp to chart – chart becmes squished

14C to 21C

1996 – same

12C to 19C

site 89-1 map no. 22

WWAA-47 COTTANEVA CREEK (et al) – Table 1

SYP unit		SYP (3/11/97)	L-P '94-96 surv COHO	L-P '94-96 surveys Steelhead	Other evidence	MRC surv 98-00	303 (d)	D F G	Notes	Temp (SYP p.8)	Temp L-P '94-96	Shade (tot WWAA)	Pools (SYP p.8-9)
47	Cottaneva Creek	Data & Lit = Coho (5 of 24 sampling sites) p.8	<10 Coho (7 of 17 sites)	Steelhead: <10 to 40+ (15 of 17 sites)			no		Coho: in Cott. Cr & Fks, & in Slgrhse G.	all under screening threshold (64° F)	Many days above 15 C	Low 3% Mod. 8% High 89%	no deep pools-good LWD-poor gravel-Rockport Cr
47	Hardy Creek	"	Coho: 0	Steelhead: <10 up to 40 (4 of 5 sites)			no	✓		all under screening threshold (64° F)	Many days above 15 C	"	poor pools; fair LWD; fair gravel
47	Juan Creek	"	Coho: 0	Steelhead: <10 up to 40 (5 to 7 sites)			no	✓		all under screening threshold (64° F)	Many days above 15 C	"	poor pools; fair LWD; good gravel
47	Howard Creek	"	Coho: 0	Steelhead: <10 to 40+ (3 to 4 sites)			no	✓		all under screening threshold (64° F)	Many days above 15 C	"	no deep pools; good LWD; poor gravel
47	DeHaven Creek	"	no data	no data			no	✓		all under screening threshold (64° F)	no data	"	no data
	Wages	no info	no data	no data				✓		no data		no data	no data
	Source of info	SYP p. 8	MRC gave L-P surv's to public	"						SYP p.8	See table attached	SYP p. 7	SYP p. 8-9

Notes: Hardy Creek, Juan Creek, Howard Creek, and DeHaven Creek are separate drainages from Cottaneva Creek (included in WWAA 47 as the Rockport tract of the L-P/MRC ownership). Cottaneva Creek itself includes So., No. & Middle Fork Cottaneva Cr., Rockport Cr, Slaughterhouse G., Kimball G. & Powderhouse G. The L-P 1994-96 Fish Distribution and Temperature studies included all of these, plus separate drainages: Hardy Cr, So., No. & Middle Fork Hardy Cr., Little Juan Cr., Juan Cr., Rock Cr., & Howard Cr. Cottaneva Cr., where the Coho were found, seems to be absent from the CDFG list. (This needs checking.) We have no information on Wages Creek (likely because no L-P/MRC ownership – but it *is* on the CDFG Petition). The SYP combines some data for all these creeks, indicated in these tables by dittos or parentheses. *Primary ref.* SYP 95-003 – Louisiana Pacific, March 11, 1997. Note: MRC, which bought out L-P in July 1998, abandoned the SYP process in early 2000 and provides no watershed or logging information in any management document.

WWAA 47-COTTANEVA CREEK (et al) – Table 2

SYP unit		Basal area sq ft/ac		WHR tree diameters (dbh) %/aver. stands		Late seral	Current Logging	Current Logging acreage ¹	Total watershed acreage	L-P/MRC ownership	% L-P /MRC	Other activities	History/ notes
		conif	hw	1-21"	24"+								
47	Cottaneva Creek	107	85	92%	8%	8%	16 THPs	2,860	10,579	7,967	75.3%	95% industrial logging	Logging in 1990s, 1940s & 1950s.
47	Hardy Creek	"	"	"	"	"	no data		3,622	2,981	82.3%	"	"
47	Juan Creek	"	"	"	"	"	no data		4,915	4,690	95.4%	"	"
47	Howard Creek	"	"	"	"	"	no data		3,514	2,373	67.5%	"	"
47	DeHaven Creek	"	"	"	"	"	no data		5,203	32	0.6%	"	"
	Wages Cr	no data											
	Entire ownership	aver. 10,000 bf/ac ²		97%	3%	3%		22,000 estimate '97-00	27,840	18,043	64.8%		
	Source of info.	BA sq ft- ⁴ SYP-p. 2	"	SYP; RCWA tables ³	"	SYP p. 2	RCWA research (CDF files)	RCWA research (CDF files)	SYP p. 1	SYP total, WWAAs p. 1	SYP tot	SYP WWAAs p.1	SYP WWAAs p.1

Notes: 1. Estimate of 1996-2000 active THPs—based on RCWA research of CDF documents. Logging figures may include other owners (besides L-P/MRC). 2. Timber inventory alleged by "Option A, Mendocino Redwood Co., December 2, 1999." 3. RCWA tables summarizing tree sizes from SYP 95-003 WHR data, attached. 4. "SYP" means SYP 95-003 - WWAA 47-Cottaneva pages. *Primary reference:* SYP 95-003: Louisiana Pacific March 11, 1997. Note: The SYP combines and summarizes much of the data for this WWAA, although these are separate drainages; combined data is indicated by ditto marks or parentheses.

