



**Brian K. Cherry**  
Vice President  
Regulatory Relations

77 Beale Street, Room 1087  
San Francisco, CA 94105

*Mailing Address*  
Mail Code B10C  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
P.O. Box 770000  
San Francisco, CA 94177

Fax: 415.973.7226

November 15, 2007

**Advice 3156-E**

(Pacific Gas and Electric Company ID U 39 E)

**Subject: Elkhorn Slough Foundation Pipeline Easement – Request for  
Approval Under Section 851**

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California

**Purpose**

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) submits this advice letter seeking approval under Public Utilities Code §851 to grant the Elkhorn Slough Foundation (“ESF”) an easement to install and maintain a water pipeline across PG&E-owned property to enhance adjacent wetland habitat property.

As explained below and in Attachment 5, ESF requires expedited Commission approval of this request no later than the December 20, 2007 Commission meeting so that work can be completed by early February 2008. Delays in implementation will jeopardize the funding for this project.

**Background**

PG&E owns certain real property within the Moro Cojo Slough located in North Monterey County (the “Property”). The ESF has acquired several properties in the Moro Cojo Slough watershed with the goal of protecting and restoring wetland habitats and improving regional water quality.

ESF is requesting an easement across two PG&E-owned parcels to install a pipeline beneath the surface of an existing dirt access road. The pipeline will carry surface water runoff from agricultural fields and other surface drainage sources from the Castroville Slough onto ESF-owned properties adjacent to the PG&E-owned parcels. The project will require burying a 4-inch PVC pipe 2-3 feet beneath the surface of a dirt access road for approximately 3,100 feet. A goal of ESF’s watershed restoration project is to improve water quality in the Monterey Bay (a Federally Protected National Marine Sanctuary) by diverting agricultural surface water through the pipeline into a wetlands area. According to ESF, the wetlands will act as a filter and improve water quality of the surface drainage

before it enters the Bay. The installation of the water delivery pipeline plays a critical role in ESF's restoration project.

ESF is facing a funding deadline, imposed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. If it fails to make progress on bringing the pipeline with Castroville Slough water to the restoration site by early February 2008, it may lose a portion of a \$1.2 million grant.

In accordance with Resolution ALJ-202, Appendix A, Section IV., PG&E provides the following information related to the proposed transaction:

**(1) Identity of All Parties and Addresses to the Proposed Transaction:**

Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Andrew L. Niven  
Peter Van Mieghem  
Deborah Shefler  
Law Department  
P.O. Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94120  
Telephone: (415) 973-2902  
Facsimile: (415) 973-5520  
Email: PPV1@pge.com

Mark Silberstein  
Executive Director  
Elkhorn Slough Foundation  
PO Box 267  
Moss Landing, CA 95039  
Telephone: 831-761-1719  
Email: mark@elkhornslough.org

**(2) Complete Description of the Property Including Present Location, Condition and Use:**

The Property consists of approximately 69 acres of real property located in North Monterey County. It is bounded by Moss Landing Harbor and State Highway 1 to the west, State Highway 156 to the south, Prunedale/San Miguel Canyon Road to the east and Paradise Canyon, Dolan Road and Elkhorn Slough to the north.

PG&E acquired the Property in deed from Bellone, Tottino, De Santi, Barsotti, and Schubert, to PG&E dated January 8, 1964, and recorded on January 14, 1964 in Reel 273 of Official Records of Monterey County, California, at Page 471.

The Property is identified by Assessor's Parcel Nos. (APN) 133-142-005 and 133-151-007, State Board of Equalization Nos. (SBE) 135-27-38A-2 and 135-27-38A-3, respectively. The proposed encumbered portion of the Property is more particularly described in the Agreement (Attachment 1 – Exhibit A).

Improvements to the Property include PG&E's 500-kilovolt (kV) Moss Landing-Los Banos electric transmission tower line corridor.

**(3) Intended Use of the Property:**

The easement would encumber approximately 0.58 acres of the Property under an existing dirt access road, and consist of a strip of land approximately 3,100 feet long by 8 feet wide, for placement of a 4-inch PVC pipe, approximately 2-3 feet deep. This pipe will carry agricultural surface water from the Castroville Slough to ESF-owned properties adjacent to PG&E's property. The water will then flood the ESF properties in order to enhance wetland habitats and improve water quality. The grant of easement will not interfere with the use of the Property by PG&E.

A description of the pipeline placement project and associated maps of the Easement Area are at Attachment 2.

**(4) Complete Description of Financial Terms of the Proposed Transaction:**

As provided in the Agreement, ESF has agreed to pay compensation of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) for the easement.

**(5) Description of How Financial Proceeds of the Transaction Will Be Distributed:**

The property at issue in this advice letter is non-depreciable land used for electric transmission facilities and is currently included in PG&E's rate base subject to FERC jurisdiction. As compensation for the easement, ESF has agreed to pay Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) for the easement. PG&E will account for the compensation as Electric Other Operating Revenue.

**(6) Impact of the Transaction on Ratebase and Any Effect on the Ability of the Utility to Serve Customers and the Public:**

No PG&E property is being sold or disposed of, so there are no changes to PG&E's rate base as a result of granting the proposed easement. The grant of easement will not interfere with the use of the Property by PG&E.

**(7) The Original Cost, Present Book Value, and Present Fair Market Value for Sales of Real Property and Depreciable Assets, and a Detailed Description of How the Fair Market Value Was Determined (e.g., Appraisal):**

Not applicable.

**(8) The Fair Market Rental Value for Leases of Real Property, and a Detailed Description of How the Fair Market Rental Value Was Determined:**

Not applicable.

**(9) The Fair Market Value of the Easement or Right-of-Way and a Detailed Description of How the Fair Market Rental Value Was Determined:**

The fair market value for the easement was determined by an appraisal of adjacent property purchased in 2003 reviewed and approved by the state of California Department of General Services, further described in Attachment 3.

**(10) A Complete Description of any Recent Past (Within the Prior Two Years) or Anticipated Future Transactions that May Appear To Be Related to the Present Transaction:**

To PG&E's knowledge, there are no recent past transactions that appear to be related to the present transaction.

**(11) Sufficient Information and Documentation (Including Environmental Documentation) to Show that All Criteria Set Forth in Section II of Resolution ALJ-202 Are Satisfied:**

PG&E has provided information in this advice letter to meet the eligibility criteria under the advice letter pilot program. Under the CEQA requirements provided in ALJ-202, the activity proposed in the transaction will not require environmental review by the CPUC as a lead agency. The proposed activity on PG&E property is categorically exempt under section 15304(f) of the Guidelines to the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §§15000, et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines")) regarding minor alterations to land ("minor trenching and backfilling where the surface is restored"). The proposed pipeline placement is in a dirt road/dirt shoulder, and the road surface will be returned to its original condition by immediately backfilling with the material that was excavated for trenching.

The intent of the proposed pipeline project is to enhance freshwater habitats. In 1996, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors adopted a Negative Declaration for the Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan (the "Enhancement Plan"). The plan focuses on providing public benefit by restoring and enhancing wetland and upland habitat within the Moro Cojo Watershed. Because the Enhancement Plan merely served as a planning guide for restoring and enhancing wetlands, it did not include an analysis of particular water facilities. It did, however,

endorse the general concept of flushing surface water through wetlands to improve water quality. For background reference, a copy of the Enhancement Plan and Negative Declaration is at Attachment 4.

The proposed transaction will not have an adverse effect on the public interest. The proposed transaction is designed to serve the public interest by creating and enhancing wetland habitats.

The compensation for the proposed easement is well below the \$5 million eligibility requirements set forth in ALJ-202 for easements. Finally, the transaction does not involve the transfer or change in ownership of facilities currently used in utility operations.

**(12) Additional Information to Assist in the Review of the Advice Letter:**

ESF may jeopardize losing a portion of a \$1.2 million dollar grant if the proposed project is not completed by the funding deadline, as further described in its letter to PG&E dated September 17, 2007, at Attachment 5. ESF requires Commission approval of this request no later than December 2007 so that work can be completed by early February 2008.

**(13) Environmental Information**

Pursuant to ALJ-202, the advice letter program only applies to proposed transactions that (a) will not require environmental review by the CPUC as a lead agency or responsible agency under CEQA either because a statutory or categorical exemption applies or (b) because the transaction is not a project under CEQA.

a. Exemption

(1) Has the proposed transaction been found exempt from CEQA by a government agency?

(a) If yes, please attach notice of exemption. Please provide name of agency, date of Notice of Exemption, and State Clearinghouse number.

Not applicable.

(b) If no, does the applicant contend that the project is exempt from CEQA? If yes, please identify the specific CEQA exemption or exemptions that apply to the transaction, citing to the applicable State CEQA Guideline(s) and/or Statute(s).

Yes. The project is categorically exempt from CEQA in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15304(f), minor trenching and backfilling where the surface is restored.

b. "No Project" Under CEQA

- (1) If the transaction is not a "project" under CEQA, please explain why.

Not applicable.

**Protests**

Anyone wishing to protest this filing may do so by letter sent via U.S. mail, by facsimile or electronically, any of which must be received no later than 20 days after the date of this filing, which is **December 5, 2007**. Protests should be mailed to:

CPUC Energy Division  
Attention: Tariff Unit, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102

Facsimile: (415) 703-2200  
E-mail: mas@cpuc.ca.gov and jnj@cpuc.ca.gov

Copies of protests also should be mailed to the attention of the Director, Energy Division, Room 4004, at the address shown above.

The protest also should be sent via U.S. mail (and by facsimile and electronically, if possible) to PG&E at the address shown below on the same date it is mailed or delivered to the Commission:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Attention: Brian Cherry  
Vice President, Regulatory Relations  
77 Beale Street, Mail Code B10C  
P.O. Box 770000  
San Francisco, California 94177

Facsimile: (415) 973-7226  
E-mail: PGETariffs@pge.com

**Effective Date**

Pursuant to the review process outlined in Resolution ALJ-202, PG&E requests that this advice filing become effective on or before **December 20, 2007**. In accordance with PUC § 311(g)(2), PG&E requests that the Commission reduce or

waive the 30 day draft resolution review period to allow for expedited approval no later than the December 20, 2007 Commission meeting.

**Notice**

In accordance with General Order 96-B, Section IV, a copy of this advice letter is being sent electronically and via U.S. mail to parties shown on the attached list. Address changes should be directed to Rose de la Torre at (415) 973-4716. Advice letter filings can also be accessed electronically at:

**<http://www.pge.com/tariffs>**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruce K. Anglin". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping "B" and "A".

Vice President, Regulatory Relations

Attachments 1-5

cc: Service List – Advice Letter 3156-E

\*\*\*\*\* **SERVICE LIST Advice 3156-E** \*\*\*\*\*  
**APPENDIX A**

\*\*\*\*\* **STATE EMPLOYEES** \*\*\*\*\*

Angela K. Minkin  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 703-2008  
[ang@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:ang@cpuc.ca.gov)

Myra J. Prestidge  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 703-2629  
[tom@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:tom@cpuc.ca.gov)

Jonathan Reiger  
Legal Division  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 355-5596  
[jzr@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:jzr@cpuc.ca.gov)

Chloe Lukins  
Energy Division  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 703- 1637  
[clu@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:clu@cpuc.ca.gov)

Kenneth Lewis  
Energy Division  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 703-1090  
[kl1@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:kl1@cpuc.ca.gov)

Jensen Uchida  
Energy Division  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco CA 94102  
(415) 703-5953  
[jmu@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:jmu@cpuc.ca.gov)

Brewster Fong  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 703- 2187  
[bfs@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:bfs@cpuc.ca.gov)

\*\*\*\*\* **AGENCIES** \*\*\*\*\*

Ronald J. Lundquist, PE, Director  
County of Monterey Public Works  
168 West Alisal Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Telephone: (831) 647-7748  
Facsimile: (831) 755-4958  
Email:

\*\*\*\*\* **3<sup>rd</sup> Party** \*\*\*\*\*

Gage H. Dayton, Ph.D.  
Moss Landing Marine Laboratories  
Moss Landing, CA 95039  
Telephone: (831) 771-4428  
Facsimile: (831) 632-4403  
Email: [gdayton@mlml.calstate.edu](mailto:gdayton@mlml.calstate.edu)

Mark Silberstein  
Elkhorn Slough Foundation  
P.O. Box 267  
Moss Landing, CA 95039  
Telephone: (831) 728-5939  
Facsimile: (831)  
Email:

**(END OF APPENDIX A)**

# CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

## ADVICE LETTER FILING SUMMARY ENERGY UTILITY

MUST BE COMPLETED BY UTILITY (Attach additional pages as needed)

Company name/CPUC Utility No. **Pacific Gas and Electric Company (ID U39 M)**

Utility type:

ELC       GAS  
 PLC       HEAT       WATER

Contact Person: David Poster

Phone #: (415) 973-1082

E-mail: DXPU@pge.com

EXPLANATION OF UTILITY TYPE

ELC = Electric      GAS = Gas  
PLC = Pipeline      HEAT = Heat      WATER = Water

(Date Filed/ Received Stamp by CPUC)

Advice Letter (AL) #: **3156-E**

Tier: **[3]**

Subject of AL: Elkhorn Slough Foundation Pipeline Easement – Request for Approval Under Section 851

Keywords (choose from CPUC listing): Section 851

AL filing type:  Monthly  Quarterly  Annual  One-Time  Other \_\_\_\_\_

If AL filed in compliance with a Commission order, indicate relevant Decision/Resolution #:

Does AL replace a withdrawn or rejected AL? If so, identify the prior AL: No

Summarize differences between the AL and the prior withdrawn or rejected AL:

Is AL requesting confidential treatment? If so, what information is the utility seeking confidential treatment for: No

Confidential information will be made available to those who have executed a nondisclosure agreement: N/A

Name(s) and contact information of the person(s) who will provide the nondisclosure agreement and access to the confidential information:

Resolution Required?  Yes  No

Requested effective date: **No later than December 20, 2007**

No. of tariff sheets: N/A

Estimated system annual revenue effect (%): N/A

Estimated system average rate effect (%): N/A

When rates are affected by AL, include attachment in AL showing average rate effects on customer classes (residential, small commercial, large C/I, agricultural, lighting).

Tariff schedules affected: N/A

Service affected and changes proposed: N/A

Protests, dispositions, and all other correspondence regarding this AL are due no later than 20 days after the date of this filing, unless otherwise authorized by the Commission, and shall be sent to:

**CPUC, Energy Division**

**Tariff Files, Room 4005**

**DMS Branch**

**505 Van Ness Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102**

**jn@cpuc.ca.gov and mas@cpuc.ca.gov**

**Pacific Gas and Electric Company**

**Attn: Brian K. Cherry, Vice President, Regulatory Relations**

**77 Beale Street, Mail Code B10C**

**P.O. Box 770000**

**San Francisco, CA 94177**

**E-mail: PGETariffs@pge.com**

PG&E Advice 3156-E

Attachment 1

LD 2213-02-1206

JCN

Water Pipeline Easement, Moss Landing  
RECORDING REQUESTED BY, AND  
WHEN RECORDED RETURN TO:

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
356 East Alisal Street  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Attention: Joyce Nichols

Location: ~~City~~/Unincorporated

Recording Fee \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Document Transfer Tax \$ \_\_\_\_\_

- o Computed on Full Value of Easement Area Conveyed, or
- o Computed on Full Value Less Liens & Encumbrances Remaining at Time of Sale]

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of declarant or agent determining tax

(A portion of APN 133-142-005 and APN 133-151-007)

**EASEMENT AGREEMENT  
(WATER PIPELINE)**

This Easement Agreement (“**Agreement**”) is made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 200\_\_ (the “**Effective Date**”) by PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, a California corporation, hereinafter called “**PG&E**”, and ELKHORN SLOUGH FOUNDATION, a California Non-Profit Corporation, hereinafter called “**Grantee.**”

**RECITALS**

A. PG&E owns certain real property within the County of Monterey, State of California, more particularly described in **Exhibit A**, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

B. Grantee is the owner of certain real property (the “**Benefitted Property**”) within the County of Monterey, State of California, commonly known as APN 133-151-022 and more particularly described in **Exhibit C**, attached hereto and made a part hereof. Grantee proposes to construct a 4 inch PVC pipeline, approximately 3100 feet in length and at a depth of approximately 36 inches, for transporting surface water runoff from the Elkhorn Slough to APN 133-151-022, and in connection therewith, Grantee has requested that PG&E grant an easement for a water pipeline.

C. PG&E is willing to grant such easement(s) on the terms and subject to the conditions set forth herein.

Now, therefore, in consideration of Grantee's agreement to pay the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00), and for good and valuable consideration, PG&E and Grantee agree as follows:

1. Grant of Easement(s): PG&E hereby grants to Grantee, upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement, the following easement(s):

(a) **Water Line Easement.** A non-exclusive easement to excavate for, construct, install, repair, replace (with the initial or any smaller size), remove, maintain and use a single water pipe line not exceeding four inches (4") in diameter, with necessary valves and other appliances and fittings, and devices for controlling electrolysis for use in connection with said pipe line, within the strip of land described in said EXHIBIT "A" and shown upon EXHIBIT "A-1" and hereinafter referred to as the "**Easement Area.**"

2. Limitations on Use.

(a) The Easement Area, and any facilities permitted to be constructed thereon, are to be used by Grantee only for those uses permitted in Section 1 above, and for no other purpose.

(b) PG&E reserves the right to restrict access to the Easement Area or any portion or portions thereof in the event of fire, earthquake, storm, riot, civil disturbance, or other casualty or emergency, or in connection with PG&E's response thereto, or if emergency repairs or maintenance are required to PG&E facilities within or in the vicinity of the Easement Area, or otherwise when PG&E deems it advisable to do so, including in connection with events and emergencies occurring or affecting PG&E's business operations located elsewhere than in the immediate vicinity of the Easement Area.

(c) Grantee shall not erect or construct any buildings or other structures within the Easement Area.

(d) Grantee shall not erect or construct any building or other structure, or drill or operate any well, within five (5) feet of any of PG&E's electric or gas facilities.

3. Condition of Easement Area. Grantee accepts the Easement Area in its existing physical condition, without warranty by PG&E or any duty or obligation on the part of PG&E to maintain the Easement Area. Grantee acknowledges that one or more of the following (collectively, "**Potential Environmental Hazards**") may be located in, on or underlying the Easement Area:

(a) electric fields, magnetic fields, electromagnetic fields, electromagnetic radiation, power frequency fields, and extremely low frequency fields, however designated, and whether emitted by electric transmission lines, other distribution equipment or otherwise ("**EMFs**");

(b) Hazardous Substances (as hereinafter defined). For purposes hereof, the term "**Hazardous Substances**" means any hazardous or toxic material or waste which is or becomes regulated by Legal Requirements (as hereinafter defined) relating to the protection of

human health or safety, or regulating or relating to industrial hygiene or environmental conditions, or the protection of the environment, or pollution or contamination of the air, soil, surface water or groundwater, including, but not limited to, laws, requirements and regulations pertaining to reporting, licensing, permitting, investigating and remediating emissions, discharges, releases or threatened releases of such substances into the air, surface water, or land, or relating to the manufacture, processing, distribution, use, treatment, storage, disposal, transport or handling of such substances. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the term Hazardous Substances includes any material or substance:

(1) now or hereafter defined as a “hazardous substance,” “hazardous waste,” “hazardous material,” “extremely hazardous waste,” “restricted hazardous waste” or “toxic substance” or words of similar import under any applicable local, state or federal law or under the regulations adopted or promulgated pursuant thereto, including, without limitation, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. §§9601 et seq. (“CERCLA”); the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, 42 U.S.C. §§6901 et seq.; the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.; the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §§1251 et seq.; the Toxic Substance Control Act, 15 U.S.C. §§2601 et seq.; the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, 7 U.S.C. §§136 et seq.; the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, 42 U.S.C. §§2014 et seq.; the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §§10101 et seq.; the California Hazardous Waste Control Law, Cal. Health and Safety Code §§25100 et seq.; the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, Cal. Water Code §§13000 et seq.; the Carpenter-Presley-Tanner Hazardous Substance Account Act (Health and Safety Code §§25300 et seq.); and the Medical Waste Management Act (Health and Safety Code §§25015 et seq.); or

(2) which is toxic, explosive, corrosive, flammable, infectious, radioactive, carcinogenic, mutagenic or otherwise hazardous, and is now or hereafter regulated as a Hazardous Substance by the United States, the State of California, any local governmental authority or any political subdivision thereof, or which cause, or are listed by the State of California as being known to the State of California to cause, cancer or reproductive toxicity; or

(3) the presence of which on the Easement Area poses or threatens to pose a hazard to the health or safety of persons on or about the Easement Area or to the environment; or

(4) which contains gasoline, diesel fuel or other petroleum hydrocarbons; or

(5) which contains lead-based paint or other lead contamination, polychlorinated biphenyls (“PCBs”) or asbestos or asbestos-containing materials or urea formaldehyde foam insulation; or

(6) which contains radon gas;

(c) fuel or chemical storage tanks, energized electrical conductors or equipment, or natural gas transmission or distribution pipelines; and

(d) other potentially hazardous substances, materials, products or conditions.

Grantee shall be solely responsible for the health and safety of, and shall take all necessary precautions to protect, its employees, contractors, consultants, agents and invitees (“**Grantee’s Representatives**”) from risks of harm from Potential Environmental Hazards. Grantee acknowledges that it has previously evaluated the condition of the Easement Area and all matters affecting the suitability of the Easement Area for the uses permitted by this Agreement, including, but not limited to, the Potential Environmental Hazards listed herein.

4. Grantee’s Covenants. Grantee hereby covenants and agrees:

(a) Construction of Improvements. Grantee agrees to construct and install, at no cost to PG&E, such facilities and improvements (“**Improvements**”) as may be necessary and appropriate for Grantee’s permitted use, as specified in Section 1. All such construction shall be performed in accordance with detailed plans and specifications (“**Plans**”) previously approved by PG&E, and shall comply with all Legal Requirements. Before commencing construction of any Improvements, Grantee shall obtain all permits, authorizations or other approvals, at Grantee’s sole cost and expense as may be necessary for such construction. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Grantee shall be responsible for complying with any and all applicable requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (“**NEPA**”) and the California Environmental Quality Act (“**CEQA**”) and satisfying, at Grantee’s sole expense, any and all mitigation measures under CEQA that may apply to Grantee’s proposed occupancy and use of the Easement Area, and to the construction, maintenance and use of Grantee’s proposed Improvements and facilities. Grantee shall promptly notify PG&E of any and all proposed mitigation measures that may affect PG&E or the Easement Area. If PG&E determines in good faith that any such mitigation measures may adversely affect PG&E or the Easement Area, or impose limitations on PG&E’s ability to use the Easement Area as specified in Section 8, then PG&E shall have the right, without liability to Grantee, to give notice of termination of this Agreement to Grantee, whereupon this Agreement and the rights granted to Grantee shall terminate and revert in PG&E, unless within ten (10) days following delivery of such notice, Grantee gives notice to PG&E by which Grantee agrees to modify its proposed Project (as that term is defined under CEQA) so as to eliminate the necessity for such mitigation measures. In the event of such termination, PG&E and Grantee shall each be released from all obligations under this Agreement, except those which expressly survive termination. Grantee acknowledges and agrees that PG&E’s review of Grantee’s Plans is solely for the purpose of protecting PG&E’s interests, and shall not be deemed to create any liability of any kind on the part of PG&E, or to constitute a representation on the part of PG&E or any person consulted by PG&E in connection with such review that the Plans or the Improvements contemplated by such Plans are adequate or appropriate for any purpose, or comply with applicable Legal Requirements. Grantee shall not commence construction or installation of any Improvements without the prior written consent of PG&E, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed, and the prior consent, to the extent required by applicable law or regulation, of the California Public Utilities Commission (hereinafter, “**CPUC**”);

(b) Compliance with Laws. Grantee shall, at its sole cost and expense, promptly comply with (a) all laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations, requirements or orders of municipal, state, and federal authorities now in force or that may later be in force, including, but not limited to, those relating to the generation, use, storage, handling, treatment, transportation or disposal of Hazardous Substances, as defined herein, or to health, safety, noise, environmental protection, air quality or water quality; (b) the conditions of any permit, occupancy certificate,

license or other approval issued by public officers relating to Grantee's use or occupancy of the Easement Area; and (c) with any liens, encumbrances, easements, covenants, conditions, restrictions and servitudes (if any) of record, or of which Grantee has notice, which may be applicable to the Easement Area (collectively, "**Legal Requirements**"), regardless of when they become effective, insofar as they relate to the use or occupancy of the Easement Area by Grantee. Grantee shall furnish satisfactory evidence of such compliance upon request by PG&E. The judgment of any court of competent jurisdiction, or the admission of Grantee in any action or proceeding against Grantee, whether or not PG&E is a party in such action or proceeding, that Grantee has violated any Legal Requirement relating to the use or occupancy of the Easement Area, shall be conclusive of that fact as between PG&E and Grantee.

(c) Notice of Enforcement Proceedings. Grantee agrees to notify PG&E in writing within three (3) business days of any investigation, order or enforcement proceeding which in any way relates to the Easement Area, or to any contamination or suspected contamination on, within or underlying the Easement Area. Such notice shall include a complete copy of any order, complaint, agreement, or other document which may have been issued, executed or proposed, whether draft or final;

(d) Non-Interference. Grantee agrees not to interfere in any way or permit any interference with the use of the Easement Area by PG&E and other entitled persons. Interference shall include, but not be limited to, any activity by Grantee that places any of PG&E's gas or electric facilities in violation of any of the provisions of General Order Nos. 95 (Overhead Electric), 112 (Gas), and 128 (Underground Electric) of the CPUC or to any other Legal Requirements under which the operations of utility facilities are controlled or regulated. Grantee shall not erect, handle, or operate any tools, machinery, apparatus, equipment, or materials closer to any of PG&E's high-voltage electric conductors than the minimum clearances set forth in the High-Voltage Electrical Safety Orders of the California Division of Industrial Safety; which minimum clearances are incorporated herein by reference; but in no event closer than ten (10) feet to any energized electric conductors or appliances. Grantee shall not drill, bore, or excavate within thirty (30) feet of any of PG&E's underground facilities, including, but not limited to, gas pipelines, valves, regulators or electric conduits. Grantee shall provide notice to Underground Service Alert at 1-800-227-2600 at least two (2) business days prior to commencing any drilling, boring or excavating permitted hereunder to assist Grantee with locating any and all underground facilities, including, but not limited to, gas pipelines, valves, regulators or electric conduits;

(e) Avoiding Dangerous Activities. Grantee agrees to conduct its activities and operations within and on the Easement Area in such a manner so as not to endanger the Easement Area, PG&E's utility facilities, the environment and human health and safety. Grantee shall not cause or permit any Hazardous Substances, as defined herein, to be brought upon, produced, stored, used, discharged or disposed of on, or in the vicinity of the Easement Area, except in compliance with all applicable Legal Requirements. Grantee shall be responsible for the cost of remediating any discharge or release of Hazardous Substances resulting from or arising in connection with Grantee's use of the Easement Area, and shall immediately notify PG&E and the appropriate regulatory authorities where required by law, of any such release. If PG&E determines that Grantee's activities in any way endanger the Easement Area, PG&E's utility facilities, the environment, or human health and safety, PG&E may, in PG&E's sole and absolute discretion, require that Grantee halt such activities until appropriate protective measures are taken to PG&E's

satisfaction. Grantee shall hold PG&E harmless from any claims resulting from any delay under this paragraph. PG&E's right to halt activities under this paragraph shall not in any way affect or alter Grantee's insurance or indemnity obligations under this Agreement, nor shall it relieve Grantee from any of its obligations hereunder that pertain to health, safety, or the protection of the environment;

(f) Maintenance. Grantee agrees to maintain its facilities and Improvements in good condition and repair, and be responsible for the security of, the facilities installed hereunder;

(g) Repairing Damage. Grantee agrees to repair any damage it may cause to PG&E's facilities and improvements in or around said Easement Area;

(h) Coordination. Grantee agrees to coordinate all activities regarding the easements granted herein to reasonably minimize any interference and inconvenience with the use by PG&E of the Easement Area and PG&E's adjoining lands.

(i) PG&E Right to Cure. Grantee agrees that if Grantee fails to perform any act or other obligation on its part to be performed hereunder, and such failure is not remedied within fifteen (15) days following notice from PG&E (or in the case of an emergency, following such notice, if any, as may be reasonably practicable under the existing circumstances), PG&E may (but without obligation to do so, and without waiving or releasing Grantee from any of its obligations) perform any such act or satisfy such obligation, or otherwise remedy such emergency or such failure on the part of Grantee. All costs incurred by PG&E in responding to or remedying such failure by Grantee shall be payable by Grantee to PG&E on demand.

5. Indemnification; Release.

(a) Grantee shall, to the maximum extent permitted by law, indemnify, protect, defend and hold harmless PG&E, its parent corporation, subsidiaries and affiliates, and their respective officers, managers, directors, representatives, agents, employees, transferees, successors and assigns (each, an "**Indemnitee**" and collectively, "**Indemnitees**") from and against all claims, losses (including, but not limited to, diminution in value), actions, demands, damages, costs, expenses (including, but not limited to, experts fees and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs) and liabilities of whatever kind or nature (collectively, "**Claims**"), including Claims arising from the passive or active negligence of the Indemnitees, which arise from or are in any way connected with the occupancy or use of the Easement Area by Grantee or Grantee's Representatives, or the exercise by Grantee of its rights hereunder, or the performance of, or failure to perform, Grantee's duties under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, Claims arising out of: (1) injury to or death of persons, including but not limited to employees of PG&E or Grantee (and including, but not limited to, injury due to exposure to EMFs and other Potential Environmental Hazards in, on or about the Easement Area); (2) injury to property or other interest of PG&E, Grantee or any third party; (3) violation of any applicable federal, state, or local laws, statutes, regulations, or ordinances, including all Legal Requirements relating to human health or the environment, and including any liability which may be imposed by law or regulation without regard to fault; excepting only with respect to any Indemnitee, to the extent of any Claim arising from the sole negligence or willful misconduct of such Indemnitee. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Grantee shall, to the maximum extent permitted by law, indemnify, protect, defend and

hold Indemnitees harmless from and against Claims arising out of or in connection with any work of improvement constructed or installed at or on, labor performed on, or materials delivered to, or incorporated in any improvements constructed on, the Easement Area by, or at the request or for the benefit of, Grantee. In the event any action or proceeding is brought against any Indemnitee for any Claim against which Grantee is obligated to indemnify or provide a defense hereunder, Grantee upon written notice from PG&E shall defend such action or proceeding at Grantee's sole expense by counsel approved by PG&E, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed.

(b) Grantee acknowledges that all Claims arising out of or in any way connected with releases or discharges of any Hazardous Substance, or the exacerbation of a Potential Environmental Hazard, occurring as a result of or in connection with Grantee's use or occupancy of the Easement Area, or any of the activities of Grantee and Grantee's Representatives, and all costs, expenses and liabilities for environmental investigations, monitoring, containment, abatement, removal, repair, cleanup, restoration, remediation and other response costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees and disbursements and any fines and penalties imposed for the violation of Legal Requirements relating to the environment or human health, are expressly within the scope of the indemnity set forth above.

(c) Grantee's use of the Easement Area shall be at its sole risk and expense. Grantee accepts all risk relating to its occupancy and use of the Easement Area. PG&E shall not be liable to Grantee for, and Grantee hereby waives and releases PG&E and the other Indemnitees from, any and all liability, whether in contract, tort or on any other basis, for any injury, damage, or loss resulting from or attributable to any occurrence on or about the Easement Area, the condition of Easement Area, or the use or occupancy of the Easement Area.

(d) Grantee shall, to the maximum extent permitted by law, indemnify, protect, defend and hold Indemnitees harmless against claims, losses, costs (including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees and costs), liabilities and damages resulting from the failure of Grantee, or any of its contractors or subcontractors, to comply with the insurance requirements set forth in **Exhibit B**, attached hereto and made a part hereof. If Grantee fails to so indemnify, protect, defend or hold harmless any Indemnitee, then at PG&E's option, this Agreement shall terminate, and the estate and interest herein granted to Grantee shall revert to and revest in PG&E, if such failure continues for five (5) days following the giving of written notice of termination to Grantee, unless within such time such failure is cured to the reasonable satisfaction of PG&E.

(e) The provisions of this Section 5 shall survive the termination of this Agreement.

6. Additional Facilities. Grantee shall not install any additional facilities or improvements in, on, under or over the Easement Area without the prior written consent of PG&E, which consent may be granted or withheld in PG&E's sole and absolute discretion, and the prior consent, to the extent required by applicable law or regulation, of the CPUC. Grantee shall submit plans for installation of any proposed additional facilities within the Easement Area to PG&E for its written approval at the address specified in Section 13.

7. Abandonment, Termination. In the event Grantee abandons the facilities installed hereunder, this Agreement shall terminate and all of the easements and other rights of Grantee hereunder shall revert to PG&E. The non-use of such facilities for a continuous period of two (2) years, unless such nonuse is due to factors outside Grantee's reasonable control, in which case such period is extended to four (4) years, shall be conclusive evidence of such abandonment. Upon any termination of this Agreement, Grantee shall remove, at no cost to PG&E, such of Grantee's facilities and equipment installed pursuant to this Agreement as PG&E may specify. Upon any termination of this Agreement, Grantee shall execute, acknowledge and deliver to PG&E a quitclaim deed or such other documents or instruments, in a form reasonably acceptable to PG&E, as may be reasonably necessary to eliminate this Agreement as an encumbrance on the title to the Easement Area or any larger parcel of property containing the Easement Area.

8. Reserved Rights. Subject to the provisions of Section 10 below, PG&E reserves the right to use the Easement Area for any and all purposes which will not unreasonably interfere with Grantee's facilities. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing:

(a) PG&E reserves the right to make use the Easement Area for such purposes as it may deem necessary or appropriate if, and whenever, in the interest of its service to its patrons or consumers or the public, it shall appear necessary or desirable to do so.

(b) Grantee acknowledges that PG&E may have previously granted, and may in the future grant, certain rights in and across the Easement Area to others, and the use of the word "grant" in this Agreement shall not be construed as a warranty or covenant by PG&E that there are no such other rights.

(c) Grantee shall not make use of the Easement Area in any way which will endanger human health or the environment, create a nuisance or otherwise be incompatible with the use of the Easement Area or PG&E's adjacent property, by PG&E or others entitled to use such property.

(d) This grant is made subject to all applicable provisions of General Order No. 95 (Overhead Electric), General Order 112 (Gas) and General Order No. 128 (Underground Electric) of the CPUC, in like manner as though said provisions were set forth herein.

9. Governmental Approvals. This Agreement shall not become effective, notwithstanding that it may have been executed and delivered by the parties, and Grantee shall not commence construction or other activities hereunder, unless and until the CPUC approves this Agreement and the easements granted and other transactions contemplated hereby (including the adequacy of the compensation to be paid by Grantee), by an order which is final, unconditional and unappealable (including exhaustion of all administrative appeals or remedies before the CPUC). Grantee further acknowledges and agrees that PG&E makes no representation or warranty regarding the prospects for CPUC approval, and Grantee hereby waives all Claims against PG&E which may arise out of the need for such CPUC approval or the failure of the CPUC to grant such approval. This Agreement is made subject to all the provisions of such approval, as more particularly set forth in CPUC Decision D-\_\_\_\_\_ (Application No. \_\_\_\_\_), in like manner as though said provisions were set forth in full herein.

10. Relocation Subject to the provisions of this Section 10, the rights granted to Grantee herein shall forever be subordinate to PG&E's right to replace, reconstruct, relocate, operate and maintain PG&E's existing and/or future facilities including but not limited to, PG&E's existing electrical transmission lines which traverse the Easement Area and PG&E's adjacent lands. If PG&E's use of its reserved rights described above necessitates the relocation of any of Grantee's facilities, Grantee shall, at its own cost and expense, relocate such facilities to an alternate location mutually agreed upon between PG&E and Grantee, provided Grantee is given at least twenty (20) days prior written notice of such required relocation. Any such relocation of Grantee's facilities shall be coordinated and scheduled between PG&E and Grantee so as to minimize, to the extent practicable, any interference with Grantee's use and operation of its facilities resulting from such relocation. If no alternate location is available on PG&E adjacent lands, this Agreement shall terminate.

11. Compliance; Insurance. PG&E shall have a right to access and inspect the Easement Area at any time to confirm Grantee's compliance with Legal Requirements and the provisions of this Agreement. Prior to the Effective Date of this Agreement, Grantee shall procure, and thereafter Grantee shall carry and maintain in effect at all times during the term of the Agreement, with respect to the Easement Area and the use, occupancy and activities of Grantee, its employees and agents on or about the Easement Area, the insurance specified in **Exhibit B**, attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference, provided that PG&E reserves the right to review and modify from time to time the coverages and limits of coverage required hereunder, as well as the deductibles and/or self-insurance retentions in effect from time to time (but PG&E agrees that it will not increase required coverage limits more often than once in any five-year period). Prior to Grantee's entry on the Easement Area, and thereafter thirty (30) days prior to the expiration date of any policy, Grantee shall provide PG&E with evidence of the insurance coverage, or continuing coverage, as required by this Agreement. All insurance required under this Agreement shall be effected under valid, enforceable policies issued by insurers of recognized responsibility, as reasonably determined by PG&E, and shall be written on forms and with insurance carriers acceptable to PG&E. Grantee is also responsible for causing its agents, contractors and subcontractors to comply with the insurance requirements of this Agreement at all relevant times (provided, however, that Grantee, in the exercise of its reasonable judgment, may permit contractors and subcontractors to maintain coverages and limits lower than those required of Grantee, provided the coverages and limits required by Grantee are commercially reasonable in light of applicable circumstances). Any policy of liability insurance required to be maintained hereunder by Grantee may be maintained under a so-called "blanket policy" insuring other locations and/or other persons, so long as PG&E is specifically named as an additional insured under such policy and the coverages and amounts of insurance required to be provided hereunder are not thereby impaired or diminished. In addition, liability insurance coverages may be provided under single policies for the full limits, or by a combination of underlying policies with the balance provided by excess or umbrella liability insurance policies.

12. Mechanics' Liens. Grantee shall keep the Easement Area free and clear of all mechanics', material suppliers' or similar liens, or claims thereof, arising or alleged to arise in connection with any work performed, labor or materials supplied or delivered, or similar activities performed by Grantee or at its request or for its benefit. If any mechanics' liens are placed on the Easement Area in connection with the activities or facilities set forth in this Agreement, Grantee shall promptly cause such liens to be released and removed from title, either by payment or by

recording a lien release bond in the manner specified in California Civil Code Section 3143 or any successor statute.

13. Notice. Any notices or communications hereunder shall be in writing and shall be personally delivered or sent by first class mail, certified or registered, postage prepaid, or sent by national overnight courier, with charges prepaid for next business day delivery, addressed to the addressee party at its address or addresses listed below, or to such other address or addresses for a party as such party may from time to time designate by notice given to the other party. Notices shall be deemed received upon actual receipt by the party being sent the notice, or on the following business day if sent by overnight courier, or on the expiration of three (3) business days after the date of mailing.

If to PG&E:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Attention: Joyce Nichols  
356 E. Alisal Street  
Salinas, CA 93901

With a copy to:

If by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
P.O. Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94120  
Attention: Wendy T. Coleman, Esq.  
Phone No. (415) 973-6067

If by personal delivery or overnight courier:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
77 Beale Street  
Mail Code B30A  
San Francisco, California 94120  
Attention: Wendy T. Coleman, Esq.

If to Grantee:

Elkhorn Slough Foundation  
PO Box 267  
Moss Landing, CA 95039  
Attention: Mark Silberstein

14. Governing Law. This Agreement shall in all respects be interpreted, enforced, and governed by and under the laws of the State of California.

15. Entire Agreement. This Agreement supersedes all previous oral and written agreements between and representations by or on behalf of the parties and constitutes the entire agreement of the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof. This Agreement may not be amended except by a written agreement executed by both parties.

16. Binding Effect. This Agreement and the covenants and agreements contained herein shall be binding upon, and shall inure to the benefit of, the parties hereto and their respective heirs, successors and assigns (subject to the provisions of Section 18). No assignment or delegation by Grantee, whether by operation of law or otherwise, shall relieve Grantee of any of its duties, obligations or liabilities hereunder, in whole or in part. The covenants of PG&E hereunder shall run with the land.

17. Assignment. This Agreement and the rights of the Grantee hereunder are appurtenant to the Benefitted Property, and may not be separately assigned, transferred, conveyed or encumbered. Any purported assignment, transfer, conveyance or encumbrance violating the foregoing condition shall be void and of no effect.

18. Attorneys' Fees. Should either party bring an action against the other party, by reason of or alleging the failure of the other party with respect to any or all of its obligations hereunder, whether for declaratory or other relief, then the party which prevails in such action shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees (of both in-house and outside counsel) and expenses related to such action, in addition to all other recovery or relief. A party shall be deemed to have prevailed in any such action (without limiting the generality of the foregoing) if such action is dismissed upon the payment by the other party of the sums allegedly due or the performance of obligations allegedly not complied with, or if such party obtains substantially the relief sought by it in the action, irrespective of whether such action is prosecuted to judgment. Attorneys' fees shall include, without limitation, fees incurred in discovery, contempt proceedings and bankruptcy litigation, and in any appellate proceeding. The non-prevailing party shall also pay the attorney's fees and costs incurred by the prevailing party in any post-judgment proceedings to collect and enforce the judgment. The covenant in the preceding sentence is separate and several and shall survive the merger of this provision into any judgment on this Agreement. For purposes hereof, the reasonable fees of PG&E's in-house attorneys who perform services in connection with any such action shall be recoverable, and shall be based on the fees regularly charged by private attorneys with the equivalent number of years of experience in the relevant subject matter area of the law, in law firms in the City of San Francisco with approximately the same number of attorneys as are employed by PG&E's Law Department.

19. No Waiver. No waiver with respect to any provision of this Agreement shall be effective unless in writing and signed by the party against whom it is asserted. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement by a party shall be construed as a waiver of any subsequent breach or failure of the same term or condition, or as a waiver of any other provision of this Agreement.

20. No Offsets. Grantee acknowledges that PG&E is executing this Agreement in its capacity as the owner of the Easement Area, and not in its capacity as a public utility company or

provider of electricity and natural gas. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained herein, no act or omission of Pacific Gas and Electric Company or its employees, agents or contractors as a provider of electricity and natural gas shall abrogate, diminish, or otherwise affect the respective rights, obligations and liabilities of PG&E and Grantee under this Agreement. Further, Grantee covenants not to raise as a defense to its obligations under this Agreement, or assert as a counterclaim or cross-claim in any litigation or arbitration between PG&E and Grantee relating to this Agreement, any claim, loss, damage, cause of action, liability, cost or expense (including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees) arising from or in connection with Pacific Gas and Electric Company's provision of (or failure to provide) electricity and natural gas.

21. No Third Party Beneficiary. This Agreement is solely for the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective successors and permitted assigns, and, except as expressly provided herein, does not confer any rights or remedies on any other person or entity.

22. Captions. The captions in this Agreement are for reference only and shall in no way define or interpret any provision hereof.

23. Time. Except as otherwise expressly provided herein, the parties agree that as to any obligation or action to be performed hereunder, time is of the essence.

24. Severability. If any provision of this Agreement shall be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement shall not be affected thereby, and each provision of this Agreement shall be valid and enforced to the full extent permitted by law, provided the material provisions of this Agreement can be determined and effectuated.

25. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in identical counterpart copies, each of which shall be an original, but all of which taken together shall constitute one and the same agreement.

26. Other Documents. Each party agrees to sign any additional documents or permit applications which may be reasonably required to effectuate the purpose of this Agreement. Provided, however, that PG&E will not be required to take any action or execute any document that would result in any cost, expense or liability to PG&E.

27. Ingress and Egress.

(a) Ingress and Egress. A non-exclusive right of surface access, ingress and egress to and from Grantee's facilities within the Easement Area, over and across the portion of PG&E adjacent lands upon which PG&E has constructed private roads and lanes thereon, if such there be, otherwise upon written request from Grantee, by such routes as PG&E determines, in its reasonable discretion, will occasion the least practicable damage and inconvenience to PG&E and its facilities; provided that the rights hereby granted shall not extend to any portion of PG&E adjacent lands which is isolated from the Easement Area by any public road or highway now crossing or hereafter crossing PG&E adjacent lands; and provided further, that if, in the future, any dedicated road or highway is built which extends to the Easement Area, or any portion thereof, then the rights granted by this paragraph shall be confined to the portion of PG&E adjacent lands, if any, on which such roads and highways are located.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first set forth above.