WWAA 47-COTTANEVA CREEK (et al) – Table 3

SYP unit		Road density mi/sq mi	% High/chronic shallow landslide potential	% of land in Extreme EHR	Miles of Class I streams	Road/stream crossing density: no./sq mi	Road within 100' of streams: mi/mi ²	Road within 100' of streams: length in miles	Surface soil erosion hazard	No. of land-slides	Predicted average increase in total erosion: yd ³ /ac/entry	Predicted average sediment yield: yd ³ /ac/entry	x logging acreage (3 yrs) = yd ³ sediment	Note *
47	Cottaneva Creek	4.6 mi	7.5%	16.1%	50.9 mi	10.4	0.8 mi	10.5 mi	High to mod.	48	18.4	3.7	10,582 yd ³	12
47	Hardy Creek	6.9 mi	**	"	"	7.9	0.6 mi	2.6 mi	Extreme	"	"	"		
47	Juan Creek	5.8 mi	"	"	"	10.1	0.6 mi	4.4 mi	Extreme	"	"	"		
47	Howard Creek	4.6 mi	"	"	"	1.6	0.1 mi	0.5 mi	Extreme	"	33.6	6.7		
47	DeHaven Creek	11.1 mi	"	"	"	0	0	0	Extreme	"	14.1	2.8		
	Wages Cr	no data												
	Entire ownership					WWAA tot 8.8	WWAA tot 0.6	WWAA tot 17.9			15.7	3.7		
	WWAA pg in SYP	p.1	p.2	p.2	p.2	p.2	p.2	p.6 table	p.3-5	p.4	p. 5.	p. 6	see table 2	

Notes: 1. The SYP averages some of the data for these separate drainages, which is indicated in this table by ditto marks. 2. Cottaneva THPs '96-00 tot. logging ac. of 2,860 ac. (from table 2) multiplied by SYP formula for predicted sediment yield for Cottaneva Creek (3.7 yd³/ac/entry). Note: The SYP gives separate predicted sediment yields for Howard Creek and DeHaven Creek, but not for Hardy Creek or Juan Creek. (In any case, we don't have logging acreage totals for those creeks.)

COTTANEVA CREEK: Temperature data – L-P 1994-96 Stream Temperature surveys

Temp surv site	Location	From	To	Range	No. of days high temp	Range of high temp	
47-1	Cottaneva Creek-So. Fork	6/25/94	9/22/94	10.6 - 15 C	2 days at	15 C	
47-1	Cottaneva Creek-So. Fork	6/29/95	10/2/95	11.5 - 16.3 C	14 days at	15-16.3 C	
47-2	Cottaneva-lower	6/29/95	10/2/95	11.5 - 17 C	40 days at	15-17 C	
47-2	Cottaneva-upper	6/18/96	9/25/96	11 - 15.5 C	9 days at	15-15.5 C	
47-3	Cottaneva- upper	6/24/94	9/22/94	11 - 15.5 C	7 days at	15-15.5 C	
47-3	Cottaneva- upper	6/29/95	10/2/95	11.75 - 16 C	17 days at	15-16 C	
47-3	Cottaneva- upper	6/18/96	9/25/96	11 - 15.9 C	4 days at	15-15.9 C	
47-4	Hardy Creek	7/21/94	9/17/94	11.5 - 15.5 C	27 days at	15-15.5 C	
47-5	Juan Creek	6/22/94	9/22/94	11 - 14.5 C	22 days at	14-14.5 C	
47-5	Juan Creek	6/29/95	10/2/95	11.75 - 16.25 C	20 days at	15-16.25 C	
47-6	Howard Creek	6/11/96	9/25/96	10.75 - 15.25 C	5 days at	15-15.25 C	

Cottaneva Creek THPs (near Rockport – WWAA 47)

Mendocino – Region 1

year	THP	Acreage	Notes:
00	246	110	ap-cc, sel (Hales Grove
00	110	116	ap-cc (so. fork)
99	480	191	ap-cc
99	147	41	sel
99	309	171	ap-cc, rehab
00	030	247	(correct year? '99?)
98	376	202	swr, ap-cc, r-s
98	249	258	cc, sel, ap, ct
97	208	105	
96	562	135	
95	470	209	
94	596	136	
94	522	81	
			subtot 2002
			THPs not transferred from L-P to MRC (completed before July '98)
96	394	320	
96	260	248	
94	560	290	subtot 858
TOT		2860	

Notes on WWAA 47 Cottaneva Creek

Cottaneva Creek includes tribs: So Fork Cottaneva, Rockport Cr, Slaughterhouse G., Kimball G., Powderhouse Gulch, Middle Fork Cottaneva, No Fork Cottaneva (note: SYP says Rockport Cr is a separate drainage but it is not).