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,  
a California corporation

Elkhorn Slough Foundation,  
a California Non-Profit Corporation

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Richard A. Gigliotti  
Its: Manager, Land Energy Delivery  
Technical and Land Services

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Its: \_\_\_\_\_

Exhibits A, A-1, B and C attached

Area 3, Central Coast Division  
Land Service Office: GO  
Operating Department: Electric Transmission  
T13S, R2E, MDB&M  
FERC License Number(s): NA  
PG&E Drawing Number(s): 213385, 213386  
PLAT NO. E-06  
LD of any affected documents: 2213-02-0003, 2213-02-0329  
LD of any Cross-referenced documents: 2213-02-1146  
TYPE OF INTEREST: 11C  
SBE Parcel Number: 135-27-38A-2, 135-27-38A-3  
(For Quitclaims, % being quitclaimed): NA  
Order # or PM #: 40707383  
JCN:  
County: Monterey  
Utility Notice Numbers:  
851 Approval Application No. \_\_\_\_\_ Decision \_\_\_\_\_  
Prepared By: JESS  
Checked By: TWM2  
Revision Number:

**EXHIBIT A**  
**PG&E PROPERTY**  
**AND**  
**EASEMENT AREA**

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

A non exclusive easement for waterline and appurtenants over, under, and across a portion of that parcel described in deed from Bellone, Tottino, De Santi, Barsotti, and Schubert, to Pacific Gas and Electric Company dated January 8, 1964, and recorded on January 14, 1964 in Reel 273 of Official Records of Monterey County, California, at Page 471, said easement being particularly described as follows:

An eight-foot wide strip, lying 4 feet each side of the following described centerline:

Beginning at point lying on the easterly sideline of Parcel 1, as said Parcel is shown and so designated on that certain map filed for record February 9, 1996, in Volume 20 of Surveys at Page 9, Monterey County Recorders Office, State of California, said point lying S. 14° 56' 24" W. 109.34 feet from the easterly terminus of that course labeled L.23; thence the following two courses:

1. S. 64°47'36" E. 59.92 feet to a point, hereinafter called "Point A"; thence
2. N. 74°54'55" E. 313.51 feet, more or less, to the easterly sideline of that parcel described in deed dated January 8, 1964, and recorded on January 14, 1964 in Reel 273 of Official Records of Monterey County, California, at Page 471. The sidelines of said strip shall be lengthened or shortened as to begin (or commence) and end (or terminate) in the westerly and easterly lines of said parcel.

Together with an eight-foot wide strip, lying 4 feet each side of the following described centerline:

Beginning at "Point A" previously described herein; thence the following 27 courses:

1. S. 29°45'48" W. 75.59 feet; thence
2. S. 18°27'05" W. 74.16 feet; thence

3. S. 02°51'27" E. 153.31 feet; thence
4. S. 06°00'03" E. 148.82 feet; thence
5. S. 16°49'41" E. 217.42 feet; thence
6. S. 11°32'50" E. 41.25 feet; thence
7. S. 02°01'58" E. 55.56 feet; thence
8. S. 04°21'39" W. 66.58 feet; thence
9. S. 14°21'04" W. 75.45 feet; thence
10. S. 05°50'17" W. 49.16 feet; thence
11. S. 06°03'31" E. 51.26 feet; thence
12. S. 11°57'13" E. 59.17 feet; thence
13. S. 15°07'38" E. 234.42 feet; thence
14. S. 20°26'09" E. 160.33 feet; thence
15. S. 17°38'50" E. 59.61 feet; thence
16. S. 07°55'40" E. 50.81 feet; thence
17. S. 00°23'26" W. 85.41 feet; thence
18. S. 03°30'59" W. 218.74 feet; thence
19. S. 01°39'36" W. 44.75 feet; thence
20. S. 05°54'41" W. 78.76 feet; thence
21. S. 08°37'54" W. 217.82 feet; thence
22. S. 19°31'35" W. 71.93 feet; thence
23. S. 13°13'09" W. 46.35 feet; thence
24. S. 65°00'32" E. 352.34 feet; thence
25. N. 82°29'20" E. 76.57 feet; thence


26. S. 69°12'42" E. 56.97 feet, more or less, to the to the easterly sideline of that parcel described in deed dated January 8, 1964, and recorded on January 14, 1964 in Reel 273 of Official Records of Monterey County, California, at Page 471. The sidelines of said strip shall be lengthened or shortened as to begin (or commence) and end (or terminate) in the westerly and easterly lines of said parcel.

That certain map filed for record February 9, 1996, in Volume 20 of Surveys at Page 9, Monterey County Recorders Office, State of California, being the basis of bearings for this legal description.


**-SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A-1"-**

**END OF DESCRIPTION**

THIS DOCUMENT WAS PREPARED BY ME ON NOVEMBER 1, 2007

  
THOMAS A. HANNAH, PLS 8312





COURSE L 23  
Vol. 20 Sur. Pg. 9

APN 133-151-022

POINT "A"

POINT OF BEGINNING

Vol. 20 Sur. Pg. 9  
APN 133-151-015

PG&E PROPERTY  
S.B.E. # 135-27-38-1

APN 133-151-007  
REEL 273 PAGE 471

CENTERLINE  
8' WIDE WATER  
LINE EASEMENT

### EXHIBIT "A-1"

PREPARED BY:  
RASMUSSEN LAND SURVEYING, INC.  
PO BOX 3135  
MONTEREY, CA 93942  
TEL: 831-375-7240

LEGEND:  
① = NUMBERED COURSE FROM  
EXHIBIT A

APN 133-151-018



PG&E PROPERTY  
S.B.E. # 135-27-38-1  
S.B.E. # 135-27-38A1  
S.B.E. # 135-27-38A2  
APN 133-142-005

APN 133-151-019

## EXHIBIT B

### INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

Grantee shall procure, carry and maintain in effect throughout the term of this Agreement the following insurance coverage. Grantee is also responsible for its subcontractors maintaining sufficient limits of the appropriate insurance coverages.

A. Workers' Compensation and Employers' Liability

1. Workers' Compensation insurance indicating compliance with any and all applicable labor codes, acts, laws or statutes, state or federal.
2. Employer's Liability insurance shall not be less than One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for injury or death, each accident.

B. Commercial General Liability

1. Coverage shall be at least as broad as the Insurance Services Office (ISO) Commercial General Liability insurance "occurrence" form with no additional coverage alterations.
2. The limits shall not be less than One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) per occurrence for bodily injury, property damage and products and completed operations and Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) aggregate. Defense costs are to be provided outside the policy limits.
3. Coverage shall include: a) an "Additional Insured" endorsement (ISO Additional Insured form CG 2010 or equivalent coverage) adding as additional insureds PG&E, its affiliates, subsidiaries, and parent company, and PG&E's directors, officers, agents and employees with respect to liability arising out of work performed by or for Grantee. If the policy includes "blanket endorsement by contract," the following language added to the certificate of insurance will satisfy PG&E's requirement: "by blanket endorsement, PG&E, its affiliates, subsidiaries, and parent company, and PG&E's directors, officers, agents and employees with respect to liability arising out of the work performed by or for the Grantee are included as additional insured"; and b) an endorsement or policy provision specifying that the Grantee's insurance is primary and that any insurance or self-insurance maintained by PG&E shall be excess and non-contributing.

C. Business Auto

1. Coverage shall be at least as broad as the Insurance Services Office (ISO) Business Auto Coverage form covering Automobile Liability, code 1 "any auto."
2. The limit shall not be less than One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) each accident for bodily injury and property damage occurring prior to completion of construction of

Grantee's facilities, and One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) each accident for bodily injury and property damage occurring thereafter.

D. Additional Insurance Provisions

1. Upon the Effective Date of the Easement Agreement Grantee shall furnish PG&E with two (2) sets of certificates of insurance including required endorsements.
2. Documentation shall state that coverage shall not be canceled except after thirty (30) days prior written notice has been given to PG&E.
3. The documents must be signed by a person authorized by that insurer to bind coverage on its behalf and submitted to:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Insurance Department  
One Market, Spear Tower, Suite 2400  
San Francisco, California 94105

Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Land Rights Protection, Salinas  
356 E. Alisal Street  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Attention: Joyce Nichols

4. Upon request, Grantee shall furnish PG&E evidence of insurance for its agents or contractors.
5. PG&E may inspect the original policies or require complete certified copies at any time.

## **EXHIBIT C**

### **LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF BENEFITTED PROPERTY**

Parcel D, as shown on the map filed for record September 18, 2003 in Volume 26 of Surveys, at Page 108, filed in the office of the County Recorder, County of Monterey, State of California.

PG&E Advice 3156-E

Attachment 2



## Moss Landing Marine Laboratories


Dear Ms. Nichols,

September 20, 2007

This letter is to let you know how much we appreciate your assistance in expediting our request to obtain an easement on PG&E property in order to enhance wetland habitat on an adjacent parcel owned by the Elkhorn Slough Foundation. As you are aware, because of funding constraints from the State Water Resource Board, we need to implement this project by January. We respectfully request that our project be expedited in order for implementation to occur. Failure to implement our project prior to the ending of our grant period would likely result in the loss of funds for this portion of the grant. We have worked hard with the Elkhorn Slough Foundation, along with several other private and public entities, to obtain this funding and implement our grant tasks. This project has many benefits for the environment and the general public and will serve as a springboard for future grant funded collaborations in the future.

Again, I want to thank you for all of your assistance in working hard to complete this project. Please let me know if you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance in any way.

Sincerely,

  
Gage H. Dayton, Ph.D.  
Moss Landing Marine Laboratories  
Moss Landing, CA 95039  
Ph: (831) 771-4428 FAX: (831) 632-4402  
Email: [gdavton@lamu.edu](mailto:gdavton@lamu.edu)

## **Improving Water Quality and Enhancing Wetland Habitat in the Moro Cojo Watershed: Diverting Water from the Castroville Slough onto Sea Mist.**

### **Summary**

This proposal was developed for PG&E in order to provide an overview and work plan of our restoration goals on Elkhorn Slough Foundation (ESF) lands within the Moro Cojo Watershed (Figure 1). The purpose of the proposed project is to pipe surface runoff water from the Castroville Slough onto an ESF owned property ("Sea Mist" parcel) in order to enhance wetland habitats and improve water quality. The project will require burying a single pipe line of 4-inch PVC pipe approximately 3300 ft of at a depth of 2-4 ft beneath the surface on PG&E owned property. The pipe will carry pumped water cross two PG&E owned parcels (Figure 2) and will transport water from the upper Castroville onto the ESF owned (Figure 3). Water will not exit the pipe onto PG&E owned property; rather, it will flow onto ESF owned property to the southeast of PG&E parcel (Figure 3). Impacts to the property will be minimal consisting only of a temporary 2-4 ft deep ditch to house the pipe. The ditch will be excavated using a small backhoe and will be approximately 3300 ft long and 3 ft wide; however, it will be filled (with the backhoe) immediately after the pipe is installed with the native material that was excavated. The entire project should take less than 1 week. Because of the depth of the pipe we foresee no potential vehicular impacts on the pipes. Furthermore, PG&E will not be responsible for any impacts on the pipe.

### **Background**

Many of the problems that are now associated with California's waterways stem from the fact that watershed functions, that historically served to maintain high water quality and provide

habitat for wildlife, have been disrupted. Restoration of the core of the watershed has proven to be one of the most technically and scientifically sound, and cost effective means, for solving many of these problems. The Elkhorn Slough Foundation has acquired several properties in the Moro Cojo Slough watershed with the goal of protecting and restoring natural habitats and improving water quality. These properties have varied histories, but all have been subject to farming, grazing, diking, or other anthropogenic impacts over the last century or more. As such, their habitat value has been substantially degraded. For nearly a decade the Elkhorn Slough Foundation has partnered with Moss Landing Marine Laboratories to obtain grant funds and work towards implementing the Moro Cojo Management and Enhancement Plan by protecting and restoring wetland habitats in the Moro Cojo Watershed. Past projects have focused on decommissioning ditches, creating ponds, diverting runoff onto to the land (rather than funneling it into Monterey Bay), planting native vegetation, weeding exotic species, and protecting wetland habitat by excluding cattle. These projects have benefited flora and fauna and improved water quality.

### **Project Objective**

We are proposing to move surface runoff water from the pool beneath the County maintained pump station that bisects the Castroville Slough (Figure 1) onto the Sea Mist parcel approximately 3300 ft downstream from the pump station. The county maintained pump functions to prevent flooding in the upper half of Castroville Slough to maintain agricultural production on the lands adjacent to the Slough. Water pumped into the lower half of the Castroville Slough empties into the Moro Cojo Slough and then flows into Monterey Bay. Our project will capture some of the surface runoff water that is pumped from the upper half of

Castroville Slough and spread onto the Sea Mist parcel to create wetlands habitat. We propose to transport the water to the diked lands via a 4-inch pipe that will be buried along the existing perimeter levee (Figure 3). We will install a booster pump in the pool beneath the county maintained pump. The pump will be designed to capture surface water during times when the county maintained pumps are running. No modifications to the existing levees will be necessary. Pumping water onto the parcels will have immediate benefits for wetland flora and fauna as well as water quality. This project will return water to historical wetland habitats and begin to restore the wetland vegetation. Ultimately, the Elkhorn Slough Foundation will move towards a more passive approach of bringing water onto these sites; however, this proposed work will serve as an important first step to support development of aquatic vegetation in these historic wetlands.




Figure 1. Overview of project location along with delineation of the Castroville Slough.





Figure 2. PVC pipe would be buried for approximately 3300 ft.



**Figure 3.** Proposed project location and details for pipe installation

**A)** Overview of project site. **B)** Current county maintained pump. Proposed project would install a 4 inch pipe to divert water from splash pool beneath the county maintained pump (B) onto the ESF owned parcel (A). **C)** Pipe would be buried 2-4 ft beneath the surface along the existing levee.

PG&E Advice 3156-E

Attachment 3



**DECISION TO EXEMPT NEED FOR FORMAL APPRAISAL (DENFA)**

GRANTEE:	DATE: 10/02/07	
Elkhorn Slough Foundation		
1700 Elkhorn Road	PROJECT Moro Cojo Pipeline Easement	
Watsonville, CA 95076		
PG&E AGENT:		COUNTY Monterey
Joyce Nichols		
Land Agent	SBE Parcel Numbers	135-27-38A-1,2,3&38-2

Project Scope: 4' diameter pipeline crossing PG&E property to provide water to restore former wetland
Land Use: Zoned Resource Conservation
Highest and Best Use: Resource Conservation
Market Source(s) Appraisal of adjacent property purchased in 2003 reviewed and approved by State of California Dept. of Gen. Services

**Valuation Comments:**

The most recent appraisal of land zoned Resource Conservation in the Elkhorn watershed concluded land was worth \$5,625/acre; full fee-interest of .52 acres:  $\$5,625 \times .52 = \$2,925$ .

If appraised as farm land, the value of the PG&E land would be higher. Using the Sea Mist appraisal of adjacent land the value of  $\$13,750 \times .52 = \$7,150$ , for the full fee-interest. If a 50% increase in value is assumed over the 7 years since the time of the appraisal, the value of the fee interest in the easement area would be  $\$20,625 \times .52 = \$10,725$ . The value of the easement would be a portion of this full fee value.

**Recommendation**

Accept full fee value offer of \$10,000 for the easement based on Foundations analysis and reconciliation of value for the appraisal of the Sea Mist ESF land across from PG&E.

**APPROVED**

Keith J. Lamb

Principal Right of Way Agent /Appraisal Administrator

**DATE:** 10/02/07

PG&E Advice 3156-E

Attachment 4

Moro Cojo Slough  
Management and Enhancement Plan

---

*Final Report*



---

The Habitat Restoration Group

P.O. Box 4006 • 6180 Highway 9 • Felton, CA 95018

Telephone (408) 335-6800 • Fax (408) 335-6810

California Landscape Contractors License #571037

of the  
of the

**Moro Cojo Slough  
Management and Enhancement Plan**

***Final Report***

**Adopted by Monterey County Board of Supervisors  
on October 22, 1996**

Prepared for:


**Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department  
*and*  
State Coastal Conservancy**

Prepared by:

**The Habitat Restoration Group  
Kathleen B. Lyons, Project Manager  
John A. Gilchrist, Project Principal**

with

**: Mitchell Swanson and Associates  
VB Agricultural Services  
Applied Marine Sciences  
Stephen B. Ruth, Ph.D.**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	viii
CHAPTER 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1-1
PHYSICAL FEATURES .....	1-1
HISTORICAL INFLUENCES .....	1-2
HYDROLOGY .....	1-3
BIOTIC RESOURCES .....	1-4
Vegetation .....	1-4
Wildlife .....	1-4
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources .....	1-5
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES .....	1-5
WATER QUALITY .....	1-6
LAND USE .....	1-6
PUBLIC ACCESS AND EDUCATION .....	1-7
MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT .....	1-7
Preferred Lower Watershed Plan .....	1-7
Project-wide Best Management Practices (BMP's) .....	1-8
CHAPTER 2 - INTRODUCTION .....	2-1
PURPOSE OF MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT PLAN .....	2-1
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES .....	2-1
GOALS .....	2-1
OBJECTIVES .....	2-2
General Overall Objectives .....	2-2
Biological Objectives .....	2-2
Water Quality and Non-Point Pollution Objectives .....	2-3
Agricultural Objectives .....	2-3
Land Use Objectives .....	2-3
Public Access and Education Objectives .....	2-3
RELATIONSHIP WITH LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM .....	2-4
OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS .....	2-4
EXISTING POLICIES AND REGULATIONS .....	2-4
Monterey County .....	2-5
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) .....	2-5
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) .....	2-6
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) .....	2-6
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) .....	2-6
California Coastal Commission (CCC) .....	2-6
Moss Landing Harbor District (MLHD) .....	2-6
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) .....	2-7
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments .....	2-7
Enforcement of Environmental Regulations .....	2-7
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM .....	2-7
Fully Funded Programs Administered by the County of Monterey ..	2-7
Joint City and State/Federal Programs Administered by the County of Monterey .....	2-7

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

	Page
State, Federal and Public Agency Programs . . . . .	2-7
Private Industry Funded Program . . . . .	2-8
Volunteer Programs . . . . .	2-8
<b>IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISMS . . . . .</b>	<b>2-8</b>
Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program . . . . .	2-8
Watershed Stewardship/Education . . . . .	2-8
Develop an Educational Brochure . . . . .	2-8
Establish a Watershed Restoration and Management Committee . . . . .	2-9
Establish an "Adopt-a-Habitat" Program . . . . .	2-9
<b>IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING . . . . .</b>	<b>2-10</b>
Watershed Protection Funding, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) . . . . .	2-10
Section 314(b) Clean Lakes Program . . . . .	2-10
Section 319 (h) Nonpoint Source Implementation Program (NPSP) . . . . .	2-10
Coastal Zone Management Program, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) . . . . .	2-10
Wetlands Reserve Program, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service . . . . .	2-10
Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, Federal Highway Administration . . . . .	2-10
<b>CHAPTER 3 - HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE . . . . .</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>HISTORIC HYDROLOGIC CONDITIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>3-1</b>
Pre-1850's . . . . .	3-1
1850's - 1910 . . . . .	3-2
1910 - 1947 . . . . .	3-3
1947 - Present . . . . .	3-3
<b>HISTORIC BIOTIC CONDITIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>3-5</b>
Pre-1850's . . . . .	3-5
1850's - Present . . . . .	3-6
1900 - Present . . . . .	3-6
<b>CHAPTER 4 - PHYSICAL PROCESSES . . . . .</b>	<b>4-1</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY OF STUDY . . . . .</b>	<b>4-1</b>
Physical Setting . . . . .	4-1
<b>GEOLOGY . . . . .</b>	<b>4-2</b>
Description of Landscape Units . . . . .	4-2
Recent Geologic History and Seismicity . . . . .	4-3
<b>SOILS . . . . .</b>	<b>4-4</b>
<b>HYDROLOGY . . . . .</b>	<b>4-4</b>
Tidal Inflows . . . . .	4-4
Precipitation and Stormwater Runoff . . . . .	4-5
Flood Control . . . . .	4-5
Water Quality . . . . .	4-6
<b>GROUNDWATER . . . . .</b>	<b>4-7</b>
Aquifers . . . . .	4-7

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

	Page
Groundwater Movement and Recharge . . . . .	4-8
Groundwater Levels and Quality . . . . .	4-8
Seawater Intrusion . . . . .	4-9
<b>CHAPTER 5 - BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES . . . . .</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>VEGETATION RESOURCES . . . . .</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>PLANT COMMUNITIES . . . . .</b>	<b>5-2</b>
Wetlands . . . . .	5-2
Coastal Salt Marsh . . . . .	5-2
Freshwater Marsh . . . . .	5-3
Freshwater Herbaceous Wetland . . . . .	5-3
Central Coast Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest . . . . .	5-4
Grasslands . . . . .	5-4
Coastal Alkali Grassland . . . . .	5-4
Mixed Grassland . . . . .	5-4
Non-native Grassland . . . . .	5-5
Maritime Chaparral . . . . .	5-5
Coast Live Oak Woodland . . . . .	5-5
Coyote Brush Scrub . . . . .	5-6
Non-native Plant Communities . . . . .	5-6
Ruderal . . . . .	5-6
Poison Hemlock Scrub . . . . .	5-6
Agricultural Land . . . . .	5-6
Rural Residential Vegetation . . . . .	5-6
Non-native Landscape Trees . . . . .	5-6
<b>PLANT SPECIES OF CONCERN . . . . .</b>	<b>5-7</b>
<b>WILDLIFE RESOURCES . . . . .</b>	<b>5-7</b>
<b>WILDLIFE HABITAT . . . . .</b>	<b>5-7</b>
Central Coast Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest . . . . .	5-8
Amphibians . . . . .	5-9
Reptiles . . . . .	5-9
Avifauna . . . . .	5-9
Mammals . . . . .	5-9
Coyote Brush/Poison Hemlock Scrub . . . . .	5-10
Avifauna . . . . .	5-10
Mammals . . . . .	5-10
Mixed/Non-native/Coastal Alkali Grassland . . . . .	5-10
Amphibians . . . . .	5-10
Reptiles . . . . .	5-10
Avifauna . . . . .	5-10
Mammals . . . . .	5-11
Freshwater Herbaceous Wetland . . . . .	5-11
Amphibians . . . . .	5-11
Reptiles . . . . .	5-11

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)**

	<b>Page</b>
Coastal Salt/Brackish-water Marsh . . . . .	5-11
Amphibians . . . . .	5-11
Reptiles . . . . .	5-12
Avifauna . . . . .	5-12
Mammals . . . . .	5-12
Maritime Chaparral . . . . .	5-12
Agricultural/Grazing Land . . . . .	5-12
<b>WILDLIFE SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN . . . . .</b>	<b>5-13</b>
California Brackishwater Snail . . . . .	5-13
Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander (SCLTS) . . . . .	5-14
California Tiger Salamander . . . . .	5-14
California Red-legged Frog . . . . .	5-15
Southwestern Pond Turtle . . . . .	5-15
California Linderiella . . . . .	5-15
<b>PROBLEM WILDLIFE SPECIES . . . . .</b>	<b>5-16</b>
<b>FISHERIES AND AQUATIC RESOURCES . . . . .</b>	<b>5-16</b>
<b>FISHERIES RESOURCES . . . . .</b>	<b>5-16</b>
Fish Species of Special Concern . . . . .	5-17
<b>AQUATIC RESOURCES . . . . .</b>	<b>5-18</b>
Aquatic Species of Management Concern . . . . .	5-19
<b>CHAPTER 6 - AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES . . . . .</b>	<b>6-1</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY . . . . .</b>	<b>6-1</b>
<b>EXISTING CONDITIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>6-1</b>
Artichokes . . . . .	6-1
Strawberries . . . . .	6-3
Vegetable Production . . . . .	6-6
Cut Flower Production . . . . .	6-6
Cattle: Feedlots and Dairies . . . . .	6-7
<b>CHAPTER 7 - LAND USE . . . . .</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>EXISTING LAND USE . . . . .</b>	<b>7-1</b>
Outdoor Recreation Areas . . . . .	7-1
Agricultural Lands . . . . .	7-1
Other Land Uses . . . . .	7-2
<b>NORTH COUNTY LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM . . . . .</b>	<b>7-2</b>
<b>RESOURCE MANAGEMENT . . . . .</b>	<b>7-2</b>
<b>LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT . . . . .</b>	<b>7-3</b>
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES . . . . .</b>	<b>7-3</b>
<b>PUBLIC ACCESS . . . . .</b>	<b>7-3</b>
<b>WATER SUPPLY AND QUALITY . . . . .</b>	<b>7-3</b>
<b>IMPLEMENTATION . . . . .</b>	<b>7-4</b>
<b>CHAPTER 8 - WASTEWATER . . . . .</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION . . . . .</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>WASTEWATER FACILITIES . . . . .</b>	<b>8-1</b>

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CHAPTER 9 - PUBLIC ACCESS AND EDUCATION</b> .....	9-1
<b>EXISTING PUBLIC ACCESS</b> .....	9-1
Vehicular Access .....	9-1
Pedestrians and Bicyclists .....	9-1
<b>EDUCATION</b> .....	9-2
<b>CHAPTER 10 - PREFERRED LOWER WATERSHED PLAN</b> .....	10-1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	10-1
Selection of the Preferred Plan .....	10-1
Phase I - Education and Enforcement through Existing Programs ..	10-2
Phase II - Establish Buffers between Wetlands and Other Lands with Willing Landowners .....	10-2
Phase III - Ecological Engineering .....	10-2
Phase IV - Design and Implement Structural Engineering Actions ..	10-2
<b>PREFERRED PLAN - WINTER/SPRING FRESHWATER CONDITIONS</b> .....	10-3
General Description of the Preferred Plan .....	10-3
Benefits and Constraints of the Preferred Plan .....	10-3
Creation of Freshwater Impoundment Areas .....	10-3
Creation of Island for Waterfowl Breeding .....	10-5
Erosion and Flooding .....	10-5
Modification of the SPRR Track Overcrossing to Install a Flashboard Dam .....	10-5
Creation of Buffers between Existing Agriculture and Wetland Resources .....	10-5
Widening Castroville Slough to 1977 Dimensions .....	10-5
<b>OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BY THE RAC</b> .....	10-6
Alternative A - Tidal Regime .....	10-6
Benefits and Constraints of Alternative A .....	10-6
Reason for Rejection of Alternative A .....	10-7
Alternative B - Partially Tidal Regime .....	10-8
Benefits and Constraints of Alternative B .....	10-8
Reason for Rejection of Alternative B .....	10-8
Alternative C - Enhanced Existing Conditions .....	10-8
Benefits and Constraints of Alternative C .....	10-9
Reason for Rejection of Alternative C .....	10-9
<b>CHAPTER 11 - PROJECT-WIDE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES</b> .....	11-1
<b>HYDROLOGY, WATER QUALITY, AND WASTEWATER</b> .....	11-2
Wastewater .....	11-3
<b>BIOTIC RESOURCES</b> .....	11-3
Wastewater .....	11-4
<b>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b> .....	11-4
<b>LAND USE</b> .....	11-5
<b>PUBLIC ACCESS AND EDUCATION</b> .....	11-6
<b>CHAPTER 12 - REFERENCES AND LITERATURE CITED</b> .....	12-1

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

Page

## LIST OF TABLES

Number	
4-1	Soil Characteristics the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed . . . . . 4-11
4-2	Hydrologic Characteristics of Moss Landing Harbor and Adjacent Wetland . . . . . 4-12
4-3	Point Rainfall Depth for the Moro Cojo Watershed . . . . . 4-13
4-4	Runoff Peak Flow and Volumes Computed for Selected 12-hour Event Calculated by HEC-1 Simulation at Highway 1 . . . . . 4-14
5-1	Plant Communities within the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed . . . . . 5-20
5-2	Plant Species of Concern Known or that Have Potential to Occur within the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed . . . . . 5-22
5-3	Sensitive Wildlife Species Known or Predicted to Occur in the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed . . . . . 5-24
10-1	Summary of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan Actions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan . . . . . 10-11
10-2	Analysis of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan - Winter/Spring Fresh- water Conditions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan . . . . . 10-16

## LIST OF FIGURES

Number	
1-1	Project Vicinity Map
1-2	Project Study Area
3-1	Historic Condition, Circa 1854
3-2	Historic Condition, Circa 1910
3-3	Photo of Sandholdt Dam After 1906 Earthquake
3-4	Schematic Maps of the Historical Position of the Salinas River Mouth
3-5	Historic Condition, Circa 1940-Present
4-1	Watershed and Soils Map
4-2	Geologic Profile of the Area Underlying Moro Cojo Slough
4-3	Tidal Hydrographs for Moro Cojo Slough and Moss Landing Harbor Recorded in Summer of 1993
4-4	Plot of Tidal Volume in Moro Cojo Slough - Past and Present
4-5	Tidal Duration for Recording Stations in Moss Landing Harbor and Moro Cojo Slough
5-1	Plant Communities of Lower Watershed
5-2	Plant Communities of Entire Watershed
5-3	Sensitive Biotic Resources of Lower Watershed
5-4	Sensitive Biotic Resources of Entire Watershed
5-5	Wetland and Riparian Habitat
6-1	Existing Agricultural Land Uses
7-1	Existing Land Uses
7-2	North County Land Use Plan

- 7-3 Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project - Proposed Facilities
- 8-1 Existing Wastewater Facilities
- 9-1 Existing and Approved Public Access and Educational Facilities
- 10-1 Preferred Plan for Lower Watershed
- 10-2 Cross-section Showing Design of Lower Watershed Preferred Plan - Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions (see D/D' on Figure 10-1)
- 11-1 Project-wide Best Management Practices
- 11-2 Cross-section Showing Project-wide Best Management Practices: Agricultural Buffer Areas and Grass-lined Swale
- 11-3 Schematic Design of Project-wide Best Management Practices: Sediment Retention Basin
- 11-4 Schematic Design of Project-wide Best Management Practices: Culvert Crossings for Amphibian Migration
- 11-5 Schematic Design of Project-wide Best Management Practices: Raised Boardwalk Within Wetland Areas and Interpretive Signs

### LIST OF APPENDICES

(Bound Separately; on file with  
County of Monterey Planning and Building Inspection Department)

#### Appendix

- A Water Quality Data Collected by MCWRA 1990-1992
- B Water Quality Measurements by California Regional Water Quality Control Board
- C Checklist of Vascular Plants - Moro Cojo Slough Watershed
- D Wildlife Species Observed or Predicted to Occur in Moro Cojo Slough Watershed
- E Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species and Species of Special Concern
- F UCSC Science Library Air Photo Coverage for Moro Cojo Slough Watershed
- G Best Management Practices for Water Resources
- H Best Management Practices for Agriculture
- I Best Management Practices for Control of Selected Invasive, Non-native Plant Species
- J Guidelines for Development Activities Adjacent to Oak Trees

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Habitat Restoration Group (HRG) would like to thank Nadine Hitchcock of the State Coastal Conservancy and Steven Maki of the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department for their considerable and invaluable assistance in the preparation of this document. HRG also appreciates the professional services received from its subconsultants: Mitchell Swanson and Associates; VB Agricultural Services; Applied Marine Sciences; and Dr. Stephen Ruth. Additionally, the project team acknowledges the assistance of the Elkhorn Slough Reserve Advisory Committee.

### CREDITS:

**Authors:** The Habitat Restoration Group - Prime Consultant, Biological Resources, and Land Use Planning

*with*

Mitchell Swanson and Associates - Hydrology, Geology and Water Quality  
VB Agricultural Services - Agriculture  
Applied Marine Sciences - Aquatic Biology  
Dr. Stephen B. Ruth - Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander

### Project Managers:

Steven Maki                      Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department  
Nadine Hitchcock              State Coastal Conservancy

### Elkhorn Slough Reserve Advisory Committee:

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Representing:</u>
Louis Calcagno	Agricultural Property Owners
Ed DeMars	Monterey County Board of Supervisors
Jim Estes	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Institute of Marine Services
Jim Harvey	Moss Landing Marine Laboratories
John Heine	Moss Landing Harbor District
Terry Jackson	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Jane King	Monterey Bay Aquarium
Bill Leavitt	Moss Landing Commercial Fishermen's Association
Tony Leonardini	Residential Property Owners
Benita Low	Monterey County Office of Education
Kenton Parker	California Department of Fish and Game, ESIGA
Rick Parmer	California Department of Fish and Game
Martha Rush	Industrial Property Owners
Rick Starr	Sea Grant Extension Program
Les Strnad	California Coastal Commission
John Warriner	The Nature Conservancy

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (Cont'd.)

### State Coastal Conservancy:

Michael L. Fischer      Executive Director

### Monterey County:

Robert Slimmon, Jr.      Planning Director

William L. Phillips      Assistant Director

### Monterey County Planning Commissioners:

Louis Calcagno

Ileene Crane-Franks

Alfred Diaz-Infante (Chair)

Miguel Errea

Laurence Hawkins (Vice-Chair)

Scott Hennessy

Robert Hernandez

Carol Lacy

Maryn Pitt-Derdivanis

Calvin Reaves

### Monterey County Board of Supervisors:


Simon Salinas              1st District (Vice Chair)

Judy Pennycook            2nd District

Tom Perkins                3rd District

Edith Johnsen             4th District (Chair)

Sam Karas                  5th District



COUNTY OF MONTEREY  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED

MAY 2 1996

BRUCE A. HEEVES  
MONTEREY COUNTY CLERK  
DEPUTY

OFFICE USE ONLY

POSTED 30 DAYS

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: COUNTY OF MONTEREY DECISION-MAKING BODY: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

PROJECT: MORO COJO SLOUGH MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT PLAN

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 1208  
CITY/STATE/ZIP: , Salinas CA 93902

PLANNER: STEVEN MAKE

TELEPHONE: (408) 755-5025

THIS PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT AS IT HAS BEEN FOUND:

- (a) That said project will not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment.
- (b) That said project will have no significant impact on long term environmental goals.
- (c) That said project will have no significant cumulative effect upon the environment.
- (d) That said project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION OF NATURE, PURPOSE AND BENEFICIARIES: Wetland Management and Enhancement Plan is a conceptual planning document to provide guidance and funding for future projects that will enhance existing freshwater habitats to increase habitat productivity and diversity, erosion control and water quality.

PROJECT LOCATION: Moro Cojo Slough, Moss Landing CA

TIME PERIOD PROVIDED FOR REVIEW

BEGINS: April 24, 1996 ENDS: May 24, 1996

ADDRESS WHERE COPY OF APPLICATION AND INITIAL STUDY ARE AVAILABLE:

MONTEREY COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.

PARKS & RECREATION DEPT.

LAFCO


MONTEREY COUNTY PLANNING & BUILDING INSPECTION DEPARTMENT  
P.O. BOX 1208/COURTHOUSE, 240 CHURCH ST., SALINAS, CA 93902

TO BE FILED WITH COUNTY CLERK WHEN NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT IS FOUND:

DATE FILED:

NEG. DEC.  
REV. 01/27/93

FILE REFERENCE #: PD 90-061  
TYPE: Planning Program APN: numerous



**Governor's Office of Planning and Research**

100 Tenth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814



May 22, 1996

STEVEN MAKI  
MONTEREY COUNTY PLANNING/BUILDING INSP. DEPT.  
PO BOX 1208  
SALINAS, CA 93902

Subject: MORO COJO SLOUGH ENHANCEMENT AND MANAGEMENT PLAN SCH #:  
96041068

Dear STEVEN MAKI:


The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named environmental document to selected state agencies for review. The review period is closed and none of the state agencies have comments. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. When contacting the Clearinghouse in this matter, please use the eight-digit State Clearinghouse number so that we may respond promptly.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Antero A. Rivasplata".

ANTERO A. RIVASPLATA  
Chief, State Clearinghouse



**Notice of Completion** *Supplementary Document M*

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 916/445-0613

See NOTE below  
SCH # 96041068

Project Title: MONROE CO. CO. SLOUGH ENHANCEMENT AND MANAGEMENT PLAN  
 Lead Agency: Monterey County Planning and Bldg. Insp. Dept Contact Person: STEVEN MAKI  
 Street Address: P.O. Box 1208 Phone: 408-7506600  
 City: Salinas, CA Zip: 93902 County: Monterey

Project Location  
 County: Monterey City/Nearest Community: Moss Landing Total Acres: 17 sq. miles  
 Cross Streets: Hwy 1 and Moss Landing Rd. Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_ Range: \_\_\_\_\_ Base: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Assessor's Parcel No. NUMEROUS Section: \_\_\_\_\_ Twp: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 1 and 156 Waterways: Elkhorn Slough, Pacific Ocean, Old Salinas Riv Chnl  
 Airports: BO Railways: Southern Pacific Schools: No, Monterey Co. High

Document Type  
 CEQA:  NOP  Supplement/Subsequent  NEPA:  NOI  Other:  Joint Document  
 Early Cons  EIR (Prior SCH No.)  EA  Final Document  
 Neg Dec  Other \_\_\_\_\_  Draft EIS  Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 Draft EIR  FONSI

Local Action Type  
 General Plan Update  Specific Plan  Rezone  Annexation  
 General Plan Amendment  Master Plan  Prezone  Redevelopment  
 General Plan Element  Planned Unit Development  Use Permit  Coastal Permit  
 Community Plan  Site Plan  Land Division (Subdivision, Parcel Map, Tract Map, etc.)  Other: Wetland Enhancement and Management Plan

Development Type THERE IS NO DEVELOPMENT RESULTING FROM THIS WETLAND AND ENHANCEMENT PLAN  
 Residential: Units \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_  Water Facilities: Type \_\_\_\_\_ MOD \_\_\_\_\_  
 Office: Sqft \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_  Transportation: Type \_\_\_\_\_  
 Commercial: Sqft \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_  Mining: Mineral \_\_\_\_\_  
 Industrial: Sqft \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_  Power: Type \_\_\_\_\_ Wants \_\_\_\_\_  
 Educational \_\_\_\_\_  Waste Treatment: Type \_\_\_\_\_  
 Recreational \_\_\_\_\_  Hazardous Waste: Type \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_

Project Issues Discussed in Document  
 Aesthetic/Visual  Flood Plain/Flooding  Schools/Universities  Water Quality  
 Agricultural Land  Forest Land/Fire Hazard  Septic Systems  Water Supply/Groundwater  
 Air Quality  Geologic/Seismic  Sewer Capacity  Wetland/Riparian  
 Archeological/Historical  Minerals  Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading  Wildlife  
 Coastal Zone  Noise  Solid Waste  Growth Inducing  
 Drainage/Absorption  Population/Housing Balance  Toxic/Hazardous  Landuse  
 Economic/Job  Public Services/Facilities  Traffic/Circulation  Cumulative Effects  
 Fiscal  Recreation/Parks  Vegetation  Other \_\_\_\_\_

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Use  
Row crop agriculture, grazing/Coastal Agricultural Preservation/Agricultural Preservation  
Wetlands/Resource Conservation/Resource Conservation-Wetlands

Project Description: The project is a conceptual planning document to be used to guide the development of small scale projects to enhance freshwater habitats which maximizes plant and species productivity and diversity, protection of sensitive habitats, reduce erosion and sedimentation and improve water quality. The Plan will enable the funding of future projects identified as consistent with overall management plan for the area.  
with appropriate phase will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. from a Notice of Preparation

State Clearinghouse Contact: Mr. Chris Belsky  
(916) 445-0613

**Project Sent to the following State Agencies**


State Review Began: 4-22-96  
 Dept. Review to Agency: 5-15  
 Agency Rev to SCH: 5-20  
 SCH COMPLIANCE: 5-22

- Resources
- Boating
- Coastal Comm
- Coastal Consv
- Colorado Rvr Bd
- Conservation
- Fish & Game # 3
- Delta Protection
- Forestry
- Parks & Rec/OHP
- Reclamation
- BCDC
- DWR
- OES
- Bus Transp Hous
- Aeronautics
- CHP
- Caltrans # 5
- Trans Planning
- Housing & Devel
- Health & Welfare
- Drinking H2O
- Medical Waste
- State/Consumer Svcs
- General Services
- Cal/EPA
- ARB
- CA Waste Mgmt Bd
- SWRCB: Grants
- SWRCB: Delta
- SWRCB: Wtr Quality
- SWRCB: Wtr Rights
- Reg. WQCB # 3
- DTSC/CTC
- Yth/Adlt Corrections
- Corrections
- Independent Comm
- Energy Comm
- NAHC
- PUC
- Santa Mn Mms
- State Lands Comm
- Tahoe Reg Plan
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please note SCH Number on all Comments  
96041068

Please forward late comments directly to the Lead Agency

AQMD/APCD 20 (Resources: 4-22)



Notice of Completion Supplementary Document M

See NOTE below
SCH #

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 916/445-0613

Project Title: MORO COJO SLOUGH ENHANCEMENT AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

Lead Agency: Monterey County Planning and Bldg. Insp. Dept. Contact Person: STEVEN MAKI
Street Address: P.O. Box 1208 Phone: 408-7506600
City: Salinas, CA Zip: 93902 County: Monterey

Project Location

County: Monterey City/Nearest Community: Moss Landing
Cross Streets: Hwy 1 and Moss Landing Rd. Zip Code: Total Acres: 17 sq. miles
Assessor's Parcel No. NUMEROUS Section: Twp. Range: Base:
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 1 and 156 Waterways: Elkhorn Slough, Pacific Ocean, Old Salinas Riv Chr
Airports: NO Railways: Southern Pacific Schools: No. Monterey Co. High

Document Type

CEQA: [ ] NOP [ ] Supplement/Subsequent NEPA: [ ] NOI Other: [ ] Joint Document
[ ] Early Cons [ ] EIR (Prior SCH No.) [ ] EA [ ] Final Document
[ ] Neg Dec [ ] Other [ ] Draft EIS [ ] Other
[ ] Draft EIR [ ] FONSI

Local Action Type

[ ] General Plan Update [ ] Specific Plan [ ] Rezone [ ] Annexation
[ ] General Plan Amendment [ ] Master Plan [ ] Prezone [ ] Redevelopment
[ ] General Plan Element [ ] Planned Unit Development [ ] Use Permit [ ] Coastal Permit
[ ] Community Plan [ ] Site Plan [ ] Land Division (Subdivision, Parcel Map, Tract Map, etc.) [ ] Other Wetland Enhancement and Management Pl

Development Type THERE IS NO DEVELOPMENT RESULTING FROM THIS WETLAND AND ENHANCEMENT PLAN

[ ] Residential: Units Acres
[ ] Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
[ ] Commercial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
[ ] Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
[ ] Educational
[ ] Recreational
[ ] Water Facilities: Type MGD
[ ] Transportation: Type
[ ] Mining: Mineral
[ ] Power: Type Wats
[ ] Waste Treatment: Type
[ ] Hazardous Waste: Type
[ ] Other:

Project Issues Discussed in Document

[ ] Aesthetic/Visual [ ] Flood Plain/Flooding [ ] Schools/Universities [ ] Water Quality
[ ] Agricultural Land [ ] Forest Land/Fire Hazard [ ] Septic Systems [ ] Water Supply/Groundwater
[ ] Air Quality [ ] Geologic/Seismic [ ] Sewer Capacity [ ] Wetland/Riparian
[ ] Archeological/Historical [ ] Minerals [ ] Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading [ ] Wildlife
[ ] Coastal Zone [ ] Noise [ ] Solid Waste [ ] Growth Inducing
[ ] Drainage/Absorption [ ] Population/Housing Balance [ ] Toxic/Hazardous [ ] Landuse
[ ] Economic/Jobs [ ] Public Services/Facilities [ ] Traffic/Circulation [ ] Cumulative Effects
[ ] Fiscal [ ] Recreation/Parks [ ] Vegetation [ ] Other

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Use

Row crop agriculture, grazing/Coastal Agricultural Preservation/Agricultural Preservation
Wetlands/Resource Conservation/Resource Conservation-Wetlands

Project Description: The project is a conceptual planning document to be used to guide the development of small scale projects to enhance freshwater habitats which maximizes plant and species productivity and diversity, protection of sensitive habitats, reduce erosion and sedimentation and improve water quality. The Plan will enable the funding of future projects identified as consistent with overall management plan for the area.
NOTE: Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. from a Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill it in.

# Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Supplementary Document N

<b>KEY</b>
<b>S</b> = Document sent by lead agency
<b>X</b> = Document sent by SCH
<b>✓</b> = Suggested distribution

- Resources Agency**
- Boating & Waterways
- Coastal Commission
- Coastal Conservancy
- Colorado River Board
- Conservation
- Fish & Game
- Forestry
- Office of Historic Preservation
- Parks & Recreation
- Reclamation
- S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission
- Water Resources (DWR)
- Business, Transportation & Housing**
- Aeronautics
- California Highway Patrol
- CALTRANS District # \_\_\_\_\_
- Department of Transportation Planning (headquarters)
- Housing & Community Development
- Food & Agriculture**
- Health & Welfare**
- Health Services \_\_\_\_\_
- State & Consumer Services**
- General Services
- OLA (Schools)

- Cal-EPA**
- Air Resources Board
- APCD/AQMD
- California Waste Management Board
- SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
- SWRCB: Delta Unit
- SWRCB: Water Quality
- SWRCB: Water Rights
- Regional WQCB # \_\_\_\_\_ (San Luis Obispo )
- Youth & Adult Corrections**
- Corrections
- Independent Commissions & Offices**
- Energy Commission
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Public Utilities Commission
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- State Lands Commission
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Public Review Period** (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date April 24, 1996

Ending Date May 24, 1996

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date April 18, 1996

**Lead Agency** (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: The Habitat Restoration Group

Address: P.O. Box 4006

City/State/Zip: Felton CA 95018

Contact: Kathleen Lyons

Phone: (408) 335 6809

**Applicant:** Monterey Co. Planning and Bldg. Insp.

Address: P.O. Box 1208

City/State/Zip: Salinas CA 93902

Phone: (408) 759 6600 Steven Maki  
Senior Planner

**For SCH Use Only:**

Date Received at SCH \_\_\_\_\_

Date Review Starts \_\_\_\_\_

Date to Agencies \_\_\_\_\_

Date to SCH \_\_\_\_\_

Clearance Date \_\_\_\_\_

Notes:

Revised October 1989

# Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Supplementary Document N

- Resources Agency
  - Boating & Waterways
- Coastal Commission
- Coastal Conservancy
- Colorado River Board
- Conservation
- Fish & Game
- Forestry
- Office of Historic Preservation
- Parks & Recreation
- Reclamation
- S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission
- Water Resources (DWR)
- Business, Transportation & Housing**
  - Aeronautics
  - California Highway Patrol
  - CALTRANS District # \_\_\_\_\_
  - Department of Transportation Planning (headquarters)
  - Housing & Community Development
- Food & Agriculture
  - Health & Welfare**
    - Health Services \_\_\_\_\_
  - State & Consumer Services**
    - General Services
    - OLA (Schools)

**KEY**  
**S** = Document sent by lead agency  
**X** = Document sent by SCH  
**✓** = Suggested distribution

- Cal-EPA**
  - Air Resources Board
  - APCD/AQMD
  - California Waste Management Board
  - SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
  - SWRCB: Delta Unit
  - SWRCB: Water Quality
  - SWRCB: Water Rights
  - Regional WQCB # \_\_\_\_\_ (San Luis Obispo )
- Youth & Adult Corrections**
  - Corrections
- Independent Commissions & Offices**
  - Energy Commission
  - Native American Heritage Commission
  - Public Utilities Commission
  - Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
  - State Lands Commission
  - Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Public Review Period** (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date April 24, 1996

Ending Date May 24, 1996

Signature *Steven Maki*

Date April 18, 1996

**Lead Agency** (Complete if applicable):  
 Consulting Firm: The Habitat Restoration Group  
 Address: P.O. Box 4006  
 City/State/Zip: Felton CA 95018  
 Contact: Kathleen Lyons  
 Phone: (408) 335 6809

**Applicant:** Monterey Co. Planning and Bldg. Insp.  
 Address: P.O. Box 1208  
 City/State/Zip: Salinas CA 93902  
 Phone: (408) 759 6600 Steven Maki

**For SCH Use Only:**

Date Received at SCH \_\_\_\_\_

Date Review Starts \_\_\_\_\_

Date to Agencies \_\_\_\_\_

Date to SCH \_\_\_\_\_

Clearance Date \_\_\_\_\_

Notes:

# INITIAL STUDY

**PROJECT NAME:** *Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan*



*File* PD #90-061

**MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

**OWNER NAME:** *Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department*

**Address:** *P.O. Box 1208, Salinas, CA 93902*

**LOCATION:** *Moro Cojo Slough, North Monterey County*

## STATEMENT OF DETERMINATION/PREPARATION


*The following study was prepared by the planner whose signature appears below on behalf of the County of Monterey, State of California.*

On the basis of this initial study and any attached or referenced information: (Check One)

The proposed project **WOULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment (this includes mitigation measures to change the project to lower significant impacts), and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** should be prepared.



The proposed project **MAY** have a significant impact on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** should be prepared.



Date: April 18, 1996

Signed: Steven Maki **STEVEN MAKI**, project planner

**NOTE: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE ATTACHED AS AN APPENDIX REFERENCED BY TOPIC HEADING AND NUMBER. ALSO, SEE COMMENT SECTION AT END OF INITIAL STUDY.**

---

1. **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

*Describe site size and topography, natural waterways, flora and fauna, existing land use, historical or cultural significance for both the immediate and surrounding site characteristics.*

*PLEASE SEE APPENDIX I (Chapter 1, Executive Summary)*

---

2. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Describe the type of project by use, physical shape, supporting infrastructure/public facilities. Describe how project will affect the environmental setting. Use quantitative analysis when possible. Attach an 8 1/2" x 11" site plan.*

*The Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan is a conceptual planning document that is intended for use as a guidance document to ultimately implement a preferred freshwater enhanced environment which maximizes habitat heterogeneity within the Moro Cojo watershed. It is based upon selected criteria developed by the Reserve Advisory Committee (RAC) to the Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve. The selected criteria include:*

- 1) retain both saltwater and freshwater habitats within the lower slough*
- 2) maintain known habitat for rare and endangered species*
- 3) maintain existing saltwater flow in the lower slough below the Southern Pacific Railroad bridge*
- 4) utilize treated, reclaimed water to recharge aquifers*
- 5) create freshwater conditions in the lower slough (east of Highway 1)*
- 6) retain water in lower slough through the creation of impoundments*
- 7) maximize freshwater in lower slough through increased run-off and use of reclaimed water*
- 8) utilize eco-engineering*
- 9) recognize the need for maintenance and monitoring*
- 10) maximize buffers between wetlands and adjacent land uses*

*Based upon these criteria and policies contained in the North County Land Use Plan, the RAC developed Goals and Objectives to guide the development of the Preferred Plan (see Appendix II)*

*Additional analysis, design and agreements with willing landowners will be required prior to implementation or construction of any recommended action.*

*FOR A DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION, PLEASE SEE APPENDIX II (Chapter 2, Introduction and Chapter 10, Preferred Lower Watershed Plan)*

---

3. **PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STATE PLANS AND MANDATED LAWS:**

*Use the list below to verify project related plans and their consistency or non-consistency with project implementation.*

*General Plan/Area Plans*

*Air Quality Management Plan*

*Specific Plans*

*Airport Land Use Plans*

*Water Quality Control Plan X consistent*

*Local Coastal Program - LUP X consistent*

4. PROJECTS THAT HAVE LITTLE OR NO POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impact related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For these types of projects the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence.

X CHECK HERE IF THIS SECTION IS NOT APPLICABLE:

The project does not meet the criteria in this section. Complete the full Environmental Checklist (Sections 5 - 21) contained in the following pages.

FINDING: For the following topics (that are checked off and are also listed in the Environmental Checklist) there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur from either construction, operation or maintenance of the proposed project.

5. EARTH		11. ENERGY	X	17. UTILITIES	X
6. AIR	X	12. LAND USE		18. NOISE	X
7. WATER		13. POPULATION	X	19. HAZARDS	X
8. PLANTS		14. HOUSING	X	20. AESTHETICS	X
9. ANIMALS		15. TRANSPORTATION	X	21. CULTURAL RESOURCES	X
10. NATURAL RESOURCES	X	16. PUBLIC SERVICES	X		

Topics not checked above must be addressed further in the Environmental Checklist (Sections 5 - 21) on the following pages. For all projects, complete Sections 22 thru 25.

CONCLUSIONS/EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT FINDING ABOVE:

The Moro Cojo Management and Enhancement Plan contains no actions and/or programs that would affect the above checked topics. Evidence/the analysis contained in the following checklist based upon the Management and Enhancement Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/NON-IMPACTS

NOTE:

Summarize conclusions for each (EARTH, AIR, etc.) with supporting evidence: why there is the potential for (POT.), why there is (YES), or why there is not (NO) - a significant environmental impact. Use the space provided at the end of each section, or add an attachment with a clear reference.

Use information such as other reports, plans or studies as supporting evidence. Add persons/agencies contacted. Include mitigation measures. Include a mitigation monitoring program as an appendix.

5. EARTH:  Will the proposal result in:	Significant Impact?		
	NO	POT.	YES
5.1 Unstable earth conditions or in geologic substructures?	X		
5.2 Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil?			X
5.3 Change in topography or ground surface relief features?			X
5.4 The destruction, covering, or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?	X		
5.5 Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on- or off-site?	X		
5.6 Changes in the deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river or stream, or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?			X

5.7 Exposure of people and property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazard?

X

*EARTH: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?*

5.1 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would result in unstable earth conditions or in geologic substructures. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

5.2 and 5.3 Creation of freshwater impoundment areas and berms for erosion control on agricultural lands is recommended. Installation of erosion control measures requires slight changes in topography and may disrupt soil until stabilized. The over all environmental effect will be positive. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/Sediment management plans for creation of freshwater impoundments and erosion control will be required as part of County Grading Permit. The freshwater impoundment areas and berms will slow erosion and enhance wetland areas and have a beneficial impact.

5.4 and 5.4 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would result in the destruction, covering, or modification of any unique geologic or physical features; nor cause any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, wither on, or off site. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

5.6 Controlling soil erosion in the watershed and reducing sedimentation in wetlands is a major recommendation of the Preferred Plan. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required. The recommendation will have a beneficial impact.

5.7 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would result in the exposure of people and property to geologic hazards. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

6. AIR:  Will the proposal result in:	Significant Impact?		
	NO	POT.	YES
6.1 Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?		X	
6.2 The creation of objectionable odors?		X	
6.3 Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		X	

*AIR: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?*

6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 No action or program contained in the Preferred Plan would result in any increase in air emissions or deterioration in ambient air quality, create objectionable odor or alternate air movement, moisture, or temperature, change in climate locally or regionally. Source/Preferred Plan contains no action or program which would result in any impact to air. Mitigation/None required.

7. WATER:  Will the proposal result in:	Significant Impact?		
	NO	POT.	YES
7.1 Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?			X
7.2 Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?			X
7.3 Alterations to the course or flow or flood patterns?			X
7.4 Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?			X
7.5 Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity?			X
7.6 Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?		X	
7.7 Change in the quantity of groundwaters, either through direct additions or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?		X	
7.8 Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	X		
7.9 Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?	X		

*WATER: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?*

7.1 The Preferred Plan would increase freshwater elevations in several previously drained wetland channels creating a more productive and heterogeneous freshwater habitat. The Preferred Plan proposes the creation of winter/early spring freshwater impoundment areas within the marsh plain of the lower slough (below SPRR) and retainment of freshwater within the main slough upstream of SPRR. An "eco-dam" or flashboard dam would be installed at the confluence of Castroville Slough and Moro Cojo Slough to the south of the main slough; thus increasing elevations and adding to currents and the course of water movement. These actions will not result in any modification of the tide gates at Moss Landing Road or saltwater flow below SPRR. The freshwater impoundments are expected to enhance the existing grassland areas for waterfowl nesting and foraging (see page 10-1). For a more detailed analysis of Preferred Plan beneficial impacts see Appendix II, pp. 10-3 to 10-6. Source/Preferred Plan.

Mitigation/None required. these recommendations will have a beneficial effect.

7.2 The Preferred Plan would change absorption rates and drainage patterns in the wetland areas. The possible creation of freshwater impoundments may result in partial or full inundation on approximately 375 acres below the 10-foot contour between the SPRR and Highway 1. These impoundments could have a beneficial impact on absorption rates and provide localized relief from saltwater intrusion which plagues the area. The installation of erosion control measures could change drainage patterns on farmland to reduce soil erosion and also could reduce the transport of pesticides, fertilizers and chemicals into the entire slough system. For a more detailed analysis of Preferred Plan beneficial impacts see Appendix II, pp. 10-3 to 10-6. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required. these recommendations will have a beneficial effect.

7.3 As indicated in 7.2, approximately 375 acres below the 10-foot contour could result in partial or full inundation. Other agricultural lands may require protection from flooding. Inundation of the alkali grassland west of SPRR may cause a gradual conversion of the area to freshwater plant species. Freshwater impoundments east of SPRR may convert the brackishwater marsh areas to a more freshwater habitat. Source/Preferred Plan. For a more detailed analysis of Preferred Plan beneficial impacts see Appendix II, pp. 10-3 to 10-6. Mitigation/These areas will require purchase or conservation easements, or some other acquisition method from willing landowners prior to project implementation. (see Table 10-1). Also mitigations would include the construction of earthen berms at the 10-foot contour and management/upgrade of existing drainage pump systems. These actions would increase habitat values of the slough system.

7.4 As indicated above, the Preferred Plan could result in partial or full inundation of approximately 375 acres. Source/Preferred Plan. For a more detailed analysis of Preferred Plan beneficial impacts see Appendix II, pp. 10-3 to 10-6. Mitigation/None as the above analysis concludes potential inundation will have a beneficial effect.

7.5 As previously indicated the Preferred Plan recommends the use of agricultural berms at the 10-foot contour, and "eco-dams" of hay bales or a flashboard dam to impound water. These actions would reduce erosion, thus reducing sediments and turbidity. Source/Preferred Plan. For a more detailed analysis of Preferred Plan beneficial impacts see Appendix II, pp. 10-3 to 10-6. Mitigation/None required as these recommendations would have a beneficial impact.

7.6 and 7.7 As indicated above, the Preferred Plan could result in the partial or full inundation of approximately 375 acres below the 10-foot contour. These waters could conceivably infiltrate into the immediate upper groundwater aquifer resulting in a beneficial impact to existing saltwater intrusion problems in the immediate area. Source/Preferred Plan. For a more detailed analysis of Preferred Plan beneficial impacts see Appendix II, pp. 10-3 to 10-6. Mitigation/None required as this recommendation would have a beneficial impact.

7.8 The Preferred Plan contains no actions or programs that would cause a reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

7.9 As indicated above, the Preferred Plan could partially or fully inundate approximately 375 acres below the 10-foot contour (all such lands are undeveloped). Partially or fully inundated lands are either habitat lands designated as "Resource Conservation", not in agricultural production; poor agricultural lands designated "Agricultural" not in

production, grazing lands designated "Agricultural" and agricultural lands in production (strawberries, artichokes, etc.) designated "Agricultural" (designations from the North County Land Use Plan). It is estimated that up to 60 acres of lands in agricultural production could be affected by inundation. No "people" or residential/commercial/industrial uses could be impacted by partial or full inundation of lands as proposed in the Preferred Plan. Source/Preferred Plan. For a more detailed analysis of Preferred Plan beneficial impacts see Appendix II, pp. 10-3 to 10-6. Mitigation/Any lands inundated would require acquisition, conservation easements, or some other acquisition method, or compensation to willing land owners prior to implementation of any specific project which would inundate lands in agricultural production.

8. PLANT LIFE Will the proposal result in:	Significant Impact?		
	NO	POT.	YES
8.1 Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops and aquatic plants)?			X
8.2 Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?	X		
8.3 Introduction of a new species of plants into an area, or result in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?	X		

*PLANT LIFE: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?*

8.1 The Preferred Plan proposes creation of winter/early spring freshwater impoundment areas within the marsh plain of the lower slough (below SPRR) and southerly of the confluence of the Castroville and Moro Cojo Slough. The creation of freshwater impoundments would inundate portions of the alkali grasslands in the lower slough and may cause a gradual conversion to freshwater plant species. The conversion of alkali grasslands to freshwater species is not considered a significant impact as it is not a species of concern, unique, rare or endangered. Areas of the upper slough (above SPRR) and south of the Moro Cojo Slough along the Castroville Slough would be subject to additional freshwater and may convert the brackish marsh areas to a more freshwater habitat. These actions will increase habitat diversity and values of the slough system. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None as habitat diversity and values will increase and result in a beneficial impact.

8.2 and 8.3 No action or program in the Preferred Plan would result in an adverse impact to plant life. Actions or programs proposed will result in benefits to any unique, rare or endangered plant, or species of concern which may inhabit the area. Nothing in the Preferred Plan would result in the introduction of any new species of plant. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

9. ANIMAL LIFE: Will the proposal result in:	Significant Impact?		
	NO	POT.	YES
9.1 Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms or insects)?			X
9.2 Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?		X	
9.3 Introduction of a new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	X		
9.4 Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?	X		

**ANIMAL LIFE: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

9.1 The freshwater impoundments are expected to enhance the existing grassland areas for waterfowl nesting and foraging thus increasing habitat values throughout the slough system and maximizing diversification of species. The Preferred Plan includes the opportunity to create an island within the slough to facilitate breeding by shorebirds or waterfowl, while offering protection from predators such as red fox and feral dogs. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None as habitat diversity and values will increase and result in a beneficial impact. The installation of the flashboard dam at SPRR is not anticipated to impact existing breeding areas of the Santa Cruz long-toed salamander, tiger salamander and red-legged frog as inundation levels will be controlled. These habitat areas are located in the very upper reaches (east of Castroville Boulevard adjacent to the High School [Figures 5-4 and 11-1] of Moro Cojo Slough. These upper-reaches are likely to retain soil moisture as a result of the flashboard dam, thus improving habitat values for these amphibians. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/Construction, maintenance and monitoring of flashboard dam to be established in consultation, or permitting by Dept. of Fish and Game and US Fish and Wildlife. The freshwater impoundments can be expected to result in an increase in freshwater mosquito population. Source/North Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District. Preferred Plan. Mitigation/Coordinate implementation of the Preferred Plan with the Mosquito Abatement District.

9.2 The freshwater impoundments could impact 65 acres of known habitat for the brackishwater snail and potential habitat for the tidewater goby in the main slough channel downstream of the SPRR. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/Preferred Plan incorporates measures to control the release of freshwater into the main slough channel through use of "eco-engineering" hay bale impoundments, or more traditional methods such as the installation of flashboard dams. More detailed design of the dams, coupled with sampling of snail populations and sampling to determine the presence of the tidewater goby is required to determine potential mitigations at the time of specific project review of proposed dams. Consultation and/or permitting with California Dept. of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service will be required. No action or program of the Preferred Plan would result in the introduction of new animal species or result in a deterioration to existing fish or wildlife. Dept. of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service may wish to introduce the Tide Water Gobi into the area based upon habitat modifications proposed in the Preferred Plan. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/Consultation and/or permitting with California Dept. of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

10. <b>NATURAL RESOURCES:</b> Will the proposal result in:	<b>Significant Impact?</b>		
	<b>NO</b>	<b>POT.</b>	<b>YES</b>

10.1 Increased in rate of use of natural resources?

X

**NATURAL RESOURCES: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

10.1 The Preferred Plan will have no impact in the rate of use of natural resources as no action or program would affect the natural resources of the area. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

11. <b>ENERGY:</b> Will the proposal result in:	<b>Significant Impact?</b>		
	<b>NO</b>	<b>POT.</b>	<b>YES</b>

11.1 Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?

X

11.2 Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

X

**ENERGY: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

11.1 and 11.2 The Preferred Plan will have no impact on the use, or increase of fuel or energy, or require the development of new sources of energy as no action or program of the Preferred Plan would utilize substantial amounts of energy or demand energy. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

12. <b>LAND USE</b> Will the proposal result in:	<b>Significant Impact?</b>		
	<b>NO</b>	<b>POT.</b>	<b>YES</b>

12.1 A substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

X

12.2 Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crops?

X

**LAND USE: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

12.1 The Preferred Plan could result in changes to the present and planned land use in the area as approximately 60 acres of land in agricultural production and designated "Agricultural" could be partially or fully inundated by freshwater impoundments. Also, an other 75 acres of agricultural land in production and designated "Agricultural" could be utilized as a buffer to protect the transitional area between agricultural production and partially or fully inundated agricultural lands. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/Acquisition, purchase of easements\* or some other method of acquisition from willing land owners would be required prior to planning to construct any water impoundment structure which would impact agricultural lands.

12.2 The freshwater impoundments could result in the loss of up to 60 acres of land in agricultural production.

Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/Acquisition, purchase of easements, or some other method of acquisition from willing land owners would be required prior to planning to construct any water impoundment structure which would impact agricultural lands.

13. <b>POPULATION</b>  Will the proposal result in:	<i>Significant Impact?</i>		
	NO	POT.	YES

13.1 Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of human population of an area? X

*POPULATION: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?*

13.1 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of human population in the area. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

14. <b>HOUSING:</b>  Will the proposal result in:	<i>Significant Impact?</i>		
	NO	POT.	YES

14.1 Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing? X

*HOUSING: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?*

14.1 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

15. <b>TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION:</b>  Will the proposal result in:	<i>Significant Impact?</i>		
	NO	POT.	YES

- 15.1 Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? X
- 15.2 Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking? X
- 15.3 Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems? X
- 15.4 Alteration to present patterns of circulation or movement of people/good? X
- 15.5 Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic? X
- 15.6 Increases in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians? X

*TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?*

15.1, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, and 15.6. No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would result in any impacts to Transportation/Circulation in the area. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

16. <b>PUBLIC SERVICES:</b>  Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:	<i>Significant Impact?</i>		
	NO	POT.	YES

16.1	Fire protection?	X
16.2	Police protection?	X
16.3	Schools?	X
16.4	Parks or other recreational facilities?	X
16.5	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	X
16.6	Other governmental services?	X

**PUBLIC SERVICES: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.5, and 16.6. No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would have any impacts to public services. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

17. UTILITIES:  Will the proposal result in:	Significant Impact?		
	NO	POT.	YES

17.1 A need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the area utilities? X

**UTILITIES: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

17.1 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would have any impacts to utilities. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

18. NOISE:  Will the proposal result in:	Significant Impact?		
	NO	POT.	YES

18.1 Increases in existing noise levels? X

18.2 Exposure of people to severe noises? X

**NOISE: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

18.1 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would have any impacts resulting from noise. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

19	<b>HAZARDS/HUMAN HEALTH:</b>  <i>Will the proposal result in:</i>	<b>Significant Impact?</b>		
		<b>NO</b>	<b>POT.</b>	<b>YES</b>

- |      |  |   |   |  |
|------|--|---|---|--|
| 19.1 | <i>A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?</i> | X |   |  |
| 19.2 | <i>Possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?</i>  | X |   |  |
| 19.3 | <i>Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?</i>   |   | X |  |
| 19.4 | <i>Exposure of people to potential health hazards?</i>   |   | X |  |

**HAZARDS/HUMAN HEALTH: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

19.1 and 19.2 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would create the risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

19.3 and 19.4 The freshwater impoundments are expected to increase the freshwater mosquito population. The freshwater winter mosquito has increased its presence in the region over the last nine years and is considered a serious public health and resource management concern. Source/Preferred Plan and North Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District. Mitigation/Aerial spraying of oil has been utilized to control this mosquito. Implementation of the Preferred Plan will be coordinated with the Mosquito Abatement District to prevent any serious public health impacts.