L-P 1994-96 Fish surveys were conducted in Cottaneva Creek and tribs: So Fork Cottaneva, Rockport Cr, Slaughterhouse G., Kimball G., Powderhouse Gulch, Middle Fork Cottaneva, No Fork Cottaneva

Separate drainages of WWAA 47: De Haven Cr, Howard Cr, Juan Cr, Hardy Cr (and Cottaneva Cr). (These creeks drain separately into the Pacific.)

L-P 1994-96 Fish surveys were conducted in Hardy Cr (& So Fork Hardy Cr, Middle Fork Hardy Cr), Juan Creek, Little Juan Cr., Howard Cr, Rock Cr.

Table 1: TREE FARMING ON THE MENDOCINO COAST

Tree Sizes in Mendocino Redwood Co. (former Louisiana Pacific) forests as of 1995-96
 - 97% in very small trees (1 to 21 inch diameter) -
 - only 3% in larger trees (decent wildlife habitat) -

PERCENTAGE OF ACREAGE IN TREE SIZE CLASS	Size 2	Size 3	Size 4.1	Size 4.2	TOTAL Acreage	Size 4.3	Size 5	Size 6	TOTAL Acreage
	1-5.9 inch diameter trees	6-10.9 inch diameter trees	11-15.9 inch diameter trees	16-20.9 inch diameter trees	% 1 inch to 20.9 inch diameter trees	21-23.9 inch diameter trees	24->32 inch diameter trees	best wildlife habitat	% larger trees
SYP #	Watershed								

41. Hollow Tree Cree	0	22.5	68.5	8.7	= 99.7	0	0	00.3	= 0.3
47. Cottaneva Creek	0	8.0	65.0	19.0	= 92.0	0	0	08.0	= 8.0
55. Jack of Hearts Cr	0	15.3	84.0	0.5	= 99.8	0	0	00.2	= 0.2
70. Noyo River	1.0	19.0	29.0	51.0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
71. McDonnell Ranch	0	14.0	01.0	85.0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
72. Caspar Creek	37.0	0	63.0	0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
74. Upper Big River*	27.4	11.5	37.6	23.5	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
75. No. Fork Big River	34.6	12.8	38.3	14.3	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
79. So. Fork Big River	22.0	14.0	46.0	18.0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
76. Two Log Creek	28.5	11.0	41.6	18.3	= 99.4	0	0	0.6	= 0.6
77. Reeves Canyon	16.0	2.0	48.0	34.0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
78. Albion River	3.0	7.5	49.0	24.5	= 84.0	0	1.0	15.0	= 16.0
81. No. Branch Navarro	19.2	28.3	40.2	12.3	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
82. Navarro River	3.5	6.7	67.1	16.5	= 93.8	0	2.1	4.1	= 6.2
85. So. Branch Navarro	32.0	6.8	46.3	14.9	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
83. Ackerman Creek	14.3	3.2	50.3	32.2	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
84. Greenwood Creek	1.0	3.5	81.0	9.0	= 94.5	0	0.1	5.4	= 5.5
86. Indian Creek	20.6	1.3	41.1	37.0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
87. Elk Creek	6.4	3.6	73.0	8.6	= 91.6	0	0	8.4	= 8.4
88. Rancheria Creek	0	11.4	83.4	3.2	= 98.0	0	0	2.0	= 2.0
89. Alder Creek	1.3	5.4	73.5	11.5	= 91.7	0	0.3	8.0	= 8.3
91. Brush Creek*	2.0	7.0	67.0	14.0	= 90.0	0	0	10.0	= 10.0
92. Zeni Ridge	20.0	06.6	65.0	4.8	= 96.4	0	0	3.6	= 3.6
93. Garcia River	13.4	31.8	42.7	7.8	= 95.7	0	4.1	0.2	= 4.3
94. Schooner Gulch	30.9	13.1	43.4	9.6	= 97.0	0	3.0	0	= 3.0
96. No Frk Gualala R.	0	59.0	32.0	9.0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
97. Wheatfield Fork	1.0	32.0	35.0	32.0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
98. Willow Creek	7.0	13.0	25.0	55.0	= 100	0	0	0	= 0
tot. of %'s	342.1	370.3	1437	574.2			10.6	65.8	76.4
div. by 28 =									
AVERAGE %	12.21	13.22	51.32	20.50	97%	0	00.37	02.35	3%