20.	<b>AESTHETICS:</b>  <i>Will the proposal result in:</i>	<b>Significant Impact?</b>		
		<b>NO</b>	<b>POT.</b>	<b>YES</b>

- |      |  |   |  |  |
|------|--|---|--|--|
| 20.1 | <i>The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?</i> | X |  |  |
|------|--|---|--|--|

**AESTHETICS: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?**

20.1 No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would result in impacts to scenic vistas, public views or create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

21.	<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES:</b>  <i>Will the proposal result in:</i>	<b>Significant Impact?</b>		
		<b>NO</b>	<b>POT.</b>	<b>YES</b>

- |      |   |   |  |  |
|------|---|---|--|--|
| 21.1 | <i>The alteration of, or the destruction of, a prehistoric or historic site?</i>  | X |  |  |
| 21.2 | <i>Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure or object?</i>                    | X |  |  |
| 21.3 | <i>Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic or cultural values?</i> | X |  |  |
| 21.4 | <i>Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</i>   | X |  |  |

*CULTURAL RESOURCES: Conclusions w/evidence - Persons contacted. Mitigation/Monitoring Measures?*  
21.1, 21.2, 21.3 and 21.4. No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would result in impacts to cultural resources. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

---

**22. CUMULATIVE/GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS:**

*NOTE: Describe any cumulative/growth inducing impacts that may occur due to implementation of the project. Identify checklist topic related to the impact and provide adequate evidence.*

No action or program is contained in the Preferred Plan that would result in any cumulative/growth inducing impacts that may occur due to implementation. Source/Preferred Plan. Mitigation/None required.

---

**23. FEASIBLE PROJECT ALTERNATIVES:**

*NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts caused by the project that are unmitigable below significance, describe below any possible project alternatives that would have less environmental impacts.*

**NO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WOULD BE CAUSED BY THE PROJECT THAT ARE UNMITAGABLE. MITIGATIONS ARE IDENTIFIED WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT .**

The RAC considered four alternatives to the selected Preferred Plan to enhance resources in the watershed of Moro Cojo Slough:

- 1) Tidal regime
- 2) Partially tidal regime
- 3) Enhanced existing condition
- 4) No project

Each of the four alternatives evaluated suggest actions to protect existing significant biotic resources, increase overall habitat values within the slough environs, resolve existing resource problems and land use conflicts and provide passive recreational/educational uses. These alternatives are described in Appendix II, pp.10-6 to 10-9. The RAC selected the Preferred Plan as the most environmentally beneficial plan as it maximizes habitat heterogeneity by increasing freshwater habitats within the Moro Cojo Slough system.

---

24. STATEMENT OF MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

*NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated and no feasible project alternatives are available, then complete the mandatory findings of significance and attach to this Initial Study as an appendix. This is the first step for starting the environmental impact report (EIR) process.*

Not applicable

---

25. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

None

26. ATTACHED APPENDICES

- 1) Environmental Setting (Chapter 1, Executive Summary      2) Project Description (Chapter 2  
Introduction and Chapter 10, Preferred  
Lower Watershed Plan)





Figure 0-1 Monterey Bay area showing the location Moro Cojo Slough within the Elkhorn Slough Watershed and the major rivers and sloughs in the area (from ABA Consultants)

2000.050

**Before the Board of Supervisors in and for the  
County of Monterey, State of California**

Resolution No. 96-417 )  
 )  
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF )  
SUPERVISORS ADOPTING A NEGATIVE )  
DECLARATION AND APPROVING THE )  
MORO COHO SLOUGH MANAGEMENT )  
AND ENHANCEMENT PLAN )

- WHEREAS, Recommended Action 2.3.4.2 of the North County Land Use Plan provides for the preparation of a comprehensive wetland management plan for the Moro Cojo Slough, and
- WHEREAS, the California Coastal Commission granted a permit (#3-89-4) to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency to replace culverts and tidegates at Moss Landing Road to control tidal action within Moro Cojo Slough, and
- WHEREAS, as a condition approving Coastal Development Permit #3-89-4, the Water Resources Agency agreed to prepare a wetland management plan pursuant to Recommended Action 2.3.4.2, and
- WHEREAS, in 1993 the State Coastal Conservancy approved a grant request from the Board of Supervisors to fund the preparation of a management and enhancement plan for the Moro Cojo Slough, and
- WHEREAS, the consulting firm of The Habitat Restoration Group was selected and contracted to prepare a management and enhancement plan for Moro Cojo Slough, and
- WHEREAS, the Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve Advisory Committee (RAC) was selected to guide and review the preparation of management and enhancement plan for Moro Cojo Slough, and
- WHEREAS, the RAC considered four plan alternatives and selected a preferred plan entitled Winter/Spring Fresh Conditions (Plan), and
- WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared and circulated on the Plan which determined that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and that a Negative Declaration should be prepared, and
- WHEREAS, no comments were received from Reviewing Agencies regarding the Initial Study and preparation of a Negative Declaration, and
- WHEREAS, the North County Advisory Committee recommended approval of the Plan (6-0), and



WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered the Plan on June 26, 1996 and recommended to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Plan (5-2-1-2); with modifications to Phase I to include the implementation of a pilot project on public lands and the timing of Phases II through IV would occur only after evaluation of the pilot project, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors considered the Planning Commission recommendation on October 22, 1996; with an additional recommendation agreed to by a group of property owners, interested parties and Supervisors Pennycook and Perkins, within whose Districts Moro Cojo Slough is located, that a modification to Phase I of the Implementation Component is needed which would:

Provide for pilot projects on public, and/or non-profit agency owned lands in years 1 through 10 to test the effectiveness of the management actions and to evaluate any impacts they may have on adjacent agricultural activities; thereby offering modifications to correct any deficiencies to remaining management actions through the remaining phases.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that based upon the foregoing recitals, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, State of California does hereby adopt a Negative Declaration and approve, as modified by the Planning Commission and as modified above the Moro Cojo Slough Wetland Management and Enhancement Plan as conceptually shown on the attached map.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT

PASSED AND ADOPTED on this 22nd day of October, 1996, upon motion of Supervisor Perkins, seconded by Supervisor Pennycook by the following vote, to-wit:


AYES: Supervisors Salinas, Pennycook, Perkins, Johnsen, Karas  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None


I, ERNEST K. MORISHITA, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, State of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an original order of said Board Supervisors duly made and entered in the minutes thereof at page    of Minute Book 69, on October 22, 1996

Dated: October 22, 1996


ERNEST K. MORISHITA, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Monterey, State of California.

By

  
Deputy







## CHAPTER 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan describes the environmental resources of the Moro Cojo Slough watershed (hydrologic features, biologic resources, agricultural practices and water quality and land use issues) and recommends actions to enhance, restore and manage the significant resources on both public and privately-owned lands within the slough system.

The management and enhancement plan was initiated by Monterey County in response to land use conflicts and development pressures within the slough watershed. The project was funded jointly by a grant from the State Coastal Conservancy; with contributions from Monterey County, Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA), State Water Resources Control Board and the Elkhorn Slough Foundation. The study was conducted during 1993 and 1994.

The administrative draft of Volume I - Existing Conditions was submitted to the County of Monterey and the Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve Advisory Committee (RAC) on November 1, 1993. A Draft report was prepared and submitted to the County and the RAC on March 21, 1994. Following review of the existing conditions report and meetings with the RAC; the County, RAC, individual RAC members, and State and Federal agencies submitted comments on the Draft Existing Conditions Report. These comments, and their responses, are presented in the Volume I - Existing Conditions, Response to Comments Report.

Volume II - Resource Alternatives Report was prepared following completion of the Existing Conditions Report and concurrent with the Existing Conditions, Response to Comments Report. The Alternatives Report examines five various alternatives for the lower watershed (Moss Landing Road to Castroville Boulevard) and presents recommended Best Management Practice's (BMP's) practices for the entire watershed.

The alternatives report provided information to Monterey County and the RAC on the various alternatives to enhance and manage the Moro Cojo Slough watershed and provided an objective, planning-level analysis of the various actions that may be pursued within the watershed, including issues regarding land use, biological resources, hydrologic resources, and agricultural activities.

The RAC selected a preferred alternative which is presented in the Final Management and Enhancement Plan. Public hearings on the preferred alternative will be conducted by Monterey County to solicit input from interested parties, with final approval by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors.

Appendices to this report are included in a separate Technical Appendix.

### PHYSICAL FEATURES

The Moro Cojo Slough watershed encompasses approximately 17 square miles within northern Monterey County (Figure 1-1). The project study area encompasses the entire watershed, and in general, is bound by Moss Landing Harbor and State Highway 1 to the west, State Highway 156 to the south, Prunedale/San Miguel Canyon Road to the east and Paradise Canyon, Dolan Road and Elkhorn Slough to the north. Castroville Boulevard and the Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) tracks bisect the study area in a north-south direction. Meridian Road and Dolan Road bisect the study area in an east-west direction (Figure 1-2).

The watershed can be characterized into two geographic areas: 1) the lower slough; and 2) the upper watershed. The lower Moro Cojo Slough is characterized by a gently sloping valley floor confined by old marine and fluvial terraces constructed by the Salinas River; the salient topographic features are the slough channels and the adjacent floodplain. The lower slough is primarily occupied by wetland slough habitat and both wetland and upland agricultural and grazing lands. The lower slough area is generally bound by Moss Landing Harbor and Highway 1 to the west, Castroville to the south, Castroville Boulevard to the east and Elkhorn Slough to the north.

The upper watershed area is comprised of low-lying slough drainages and gently to moderately sloping terrace slopes that bound the slough. The upper watershed is a mixture of low-elevation wetlands, upland grassland and chaparral, agriculture, cattle grazing and rural residential development. The upper watershed is generally bound by Castroville Boulevard to the west, Highway 156 to the south, Prunedale to the east and Paradise Canyon to the north.

## HISTORICAL INFLUENCES

Historical influences within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed can be categorized into four periods: pre-1850, 1850-1910, 1910-1947, and 1947-present. Prior to the 1750's, indigenous people, known as the Ohlone, inhabited the Moro Cojo region. The earliest known accounts of the area were from Spanish explorers during the late 1500's. Their journals described the greater Monterey Bay region as an environment much wetter than today, with wetlands of large size stretched over lowland areas and water channels, and upland areas of native bunchgrass. The Ohlone are known to have practiced land management and harvesting techniques, including burning grasslands, burning woodland understory and cutting of shrubs. It is expected that these land management activities were occurring within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed area. By the mid-1700's Spanish missionaries and large ranching families occupied the lands and began grazing large herds of cattle and sheep. This began the conversion of many of the upland native perennial grasslands to non-native annual grasslands and the reduction in many of the native large mammal populations.

Accounts of environmental conditions in 1854 depict the lower Moro Cojo Slough as subject to tidal seawater exchange from the ocean, as well as winter freshwater runoff and spring flow from the Moro Cojo watershed. A bridge connected the current Moss Landing Peninsula to the mainland, however, no channel structures were evident. A ferry was in operation across Elkhorn Slough at its confluence with the Salinas River. Salt marsh vegetation was recorded along both the Elkhorn Slough and Moro Cojo Slough from its confluence with the Salinas River (now Moss Landing Harbor) and upstream, probably a distance beyond the present location of the SPRR tracks. Open water ponds were evident adjacent to Moro Cojo Slough channel, as were numerous side channels and low-lying wetland areas. The upland areas surrounding the slough were grassland; the upper watershed areas were dominated by annual grasslands, chaparral and oak woodland habitat.

Between 1850 and 1910, major changes in the resources of the study area occurred as tidal control structures were installed across the Moro Cojo Slough channel. By 1886 the Pajaro Valley Railroad and SPRR had crossings over the slough. A county road (near the current Moss Landing Road) and Castroville Road crossed the slough at or near their present locations. The Pajaro Valley railroad crossing and the county road (e.g., Moss Landing Road) crossing were earthen fill across almost all of the slough, resulting in a restriction in tidal exchange (e.g., Sandholdt Dam). Agricultural land uses, predominantly cattle grazing, were common above the tidal range within the watershed. Reports of surfperch, steelhead and other fish were recorded from the slough from the turn of the century until the 1930's.

Between 1910 and the mid-1940's, extensive reclamation of wetlands for agricultural use occurred around Monterey Bay. Reclamation of tidal land around Moro Cojo Slough appears to have occurred in the 1930's and 1940's, primarily through ditching, levees and berms. Also during this time was the loss of shallow groundwater in the Moss Landing and surrounding areas, presumably by agricultural and other uses. Industrial uses, such as the Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) Moss Landing Power Plant and Kaiser Refractories Plant, were built before 1949. Wetland habitats during this period were confined between levees or berms, and cut off from tidal exchange. In 1946-47, the Moss Landing Harbor entrance was constructed which created a deep tidal inlet at the mouth of Moro Cojo Slough. This action, coupled with the relocation of the Salinas River in 1910, ensured that marine conditions prevailed in the slough.

Between 1947 and the present, land uses such as residential development, grazing and agriculture (i.e., crops of artichokes and strawberries) intensified within the watershed. Additional levees and ditches were constructed adjacent to the slough to facilitate year-round agriculture (1940 through 1989), industrial development occurred along the northwestern portion of the watershed (e.g., expansion of the PG&E and National Refractories developments between 1949 and 1968), land fill activities relating to commercial development near Moss Landing (1949 through 1976), and residential and school development (1976 through 1979). Portions of riparian corridors were channelized and/or dammed between 1976 and 1979. There are reports of the presence of steelhead, striped bass and salmon in the slough as late as the 1940's. In 1988, the culverts of Sandholdt Dam under Moss Landing Road were replaced so that very limited tidal inflow now occurs.

## HYDROLOGY

The hydrology of the Moro Cojo Slough watershed is complex having changed significantly over geologic and historic time. Fluvial processes, coastal processes, groundwater and human modifications have affected the hydrologic features of the slough system. The Moro Cojo Slough watershed is located within the northeastern corner of the Salinas Valley groundwater basin. The hydrologic regime has been modified by the construction of a tide gate at the mouth of the slough, man-made drainage channels, levees, and use of ground and surface water for agriculture and residential development.

The lower watershed includes the remnants of Moro Cojo Slough, which is incised within a valley floor of recently deposited estuarine muds. Elevations on the valley floor range from 0.0 feet mean sea level (MSL) at the top of the slough channel to about +8.0 feet MSL at the valley edges. The lower slough, between Moss Landing Road at the mouth and the confluence with Castroville Slough, exhibits channel widths up to 500 feet, narrowing gradually to less than 50 feet at the SPRR and then less than 5 feet at its head near Castroville Boulevard. A nearly continuous levee system bounds Moro Cojo Slough between the SPRR and Highway 1; behind these levees are drainage ditches serviced by pump systems. Castroville Slough drains the northeastern side of the town of Castroville into Moro Cojo Slough about 2 miles above Moss Landing Road. Other tributaries have been filled or reclaimed.

A variety of hydraulic structures have been constructed in and around Moro Cojo Slough to drain marsh land for agricultural use or to provide road crossings over the slough, including Sandholdt Dam. The MCWRA manages tide levels in the slough between -2.0 and -1.5 feet MSL to prevent flooding of residential and agricultural lands. The culverts at Highway 1 forms a constriction in addition to the SPRR crossing and Castroville Boulevard culverts.

Annual precipitation averages 17.3 inches in the Moro Cojo area and conveyance of flood flows is restricted by the artificial hydraulic controls at SPRR, Highway 1, Moss Landing Road and the levee and ditch system surrounding the slough, flood control facilities are managed and administered by the

MCWRA. Local farmers operate the Sea Mist Dam and pump system on Castroville Slough, as well as small scale drainage around farm lands.

## BIOTIC RESOURCES

### Vegetation

The vegetation within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed is comprised of several plant communities: wetlands (coastal salt marsh, freshwater marsh, herbaceous wetlands, and central coast arroyo willow riparian forest); grasslands (coastal alkali grasslands, mixed and non-native grasslands); maritime chaparral; coast live oak woodland; coyote brush scrub; and several types of non-native plant communities (residential landscaping, agricultural lands, ruderal, and non-native landscape trees).

The wetland communities are the dominant feature along the slough channels and form almost continuous bands along the watercourses. The width of the coastal salt marsh has been limited historically by the construction of man-made levees, berms and drainage ditches along the border of the slough. The modified tidal regime also restricts the linear extent of the salt marsh vegetation from the mouth of the slough to just upstream of the SPRR tracks. Areas previously inhabited by salt marsh vegetation show evidence of conversion to a species composition that is more tolerant of freshwater. Above Castroville Boulevard there are stands of arroyo willow riparian forest; small freshwater tributaries to the slough are vegetated with a combination of herbaceous wetlands and willow riparian habitat. Much of the upland plant communities within the watershed have been modified by various land uses. Areas historically inhabited by maritime chaparral are now a mixture of chaparral and residential landscaping, including non-native trees (i.e., eucalyptus groves). Remnant grasslands remain throughout the study area, the most prominent are in areas being used as pasture land; a portion of the historic alkali grasslands remain near Highway 1.

The records of the California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG) California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) and other reports for the region indicate the following rare, endangered and/or locally unique plant species have the potential to occur or have been reported within the study area: Hooker's manzanita, Pajaro manzanita, Santa Cruz Mountains pussypaws, Monterey ceanothus, Monterey spineflower, Lewis's clarkia, seaside bird's-beak, Eastwood's goldenbush, fragrant fritillary, small-leaved lomatium, curly-leaved monardella, Dudley's lousewort, Gairdner's yampah, wild petunia, Yaden's piperia, Hickman's cinquefoil, round woolly marbles and Santa Cruz microseris. Gairdner's yampah was observed within the mixed grassland community and Hooker's manzanita and Pajaro manzanita were observed in the maritime chaparral (Figures 5-3 and 5-4).

conservation  
targets  
\*

### Wildlife

The Moro Cojo Slough watershed is a valuable resource to a great variety of wildlife species. The slough and its associated wetlands habitats, with its close proximity to the nearby Elkhorn Slough system, Old Salinas, Salinas and Pajaro River mouth areas and Monterey Bay, combine to make the most important wetland system on the central coast for wildlife. Wildlife habitats are comprised of the plant communities mentioned above, as well as hypersaline ponded areas, mudflats and perennial and seasonally inundated freshwater and brackishwater ponds. Wildlife species diversity and abundance varies depending on the season and the water levels of the slough wetlands. While some wildlife species may be restricted to certain plant communities due to specific habitat requirements, many of them utilize several of the habitats in the watershed.

Several significant wildlife uses have been identified in the watershed. These include amphibian migration corridors, potential amphibian breeding sites, potential nesting/foraging habitat for hawks and warblers, egret foraging/roost area, black-shouldered kite roosting area, shorebird and waterfowl nesting and foraging habitat, potential tricolored blackbird nesting habitat, potential amphibian upland habitat and known occurrences of rare and endangered species (Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander [SCLTS]) and species of special concern (California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog).

### **Fisheries and Aquatic Resources**

The fishery resources of the slough are known from very limited sampling. Anecdotal accounts indicate that large numbers of red-tailed sea perch (surfperch), steelhead and other fish populated Moro Cojo Slough from before the turn of the century until the 1930's (Hansen, 1976). Studies during the 1970's and 1990's recorded the presence of native and non-native non-game fishes. Fish species typical of the lower slough include threespine stickleback, long-jaw mudsucker, staghorn sculpin, jacksmelt and mosquitofish. Tidewater goby, a Federal endangered species, may inhabit the lower slough.

The study assessed the presence of the brackishwater snail, an aquatic species of special concern and candidate for Federal threatened listing. Studies documented widespread presence of the snail from approximately half-way between Moss Landing Road and Highway 1, east to just upstream of the confluence with Castroville Slough. The snail appears to utilize the area of shallow, slow-moving tidal waters and depositional mud deposits of the slough.

### **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

Agriculture is a major land use in the study area, with approximately 10,000 acres in agricultural production within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. The crops include artichokes, strawberries, flowers, vegetables and cattle operations. The row crops are grown year-round, mostly on land adjacent to the lower slough. Artichokes, the predominant vegetable crop, are grown by Sea Mist Farms on approximately 875 acres on three ranches within the lower slough.

Strawberries are the largest fruit crop in production within the watershed for a total of approximately 2,000 acres. The strawberry fields are located in the upper watershed and are farmed by lessees which tend to be renewed on a yearly basis. Most individual farms are between 10 and 50 acres. In addition to fertilization of the ground prior to planting, the land is fumigated to kill weed seeds, nematodes and plant diseases. Although approximately 20 pesticides are regularly used on the strawberry crop, some growers are using biological controls for some pests (i.e., mites). Several of the strawberry farms within the watershed have crops planted immediately adjacent to the slough, where problems with soil erosion (development of hard pans) and water contamination from sprays and fertilizers are evident.

Vegetables are grown in many areas of the slough, primarily near Highway 1 and Dolan Road. Crops include brussels sprouts, broccoli, lettuce, spinach and cauliflower. Crop production activities are similar to artichokes, except for more intensive application of fertilizer. Vegetable growers are implementing practices to minimize erosion and runoff into the slough and typically cover crop their fields every 2-3 years to replenish soil fertility.

Nurseries growing cut flowers are located in the upper watershed area near Elkhorn Road. Fumigants, pesticides and fertilizers are utilized prior to or during production with irrigation occurring by sprinklers and drip tape. The nurseries have recently improved management practices to collect runoff and correct hillside erosion problems.

Cattle operations occur along Highway 1, Highway 156, Dolan Road and Castroville Boulevard and two dairies are located along Dolan Road. Many of the operations border the slough, and some have no separation between operations and the watercourses. Small grazing operations exist in the upper watershed rural residential areas, including acreage with horses, pigs, chickens and cattle.

## WATER QUALITY

Water quality of the Moro Cojo Slough has been altered by a variety of human activities. These include diking and draining of wetlands, point and non-point discharges by industry, reduction in surface and groundwater supply, and uncontrolled runoff from some agricultural practices. One package treatment plant (a factory which gathers wastes and conducts all treatment on-site), the WaterTek facility, serves the Oak Hills community near Castroville Boulevard and consists of percolation ponds and a spray field. With the exception of Oak Hills, the areas served by the Castroville County and Moss Landing County Sanitation Districts, the watershed developments are on septic systems.

Threats \*

The primary threats to the resources of the slough are due to increased nutrient input, septic system failure, inadvertent release of hazardous materials, and persistent pesticide residue. Many the agricultural operations bordering the slough implement land management practices to minimize impacts to the slough water quality. These include roads to prevent irrigation runoff, fertilizer runoff or pesticide over-spray from entering the slough.