Note 1: These statistics are taken from L-P's "Sustained Yield" Plan (SYP 95-003), "Wildlife Habitat Relationship" tables, current period (table generally appears on or near p. 20 in each WWAA-SYP #). Tree sizes are in "diameter at breast height" (DBH) inches. The above table combines all trees in one size class regardless of canopy density. *Note: Big River has at least one unentered old growth stand (Russell Brook) which doesn't show up in the WHR tables. MRC's ownership in Brush Creek is very small.

Note 2: In the early 1970s, corporate forest lands in Mendocino contained an average of 60,000 board feet per acre (bf/ac) of standing timber. Today, they contain 10,000 bf/ac, at best. Liquidation of these forests continues to be a disaster for wildlife, as the Mendocino Redwood Company (which bought out Louisiana Pacific in 7/98) completes the deforestation program begun by L-P.

Table 2: LIQUIDATION LOGGING ON THE MENDOCINO COAST

Logging since 1995 by L-P and current logging by MRC is eliminating the meager portion of old, big trees (3%) reflected in columns 3 and 5 (statistics taken from L-P's 1995 "Sustained Yield" Plan)

Fifty percent of the L-P/MRC logging plans for 1997-1998 target the areas that contain the last 3% of big trees.

WHERE IS THE OLD GROWTH?	tot MRC acreage	ac = 1 inch to 20.9 inch diameter trees	ac = larger trees (24->32 in.)	% = 1 inch to 20.9 inch trees	% = larger trees
41. Hollow Tree Creek	20,344	20,290	54	99.7%	0.3%
47. Cottaneva Creek	18,043	16,656	1,387	92.0%	8%
55. Jack of Hearts Crk	802	800	2	99.8%	0.2%
70. Noyo River	19,381	19,381	0	100%	0
71. McDonnell Ranch	627	627	0	100%	0
72. Caspar Creek**	297	297	0	100%	0
74. Upper Big River	6,888	6,888	0	100%	0
75. No. Fork Big River	4,697	4,697	0	100%	0
79. So. Fork Big River	18,113	18,113	0	100%	0
76. Two Log Creek	4,347	4,321	26	99.4%	0.6%
77. Reeves Canyon	1,782	1,782	0	100%	0
78. Albion River*	15,549	13,117	2,432	84%	16%
81. No. Branch Navarro	13,121	13,121	0	100%	0
82. Navarro River	23,073	21,635	1,438	93.8%	6.2%
85. So. Branch Navarro	14,890	14,890	0	100%	0
83. Ackerman Creek	3,898	3,898	0	100%	0
84. Greenwood Creek*	9,924	9,394	550	94.5%	5.5%
86. Indian Creek	1,729	1,729	0	100%	0
87. Elk Creek*	14,022	12,839	1,183	91.6%	8.4%
88. Rancheria Creek	1,741	1,708	33	98.0%	2%
89. Alder Creek	10,472	9,601	871	91.7%	8.3%
91. Brush Creek	660	592	68	90.0%	10%
92. Zeni Ridge	328	316	12	96.4%	3.6%
93. Garcia River	11,508	11,015	493	95.7%	4.3%
94. Schooner Gulch	2,162	2,097	65	97.0%	3%
96. No. Fork Gualala River	946	946	0	100%	0
97. Wheatfield Fork	6,987	6,987	0	100%	0
98. Willow Creek	5,587	5,587	0	100%	0
	231,918	223,324	8,064	97%	3%

NOTE: To sum up, 51% of what is now MRC forest acreage was in 11-16 inch diameter trees (very small trees), as of about 1996, with only 3% in trees in the large size class. A whopping 75% was in 1 to 16 inch diameter trees. (By comparison, the coast redwood is capable of growing to 20 feet in diameter.) *MRC is taking 25% of its annual cut out of the Albion River, which contains the largest % of big trees (16%) but which comprises only 7% of the MRC timber ownership. As of 9/00, MRC had 12 logging plans in Elk Creek (8.4% of the big trees) and ten logging plans in Greenwood Creek (5.5% of the big trees.) The evidence is that this company is "high-grading"—targeting the last few big trees and the last bits of decent wildlife habitat. (In addition, as tables of MRC logging plans (THPs) show, 80% of MRC logging plans contain various forms of clearcutting.)

Prepared by the Redwood Coast Watersheds Alliance, P.O. Box 90, Elk, CA 95432. Tel. (707) 877-3405.