Nutrients enter the slough from uncontrolled agricultural runoff, seepage from holding ponds and poorly placed or faulty septic systems. The nutrient enrichment can cause eutrophication, resulting in algal blooms that ultimately reduce oxygen availability for aquatic animals.

Persistent pesticide residues from past use of DDT, toxaphene, dieldrin, endrin, and aldrin are suspected of being present in the water and underlying slough sediments. Endosulphan, a pesticide currently in use, may also be present in the water. Detailed water and sediment testing is required to determine whether these pesticides or their derivatives are present.

## LAND USE

Moro Cojo Slough is a major wetland resource occupying a significant percentage of land within the study area. Other predominate land uses include agriculture and low density rural residential development on uplands surrounding the slough. Industrial uses occupy a small percentage of land in the lower slough, with some commercial and high density residential development in Castroville and along Highways 1 and 156. All of these land uses have had some impact on the slough system over the last 100+ years.

The 1982 North County Land Use Plan (LUP) is the County Planning document which guides future land use changes in the study area. This plan places a strong emphasis upon preservation of natural resources including environmentally sensitive habitats (wetlands and rare-endangered species), as well as protection of viable agricultural lands. On lands without sensitive resources and unsuited for agricultural use, coastal-dependent development has priority. Other types of development (residential, non-coastal dependent commercial) are designated in parts of the study area. The Local Coastal Program also includes implementation plans (1988a, b) which provide development regulations and permit processing requirements to enact policies within the LUP.

## PUBLIC ACCESS AND EDUCATION

Public access to the slough is limited for all modes of transportation. Vehicular access is supplied by intersections of the slough with county roads and State Highway 1. Pedestrian access is limited to public rights-of-way, with little separation from traffic. No public trails exist adjacent to the slough itself. The existing public trails in the watershed are limited to the hiking/equestrian trails in Manzanita Regional Park and the California Coastal Bicycle Route, although ad hoc trails do exist in scenic easement areas within the Oaks Hills community. The North County Trails Plan proposes numerous new trails in the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. These include trails along existing roadways and trails within scenic easements.

There are five public schools within the watershed, providing opportunities for education activities on the slough's resources. An existing agreement with North Monterey County High School specifies the development of a wetland educational program.

## MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

The present ecological condition of Moro Cojo Slough is substantially degraded as introduced land uses have altered both tidal influences, groundwater-spring flow and, consequently, the backbone of most of the original habitat. Significant hydrologic changes have occurred, including blockage of tidal seawater inflows with the construction of a dam at the mouth of the slough, reclamation of vast marsh lands to agricultural uses, clearing and urbanization of the upper watershed and Castroville areas, and over exploitation of groundwater resources throughout the watershed. A recent lack of freshwater due to the extended drought (1987-1992 and 1994) and a decline in groundwater quality has reduced the agricultural value of land in the former tidal areas surrounding the slough.

Moro Cojo Slough is degraded and has far less ecological value than the original system; however, an opportunity exists to enhance, manage and restore what are now relatively rare habitats in the Monterey Bay area.

Habitat enhancement and restoration often involves physically manipulating land and water (raising or lowering levees or berms, removing dam structures, grading land, etc.) in order to re-introduce the hydrologic conditions that support vegetation and wildlife habitat. However, physical manipulations must also be designed for other land uses that were absent in the pre-European era, such as flood control, mosquito control, agricultural use, and infrastructure. Restoration must look to the past for guidance and examples but the design must recognize that modern conditions may not allow for the restoration of the original and natural conditions. In order to optimize environmental values, the design must be compatible with the current conditions.

### Preferred Lower Watershed Plan

Five alternatives to enhance resources within the lower watershed of Moro Cojo Slough (e.g., Moss Landing Road to Castroville Boulevard) were developed. These alternatives were evaluated by the RAC, who then selected the preferred resource management alternative for the lower watershed. The five alternatives reviewed were; Alternative A, Tidal Regime; Alternative B, Partially Tidal Regime; Alternative C, Enhanced Existing Conditions; Alternative D, Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions; and Alternative E, No Project.

Each of the five alternatives evaluated suggest actions to protect existing significant biotic resources, increase overall habitat values within the slough environs, resolve existing resource problems and land

\*  
objective  
desired  
outcome

use conflicts and provide passive recreational/educational uses. The RAC reviewed each of the alternatives presented in the Resource Enhancement Alternatives report and, through consensus, selected Alternative D, Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions as the Preferred Plan (Figure 10-1).

The Preferred Plan - Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions creates areas for freshwater impoundments within the lower slough watershed between Moss Landing Road and Castroville Boulevard. The plan does not modify the existing tidal environment below the SPRR. The tide gates at Moss Landing Road will be retained and operated in the same manner as the existing operation. A flashboard dam will be installed at SPRR to restrict tidal movement and to allow upstream impoundment of freshwater during the winter and spring. Freshwater impoundments would also be created in existing alkali grasslands, and/or excavated into the grassland, between Highway 1 and the SPRR. The RAC has recommended the use of "eco-engineering" (e.g., hay bales) to create barriers between the freshwater impoundments and the main slough channel. The hay bale barriers will need to be constructed so they are effective in impounding water, to create the desired freshwater "lakes", as well as preventing excessive leakage of freshwater into the adjacent salt/brackish main slough channel, to protect habitat for the brackishwater snail. Existing brackishwater areas above the SPRR would convert to more freshwater conditions due to the construction of a flashboard dam at the SPRR overcrossing. Areas currently freshwater near Castroville Boulevard would persist. Most areas below the 10-foot contour between Highway 1 and SPRR would be subject to freshwater inundation during the winter and spring, depending upon rainfall. The RAC has recommended the use of reclaimed water to maintain the freshwater impoundments during the winter and spring, if rainfall and/or runoff from the watershed is not sufficient to keep the impoundments inundated. The preferred plan incorporates agriculture and/or grazing on lands above the 10-foot contour.


The preferred plan offers several features that meet the project goals and objectives. The plan also poses several constraints, including hydrologic, biological, and agricultural land use issues. The alternative will also require several permits from regulatory agencies. An analysis of the key actions and the anticipated impacts and mitigations of this alternative are described below and summarized on Table 10-2.

#### **Project-wide Best Management Practices (BMP's)**

BMP's are recommended for the entire watershed to provide resource protection and enhancement (Figure 11-1). The BMP's are consistent with guidance documents developed as part of Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA). This act requires states with federally approved coastal zone management programs, such as California, to develop and implement Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs to ensure the protection and restoration of coastal waters.

The BMP's address sediment/erosion, confined animal facilities, nutrient management, pesticide management, livestock grazing, new development, sewage systems, pollution prevention, stormwater runoff, protection and restoration of wetland and riparian areas, and public education. The BMP's also recommend actions to protect and manage rare, threatened, endangered and locally unique plant and animal species and their habitats.

The locations for each action are depicted in Figure 11-1. Landowners are encouraged to voluntarily implement these actions in order to meet the overall project goal of enhancement and resource values of the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. Each action is intended to be implemented by/with willing landowners.





The Habitat Restoration Group

Mitchell Swanson & Associates  
 VB Agricultural Services  
 Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cojo Slough  
 Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Project Vicinity Map


Figure 1-1  
 2/96  
 705-01





**The Habitat Restoration Group**  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Morro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Project Study Area




SCALE

--- 10' CONTOURS



2/96  
 705-01

Figure 1-2



## CHAPTER 2 INTRODUCTION

### PURPOSE OF MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT PLAN

The purpose of the Management and Enhancement Plan for the Moro Cojo Slough is to identify actions and measures to enhance, restore and create a diverse and productive mix of wetland habitats, improve water quality, manage flood waters consistent with the protection of natural and agricultural resources and provide for public access and education in appropriate areas adjacent to the slough. The plan indicates specific wetland enhancement alternatives and conceptual restoration designs for selected sites. The plan also identifies actions to: control erosion and sedimentation on the watershed, improve water quality of the slough, protect endangered and threatened species, manage flood control and agricultural practices to maximize compatibility with wetland viability, and indicates opportunities for public access and recreation.

This plan addresses wetland resources that are identified in the Monterey County General Plan and the LUP, a segment of the Monterey County Local Coastal Program. The plan addresses resource management measures for both public and privately-owned lands, including those owned and/or managed by MCWRA, Elkhorn Slough Foundation, CDFG, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

The request for a management and enhancement plan was initiated in 1990 by Monterey County in response to land use conflicts and development pressures within the slough watershed, as identified in the Local Coastal Program. The project was funded jointly by a grant from the State Coastal Conservancy; with in-kind contributions from Monterey County, MCWRA, State Water Resources Control Board and Elkhorn Slough Foundation.

Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department and the State Coastal Conservancy coordinated the preparation of the plan. The Habitat Restoration Group (HRG) was selected as the consultant to prepare the plan in 1993. The Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve Advisory Committee (RAC) provided review and guidance on development of the plan.

### GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

#### GOALS

The goals of the Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan are derived from the LUP and RAC. Goals and objectives developed at the July 1993 RAC meeting are designated as "(RAC)" in the text below.

- Preserve, enhance and restore the natural resource values of the wetlands and adjacent upland habitat of the slough for maximum biological resource values.
- Reduce the impacts of human activities (including water quality, sedimentation and erosion) on the slough's wetland resources.

- Utilize resources of other projects as a vehicle for restoration (e.g., CalTrans, Moss Landing Harbor, Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve [where property within the reserve lies within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed] and other agencies, as applicable).
- Provide passive recreational uses of the slough and adjacent habitat where compatible with natural resource management and adjacent land uses.
- Increase freshwater supply to benefit wetland habitat values (RAC).
- Develop BMP's for the slough and immediate vicinity.
- Restore and enhance habitat for plant and wildlife species of special status.
- Provide natural resource interpretation for the residents of, and visitors to, the Moro Cojo Slough region.

## **OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of the Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan are the derived measurable results of implementing the goals.

### **General Overall Objectives**

- G-1** Examine the benefits of maximizing freshwater retention (RAC).
- G-2** Achieve habitat diversity through non-mechanical, low-maintenance and low-cost projects that have minimum habitat disturbance (RAC).

### **Biological Objectives**

- B-1** Evaluate the benefits, costs and feasibility of separating and increasing freshwater marshes and wetlands (RAC).
- B-2** Evaluate the benefits, costs and feasibility of separating and increasing salt/brackish water marshes and wetlands.
- B-3** Control and/or eradicate invasive non-native plant species. Minimize opportunities for non-native plant species to establish in and around the natural habitat areas.
- B-4** Create barriers to deter domestic pets, feral animals and non-native wildlife from habitat areas. These animals reduce the value of natural habitats for waterfowl and other species naturally associated with such resources.
- B-5** Manage habitat in and around the wetlands in a manner conducive to maintaining and/or enhancing wildlife habitat values.
- B-6** Where possible, create buffers between existing and/or proposed agricultural/urban developments and the sensitive slough habitat areas, consistent with the Local Coastal Program.

- B-7 Revegetate barren and degraded areas with native plant species to enhance botanical and wildlife values.
- B-8 Maintain the local gene pool of native vegetation by planting locally native species.

#### **Water Quality and Non-Point Pollution Objectives**

- W-1 Identify alternative methods to address water quality problems at the source (RAC).
- W-2 Minimize sedimentation and soil erosion through the use of vegetation cover and other surface erosion control measures.
- W-3 Improve and/or create stormwater detention facilities to protect/enhance water quality of the slough from agricultural and urban runoff.
- W-4 Manage water and drainage to accommodate agricultural uses on adjacent lands.
- W-5 Avoid actions that impact groundwater.
- W-6 Coordinate with mosquito abatement district on measures to minimize impacts to sensitive habitat features.
- W-7 Develop a monitoring program to evaluate the success of the slough management program.

#### **Agricultural Objectives**

- A-1 Identify alternative management practices (RAC).
- A-2 Identify practices which can benefit agricultural drainage and wetland resources (RAC).
- A-3 Develop management plans for current agricultural crops to minimize impacts to wetlands.
- A-4 Identify practices to minimize erosion, control irrigation drainage and minimize pesticide and fertilizer runoff into wetlands.
- A-5 Identify agricultural-wetland conflicts and mitigation measures for solutions.

#### **Land Use Objectives**

- L-1 Evaluate potential habitat restoration areas on marginal agricultural lands (RAC).

#### **Public Access and Education Objectives**

- P-1 Evaluate linking public access with educational facilities within and adjacent to Moro Cojo Slough (RAC).
- P-2 Encourage citizen involvement and participation in the planning and implementation phases of the watershed management plan.
- P-3 Explore potential revenue sources and regulatory mechanisms to implement the plan.

\*  
set  
(slough)  
below

## RELATIONSHIP WITH LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

The LUP, a segment of the Monterey County Local Coastal program, guides development within the coastal zone in the Moro Cojo Slough areas of the county. The LUP focuses on critical planning issues identified in the Coastal Act, including agriculture,

Several policies within the LUP relate to the management of the area's slough resources.

Policies include the following:

- Resource management and enhancement plan should be developed for Moro Cojo Slough.
- Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on such resources shall be allowed within such areas.
- Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be located and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such area and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.
- Prime farmland should be permanently preserved unless there is an overriding need to protect the public health and safety or where conversion is necessary to establish a stable boundary between agriculture and adjacent urban uses or sensitive habitat,
- Views along Highways 1 and 156 should be preserved and restored consistent with their scenic highway designation.
- Prohibit development to the fullest extent possible in beach, dune, estuary and wetland areas, and protect viewsheds.

just  
science  
DS-

Planning guidelines specific to the County's wetland resources have been developed in the LUP; these include: development of low intensity recreational uses, research and education, grading setbacks adjacent to wetland areas, reduction of impervious surface coverage, a 100-foot setback established from the edge of wetlands, and encouragement for preservation and restoration of wetlands.

## OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Several other plans also affect land use decisions and the development of sensitive environmental resource areas in the Moro Cojo Slough area, including the Moss Landing Harbor District (MLHD) Master Plan (1986), the North County Area Plan (1988), the Moss Landing Community Plan (1982) and the Elkhorn Slough Wetland Management Plan (1989).

\*

## EXISTING POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

Land use activities within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed are subject to regulations by several agencies. Monterey County is the primary land use authority which regulates development-related activities within the watershed, however, other agencies may be involved depending upon the location, activity and resources involved. Other agencies may include: California Coastal Commission (CCC) (permit within tidal, wetland areas, appealable areas), CDFG (Streambed Alteration Agreements), permits relating to State-listed plants and animals and Federally-listed plants, USFWS (relating to Federally-listed plants and animals), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) (discharges into waterbodies), NOAA Mon-

terey Bay Sanctuary (discharges into Monterey Bay) or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) (fill or excavation of jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S.).

### **Monterey County**

The County of Monterey has policies within the Local Coastal Program for new development within and adjacent to environmentally sensitive resources, such as riparian corridors, wetlands and rare and endangered species habitat. Policies include preparation of biological reports, setbacks to environmentally sensitive habitats, and protection of sensitive areas through deed restrictions or dedication of permanent conservation easements. Where development has already occurred in areas supporting sensitive habitat, property owners are encouraged to voluntarily establish conservation easements or deed restrictions.

Recently, in 1993, development projects have occurred adjacent to and outside of the coastal zone within the town of Castroville, and have resulted in the deposition of fill materials in areas of apparent wetlands along Castroville Slough (areas depicted on Figure 3-5). Because this area is largely outside of the coastal zone, it is unclear whether permits were obtained from regulatory agencies, such as COE or RWQCB. The developments have resulted in the fill of apparent wetlands and development within the 100-foot riparian setback. Local permits were obtained and pursuant to Monterey County's restoration ordinance, restoration plans have been prepared. The restoration plan is required for any unauthorized work within the wetland area within the 100-foot setback but outside of the coastal zone. Under the ordinance, restoration includes, but is not limited to, the revegetation of native plants and the reconstruction of natural land features (Section 21.84.130).

### **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as administered by the COE, regulates the discharge of dredged and fill materials into waters of the U.S. and has established a permit program to ensure that discharges comply with environmental requirements. Since 1972 and the implementation of amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (renamed Clean Water Act), the COE has had permit authority on filling and draining activities within navigable waters of the U.S. Since 1977, this authority was extended to include wetlands and adjacent waters. Also in 1977, a Section 404(f) amendment was added to the regulations which allowed for specific permit exemptions. These exemptions included normal farming practices, maintenance of dikes, dams, levees, and construction and maintenance of farm/stock ponds, irrigation ditches and drainage ditches (Section 404(f)[1]). However, the exemptions do not apply to activities whose purpose is to convert an area of waters of the U.S. into another use, where the flow of waters may be impaired or the reach of such waters reduced (Section 404(f)[2]). For example, a permit would be required for the discharge of fill into wetlands in order to convert the wetland area to produce upland crops.

In 1891, an Act of the Legislature declared the Moro Cojo Slough "unnavigable", in the interests of reclamation (Clark, 1991). It therefore appears that actions following the implementation of Section 404 in 1977 would require permitting by the COE. Within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, there have been exempt, permitted and unpermitted alterations of jurisdictional waters and wetlands. As depicted in Figure 3-5, the activities performed prior to 1977 appear to be considered pre-existing and would not be subject to regulatory permitting. Activities conducted since 1977 that are considered exempt include the continued farming of wetland areas (i.e. farming/agricultural activities in areas below the approximately 10-foot contour) and continued maintenance activities along levees and agricultural drainage ditches. Examples of permitted actions include culvert and tidegate installation at Moss Landing Road and culvert replacement at Highway 1. Unauthorized actions have included deposition of fill materials into previously

undisturbed (pre-1977) portions of Castroville Slough and expanded farming or development activities into previously undisturbed wetland areas.

### **California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)**

Through Fish and Game Code 1601/1603, the Streambed Alteration Agreement, the CDFG has regulatory authority on activities affecting the bed and bank of stream courses. Streambed Alteration Agreements are required for construction-related activities within stream courses relating to new flood control projects, road construction and development activities. The Department has a policy of no-net-loss of riparian resources and often recommends a 2:1 or 3:1 replacement of riparian acreage lost. In addition, CDFG also has permit authority on the take of State-listed threatened and endangered wildlife and plant species through Section 2180 of the Fish and Game Code. CDFG also regulates the take of plant species which are both State and Federally-listed through an agreement with the USFWS. Within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, CDFG has regulatory authority on the following species: seaside bird's beak, Santa Cruz tarplant, Dudley's lousewort, Hickman's cinquefoil, Santa Cruz long-toed salamander, California brown pelican, southern bald eagle, peregrine falcon, and California clapper rail.

### **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)**

The USFWS regulates, through permitting, the take of Federally-listed wildlife species on both private and public lands. USFWS regulates Federally-listed plant species when they occur on federal lands or where other federal agencies and/or funding is involved. USFWS also comments on issues relating to natural resources through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, USFWS requires consultation and permitting on the take of the following species and/or their habitat: Monterey spineflower, SCLTS, California brown pelican, southern bald eagle, peregrine falcon, tidewater goby, and California clapper rail. Additionally, USFWS consults with the COE regarding wetland permitting issues.

### **California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)**

The Regional Board has permit authority on discharges into California's waterways. They are responsible for certifying compliance of discharges with the State's clean water program. A certificate of compliance (or waiver) is necessary prior to issuance of a Section 404 permit from the COE.

### **California Coastal Commission (CCC)**

The CCC regulates development activity within the coastal zone in areas where the Commission has retained jurisdiction, in conjunction with Monterey County's implementation of the North County segment of the Local Coastal Program. Selected coastal permit actions by Monterey County can be appealed to the CCC. The CCC retains original jurisdiction on tidelands, submerged lands, and other public trust lands (whether filled or unfilled) and for development by a public agency for which a Monterey County permit is required. The entire Moro Cojo Slough watershed, with the exception of the unincorporated town of Castroville, is in the coastal zone. If an activity occurs without the required permit, the CCC can issue a cease and desist order and/or subject the violator to fines (Section 30809).

### **Moss Landing Harbor District (MLHD)**

The MLHD gained jurisdiction over all open water, to the point where tidal influence ceases for all sloughs which drain into Moss Landing Harbor, including Moro Cojo Slough. This grant was made by State Lands Commission in 1947. In 1991, the Harbor District established a permit process for any acti-

vity involving structures within, or physical use of open water areas. MLHD has issued permits for the Harbor area and Elkhorn Slough, but to date has received no permit applications for Moro Cojo Slough above Moss Landing Road. This discussion will be inserted into Chapter 7.

#### **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)**

The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, under authority of NOAA, regulates activities within the Sanctuary. The Sanctuary has permit authority on any human-induced deposition of materials from Moro Cojo Slough, and its tributaries, into the Bay.

#### **Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)**

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments has proposed to develop a watershed management plan for the Tembladero, Espinosa, and Moro Cojo Slough drainages to address nonpoint source pollution (NPSP) from farm drainages. A companion Clean Water Act Section 319(h) implementation project has also been proposed. The 319(h) project involves the implementation of several wetland restoration projects, in a small portion of the watershed, to demonstrate their value as natural filters for reducing NPSP and facilitating groundwater recharge. AMBAG, through its CAMPITS project, has developed a Geographic Information System showing land uses in the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed.

#### **Enforcement of Environmental Regulations**

The reasons for non-permitted activities within waters and wetland resources within the watershed are probably numerous and varied. One probable reason is an overall lack of knowledge by landowners of what regulatory laws apply to their activities combined with poor communication between landowners and regulatory personnel. Secondary reasons include indifference to resource protection policies and/or regulations by landowners and lack of monitoring and enforcement by regulatory personnel.

### **IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**

The focus of the implementation and cost estimate section is to identify potential sources of implementation, including both funded and volunteer activities. All activities will require coordination and approval from landowners. There are several avenues for implementation of the watershed enhancement and management recommendations. Activities could include the following:

**Fully Funded Programs Administered by the County of Monterey.** Funding could include General Fund allocations, Public Works Department funding, Planning and Building Department funds, Parks Department funding, or formation of a watershed-wide assessment district. If an assessment district is formed, the capital improvements and yearly maintenance costs could be divided among the parcels within the district.

**Joint City and State/Federal Programs Administered by the County of Monterey.** There are several funding programs available for restoration of wetland and coastal resources. Funding may be available from grant programs and/or matching fund programs for implementation of the enhancement and management recommendations. Once funding is secured, implementation could occur by contracted qualified personnel and/or volunteers (e.g., local schools, environmental groups, local residents).

**State, Federal and Public Agency Programs.** State, Federal or other public agencies that own land within the watershed should be responsible for implementation of the resource enhancement and management recommendations on their respective properties.

**Private Industry Funded Program.** Certain projects are suitable for implementation by private industry. These projects would be those that would be expected to potentially impact the wetlands, such as runoff from development or direct impacts to significant resources from development (i.e., commercial/residential development). Implementation would occur by contracting with qualified personnel.

**Volunteer Programs.** Certain projects are suitable for implementation by volunteers. Projects could include removal of invasive non-native plant species (where there is no use of herbicides or heavy equipment), monitoring of watershed features (i.e., water quality, vegetation, wildlife), and educational activities. Volunteer groups could include local school groups/classes, school science clubs, environmental groups, residents and neighborhood/homeowners associations.

## IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISMS

For project-wide and/or lower slough enhancement and management recommendations, various implementation strategies are identified and described. Pond stewardship and education are suitable as project-wide tasks; many of the implementation strategies are also suitable to the lower watershed-specific plans. All activities will require coordination and approval from landowners.

### Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program

Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA) requires states with Federally approved coastal zone management programs such as California, to develop and implement Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs to ensure the protection and restoration of coastal waters. Within three years of program approval by NOAA and EPA (i.e., January 1999), states must provide for landowner implementation of the measures. Following a two-year monitoring period (to January 2001) to assess the effectiveness of the measures, states will then have an additional three years (until January 2004) to obtain landowner implementation of additional, more stringent management measures where necessary to attain or maintain adequate water quality standards (EPA, 1993). A funding request, to prepare a more comprehensive NPS Pollution program for the Natividad/Gabilan Creek watershed (which includes the Moro Cojo Slough drainage), has been submitted to the EPA under Section 205(j)(2) of the Clean Water Act (AMBAG, 1994). A companion project, under Section 319(h) of the Clean Water Act, is proposed to implement several wetland restoration projects to demonstrate their value as natural filters for reducing nonpoint source pollution and facilitating groundwater recharge (*ibid.*).

### Watershed Stewardship/Education

The key feature in successfully implementing a watershed stewardship/education program is effective dissemination of information to area residents. Examples of implementation include:

**Develop an Educational Brochure.** An effective education device is the preparation of a brochure that is mailed to residents within the watershed. The brochure, or watershed guide, would describe the resources of the watershed and list actions residents can take to improve the resource quality of the area.

**Funding Sources:** Area businesses (through advertisements)

State Coastal Conservancy grants

Coastal Zone Management Program, NOAA

Section 314(b) Clean Lakes Program, EPA

**Establish a Watershed Restoration and Management Committee.** An advisory committee of concerned citizens could be established by the County to guide watershed activities.

**Funding Sources:** Coastal Zone Management Program, NOAA  
Section 314(b) Clean Lakes Program, EPA

**Establish an "Adopt-a-Habitat" Program.** This program would utilize citizens, environmental groups, school groups (local K-12; adult school; science/math clubs) to adopt a habitat (i.e., wetland, oak woodland, grassland). The volunteers would establish a program to regularly monitor and/or conduct activities within their chosen habitat.

**Funding Sources:** Coastal Zone Management Program, NOAA  
Section 314(b) Clean Lakes Program, EPA  
State Coastal Conservancy grants  
Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)  
Section 319 Non-Point Pollution Program, EPA

Examples of tasks that could be conducted include the following:

*Bird monitoring:* Monitor bird use of the slough a minimum of 4 times a year, in each major season. At each count (minimum of 10 minutes) all birds seen or heard are recorded. Use data to compare seasonal and yearly use.

*Vegetation monitoring:* Conduct vegetation monitoring along established transects (see Chapter 3) each spring, recording plant species along transect line. Monitor trends in vegetation composition and vegetation cover.

*Fisheries monitoring:* Conduct yearly sampling of slough to document species composition and habitat conditions. Conduct fish scale analysis to determine rate of growth of fish and fish condition analysis as a monitor of aquatic habitat conditions.

*Reptile and amphibian monitoring:* Conduct winter and spring sampling of water resources and known breeding areas to determine species composition and presence of sensitive species.

*Water quality monitoring:* Conduct seasonal measurements of water levels, Ph, temperature and salinity within the slough. Periodically collect samples for laboratory analysis for nitrates and other pollutants.

*Debris and trash clean-up:* Conduct yearly assessments of the slough and other watershed areas and clean up inorganic debris and trash.

*Revegetation:* Collect local native plant species propagules (seed); coordinate nursery propagation; and conduct revegetation of disturbed areas.

*Non-native plant species control:* Assess on a yearly basis the extent of non-native invasive plant species within the watershed; conduct field work to control/eradicate species from select areas; coordinate with qualified personnel on herbicide application.

*Invertebrate monitoring:* Conduct seasonal surveys of the slough to document presence and diversity of aquatic invertebrate species.

## IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING

State and Federal programs are currently available to fund wetland restoration and management projects.

### **Watershed Protection Funding, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

The EPA has a number of funds available to implement watershed protection measures, many of which are applicable to projects proposed in the Moro Cojo Slough Enhancement and Management Plan.

*Contact:* EPA Office of Water Funds (202) 260-9113

**Section 314(b) Clean Lakes Program.** Funds available from the Restoration, Protection and Implementation Project to implement management techniques to protect water bodies. Funds are also available in the Post-Restoration Monitoring Project to monitor and determine effectiveness of various restoration techniques. Implementation programs are 50% matching monies. The Monitoring Project is 30% matching funds.

**Section 319 (h) Nonpoint Source Implementation Program (NPSP).** Funds available for implementation of NPSP, including post-implementation monitoring. Matching funds percentages vary on the type of project.

### **Coastal Zone Management Program, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)**

This program is intended to provide funds for the implementation of State Coastal Zone Management Programs, including non-point pollution control programs.

*Contact:* Coastal Programs Division, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, NOAA, 1825 Connecticut Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20235.

### **Wetlands Reserve Program, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service**

The program is intended to restore and protect farmed wetlands by providing permanent or long-term easement with the Federal agency. Technical assistance from Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) on restoration practices is also available. Funding is available through 1995.

*Contact:* County or State NRCS Office of Conservation and Environmental Protection Division, USDA (202) 720-6221.

### **Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, Federal Highway Administration**

The ISTEA program, administered in California by CalTrans, has funding available for habitat enhancement when the enhancement is related to roadway improvements. Funding may be limited for projects in the lower slough adjacent to/within the CalTrans Right-of-Way.

*Contact:* CalTrans or Transportation Agency for Monterey County.

## CHAPTER 3 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Moro Cojo Slough has experienced dramatic hydrologic changes since the introduction of European-style land uses in the mid-1800's. These changes were aimed at draining land for agriculture, which counteracted the natural hydrologic forces that originally formed Moro Cojo Slough and its wetlands. Management, enhancement and restoration efforts will involve reversing land reclamation efforts to an extent that does not impact remaining adjacent agriculture and other land uses. However, some of the historical changes will be impossible to reverse to the precise historical conditions, for example, re-establishing significant freshwater flows without the historical proximity of the Salinas River mouth. Therefore, restoration efforts must be based upon realistic modification of the present condition and geared toward maximizing biological values consistent with preservation of a healthy agricultural environment and local economy.

### HISTORIC HYDROLOGIC CONDITIONS

#### Pre-1850's

Under conditions prior to the 1850's, Moro Cojo Slough was subject to tidal seawater exchange from the ocean, as well as winter freshwater runoff and spring flow from the Moro Cojo watershed. Periodically the slough also received runoff from the Salinas and Pajaro Rivers and Elkhorn Slough. These hydrologic and biotic features are partially displayed on an 1854 U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey (CGS) map (Figure 3-1).

The 1854 map clearly shows that Moro Cojo Slough experienced regular tidal seawater exchange. The low tide line (which approximates Mean Low Water (presently -1.5 feet NGVD) extends well inland and connects Moro Cojo Slough to the tidal inlet at the historical mouth of the Salinas River. The width of the slough (up to 500 feet wide) resulted from constant scouring, the tidal ebb flows and a large tidal prism. Highly meandering tributary channels are also characteristic of tidal flows.

The 1854 map shows the Salinas River in its pre-1910 historic position, north of Moss Landing, along with remnant channels that connected the Pajaro River to the historical mouth of the Salinas River. This geometry of the Pajaro and Salinas River mouths would have brought winter freshwater inflows to Elkhorn and Moro Cojo Slough, as well as the broad floodplain areas to the south. The historic mouth of the Salinas River was relocated to its present position after 1908, when a major flood breached the barrier beach just south of Mulligan Hill. Farmers, seeking relief from flooding of the Salinas River lagoon, installed an earthen tide gate on the Old Salinas River inlet. The farmers, followed by the MCWRA, periodically breached the seasonal summer sand bar to maintain low lagoon levels.

Geologic evidence indicates that the Salinas River may have been at its present south position at Mulligan Hill for extended periods in the past (Gordon, 1987). Thus Moro Cojo Slough would have been periodically isolated from the Salinas River source of freshwater. Regarding this issue on Elkhorn Slough, with relevance to Moro Cojo Slough, Gordon states that:

*"...comments on seasonally freshwater in the slough (Elkhorn) are confined to the historical period - that is, to conditions that have existed since European settlement began. There may well have been earlier periods when Elkhorn Slough was, as now, strictly speaking a marine estuary, with its waters saline throughout the year (for example, in the geologic past when the Salinas River emptied naturally into the bay near Mulligan Hill)."*

Gordon (*ibid.*) cites the deltaic bulge on bathymetric maps just offshore of the present mouth, as well as the groundwater outflow in the 140-foot aquifer through an old channel of the Salinas River, just offshore of the present location. It is probable that the Salinas River mouth switched between the two positions over the past several thousand years, perhaps related to the magnitude of flooding. The momentum of large floods would tend to take a more direct path, perhaps aided by erosion by wave storms on the ocean. During non-flood periods, or when more moderate floods prevailed, a tidal inlet near the present location would close due to insufficient tidal prism and ebb tide scour (as occurs presently). This would have flooded the areas behind the barrier dunes until a low spot through the dunes to the ocean could be overtopped. With the relatively large tidal prisms of the Elkhorn, Moro Cojo, Pajaro River/Watsonville Slough systems converging at Moss Landing, and a permanent or semi-permanent tidal inlet, a low area in the barrier dunes would persist.

Freshwater flows from the Salinas River to Moro Cojo Slough were, as they are today, tied closely to the seasonal occurrence of rainfall. A review of flow records collected by the U.S. Geologic Survey at the Spreckels gage prior to 1941, before the first reservoir was constructed, show extensive periods of no-flow or very low flow between April and October. The same hydrologic pattern applies to the Pajaro River. This means that freshwater inflows to Moro Cojo Slough from the Salinas River were seasonal, and that marine conditions would have predominated during the non-rainy season, even with the Salinas River mouth north of Moss Landing.

Freshwater flow from the Moro Cojo watershed to the slough consisted of both winter surface stormwater runoff during the rainy season combined with perennial spring flow. The highly permeable areas of the upper watershed are likely recharge sites for springs that emitted from the tributary valleys above the present SPRR crossing as well as, perhaps, some of the seeps and springs found at Moss Landing and the surrounding hillsides. Spring flow on hillslopes would have created perennial wetland areas within upland areas. Spring flow and stormwater runoff flowing into the major tributaries of Moro Cojo Slough would have created a zonation of brackish and freshwater marshes behind seawater in the tidal portions of Moro Cojo Slough. This zonation probably moved seasonally towards the ocean during the rainy season, but retreated landward in the summer months and during extended drought periods.

In summary, original hydrologic conditions in Moro Cojo Slough varied between fully tidal marine conditions and periods of brackish and freshwater influences. Moro Cojo Slough was clearly under tidal influence and, regardless of whether the Salinas River mouth was nearby, it undoubtedly experienced periods of full marine influence, perhaps seasonally. Freshwater appears to have been abundant in the east end of lower Moro Cojo Slough and on surrounding hillsides, due in large part to the presence of topographically higher recharge areas to the east.

#### 1850's - 1910

The 1854 map (Figure 3-1) shows the beginning of European-style commerce and land use in the Moro Cojo and Moss Landing area. By the 1880's, extensive land reclamation was underway in Elkhorn Slough and perhaps around Moro Cojo Slough. The most significant event for Moro Cojo, however, was the construction of an early version of the Sandholdt Dam (Gordon, 1987) in the 1880's, which apparently was only partially effective in blocking tidal flow to the upper slough. A 1910 map shows a partial fill crossing over Moro Cojo Slough near the site of the present Moss Landing Road site (Figure 3-2). A photograph taken shortly after the April 1906 earthquake shows failure of this fill resulting from seismic shaking and lateral ground spreading (Figure 3-3). During this period, prior to 1906, the SPRR crossing was constructed, partially blocking the upper marsh plain of Moro Cojo Slough.

It is reported that the agricultural industry grew and spread through the coastal Monterey Bay Area during this period (ABA, 1989). It appears that agricultural uses occupied the hills surrounding Moro Cojo Slough above the tidal range. Reclamation of the tidal areas appears to have occurred later in the 1930's and 1940's.

In 1909, the Salinas River mouth was established south of Moss Landing at Mulligan Hill. Despite construction of an earthen dam between Mulligan Hill and the beach to block northward flow, flow spilled over to the Elkhorn Slough outlet in 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1934 (Gordon, 1987). The historic mouth of Elkhorn Slough remained an open tidal inlet during this period. In the absence of freshwater flows from the Salinas River, Elkhorn and Moro Cojo Sloughs became more marine in character.

#### 1910 - 1947

Extensive reclamation of wetlands for agricultural use was underway in Monterey Bay by 1910. The reclamation of tidal lands around Moro Cojo Slough appears to have occurred in the 1930's and 1940's. Typical methods included ditching, levee, and berm construction. Electrical pumps were later used to drain ditches around reclaimed agricultural fields. Figures 3-4 and 3-5 shows the historical decrease in potential tidal prism for Moro Cojo Slough resulting from levee and berm construction and exclusion of marsh plains.

A significant change reported in the 1930's and 1940's was the loss of shallow groundwater in the Moss Landing and surrounding areas (ABA, 1989). Presumably groundwater pumping for agricultural and other uses depleted the shallow upper aquifer in the Moss Landing area. An increase in drilling and pumping of deeper aquifers at 180 and 400 feet after the 1950's caused salt water intrusion after the 1960's, which has progressively spread landward up the Salinas Valley aquifer, including the area immediately west of Castroville.

A review of historical aerial photographs taken between 1931 and 1993 found that reclamation activities on former tidal marsh areas adjacent to Moro Cojo Slough occurred during this time. The Highway 1 crossing appears on 1940 aerial photographs (Figure 3-5). The PG&E Moss Landing Power Plant and the Kaiser Refractories Plant were built prior to 1949 on the terrace between Moro Cojo and Elkhorn Sloughs. Castroville Slough was dammed in 1940's at the present SeaMist pump site.

The most significant change occurred when the Moss Landing Harbor entrance was constructed in 1946-47, creating a deep tidal inlet at the mouth of Moro Cojo Slough. The proximity of the harbor entrance to Elkhorn Slough, coupled with the relocation of the Salinas River mouth to the south in 1910, ensured that marine conditions prevailed in the estuary. The increased depth of the inlet has caused rejuvenation and erosion of the marsh plains around Elkhorn Slough, and deepening of Elkhorn Slough itself. Deepening of the slough mouth near the harbor has been accelerated in recent years by wetlands expansion in upper watershed, which has increased the tidal prism and, therefore, tidal scour (Oliver, *et al.*, 1993). Moro Cojo Slough has not been affected since Sandholdt Dam and Moss Landing Road block erosive tidal flows.

#### 1947 - Present

The post-World War II period saw continuing land reclamation and expansion of agriculture into the 1950's and 1960's. The levees along Moro Cojo Slough between Highway 1 and the SPRR crossing appear in the 1956 air photos. Ditching and levee/berm construction continued into the 1970's. The marsh land below elevations of 10 feet mean sea level (MSL) along Moro Cojo Slough was cultivated, but eventually became grazing land for cattle; grazing continues as the dominant use below elevations of

10 feet today, although the pasture has degraded in many areas. Local landowners report that the pasture quality was in good condition up to the early 1970's. Causes for the pasture degradation are not known. Possible causes include cessation of irrigation, the extended drought between 1987 and 1992, overgrazing, a loss of groundwater and surface water from withdrawals in the watershed to the east, and continued construction of drainage improvements in lower Moro Cojo Slough in the early 1970's. In any event, most agricultural land below elevations of 10 feet MSL along the slough has been abandoned, or is being used for cattle grazing.

It has been reported that it was common practice to flush accumulated soil salts from drain tiles under agricultural lands with irrigation water and then discharge the highly saline waters into Moro Cojo Slough (Hansen, 1976 and Gordon, 1987). Water conservation practices now used on active farmlands of predominately artichokes and strawberries do not allow irrigation runoff.

The culverts of Sandholdt Dam under Moss Landing Road were replaced and upgraded in 1988. The present configuration includes four 48-inch reinforced concrete pipes with flap gates. These structures replaced older culverts that leaked some seawater into Moro Cojo Slough and maintained saline and brackish aquatic habitats. A slide gate was installed to restore a very limited tidal inflow between -1.5 and -2.0 feet MSL.

The Highway 1 culverts were replaced in the 1980's with 24-foot by 6-foot concrete box culverts. Highway 156 was constructed at the southeastern side of the watershed prior to 1949 and involved filling the upper end of Moro Cojo Slough.

The Kaiser National Refractories Plant adjacent to Highway 1 discharged waste effluent into Moro Cojo Slough from the early 1940's to 1972. The outfall was located in the vicinity of the Moss Landing Harbor. The effluent contained sediment consisting of calcium carbonate and magnesium hydroxide that became suspended in the water of the slough and was then deposited on the channel bottom. The sediment was concentrated around the outfall. During high tide, the solids would settle out of suspension. When the sediment reacts with the tidal water, the calcium and magnesium compounds form calcite  $\text{CaCO}_3$  and magnesium hydroxide (brucite)  $\text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$ . The location of the outfall was moved in 1972 from the slough to an off-shore location in Monterey Bay. Although the historic and current effects of these discharges on biota of Moro Cojo Slough are unknown, Hansen (1976) found that sediment concentrations of calcium and magnesium at three stations above Highway 1 were very similar to those in soil from adjacent saltmarsh sites. This suggests that enrichment of these compounds in slough sediments, if it did occur in response to discharges from the Kaiser National Refractories plant, did not persist more than four years throughout most of the slough.

The 1970's brought a series of dense residential developments to the Moro Cojo Slough watershed above Castroville Boulevard. These projects involved grading and filling as well as the construction of groundwater wells, adding to the regional groundwater depletion and perhaps reducing spring flow to Moro Cojo Slough. A series of stock ponds and sewage effluent ponds were constructed in the valleys east of Castroville Boulevard in the 1970's.

During this period, the cultivation of strawberries and other crops on highly erodible hillslopes immediately adjacent to Moro Cojo Slough caused severe soils erosion. After World War II chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides came into widespread use. Organochlorine pesticides such as DDT and Endosulphan were used in the areas surrounding Moro Cojo Slough in the 1950's through 1980's. Although DDT was banned in the late 1960's, toxic byproducts persist in soils and are transported to Moro Cojo Slough. Since there has been little flushing in Moro Cojo Slough, these compounds have accumulated in the slough sediments. This pattern of transport from farm fields to accumulation in

estuaries has been documented throughout the central coast area (Salinas River, Pajaro River, and Elkhorn Slough).

In summary, the present Moro Cojo Slough is cut off from tidal seawater exchange by the Sandholdt Dam. Significant hydraulic constrictions to flood and tidal flow occur at the SPRR crossing, Highway 1, and Sandholdt Dam at Moss Landing Road. Reclaimed agricultural lands along the slough have been abandoned or have been used for grazing. Limited tidal exchange and freshwater inflows have maintained brackish to hypersaline aquatic conditions in the slough. Residual salts in soils on the marsh plain support a remnant salt marsh below the SPRR crossing, brackish conditions above SPRR, and freshwater in tributary valleys.

## HISTORIC BIOTIC CONDITIONS

### Pre-1850's

Although little information is available regarding early biotic conditions specific to the Moro Cojo Slough area, there are many accounts and archaeological reports that describe conditions of nearby areas such as Monterey, Elkhorn Slough, Santa Cruz, and the Monterey Bay in general. From these descriptions and knowledge of local indigenous peoples, it is possible to build a picture of early historic faunal and human conditions in the vicinity of the Moro Cojo Slough.

Current scientific knowledge suggests that the first native peoples migrated into the Monterey Bay Area between 8,000 and 12,000 years ago. Archaeological evidence from the Moss Landing and Elkhorn Slough areas date back 6,000 years and has added significant insight to theories as to what habitats and fauna predominated in early times. Moro Cojo Slough is within the area historically occupied by people the Spaniards called Costanoan. More specifically, the slough lies in the area of the Kalintaruk tribelet of the Ohlone. It is likely that other nearby tribelets, such as the Mutsun, Ensen, Mustak, Imunakan, and the Sahon, found means of utilizing the sloughs' resources as well (Gordon, 1987; Margolin, 1978; Patch, 1979).

Spanish explorers as early as the late 1500's wrote accounts of the indigenous people, their daily practices of subsistence, as well as the predominant flora and fauna. Early documentation suggests that there existed an environment far richer than is evident today. Prior to the advent of early agricultural practices (draining, diking and irrigation) in the area, the water table was much higher, and the land consequently much "wetter". Wetlands of enormous size stretched over lowland areas near the bays and water channels, with tall stands of native bunchgrasses dominated open areas and higher elevations boasted dense redwood forests and pine and oak chaparral. The Vizcaino party in 1602 witnessed a grizzly bear feeding on a whale carcass near the water's edge in Monterey. Up through the time of early Anglo occupation, accounts of tule elk, wolves, pronghorn antelope, bald eagles, and California condors were common. Although no formal agricultural practices were employed, the Ohlone subsisted on carefully maintained edible plants. The Ohlone people practiced land management and harvesting techniques that resulted in the proliferation of edible plant species and botanical products used for utilitarian items. Their diet was commonly supplemented with game such as antelope, deer, elk, and a wide variety of sea and land birds. The Ohlone also subsisted on marine communities including sea lions, sea otters, mussels, urchins, and abalone.

The Ohlone set fire to the grasslands to maintain these areas in early successional stages and provide a supply of edible grasses and herbs. Burning in the understory of woodlands also facilitated the growth of edible herbaceous understory species. The tilling of the ground and specific harvesting techniques that were applied during the harvest of roots, bulbs and corms promoted the regrowth of new plants. The

loosing of the soil during harvesting was beneficial to the regrowth of new plants. The cessation of these management techniques has probably resulted in reduced reproduction of some species and some alteration of the native floral composition.

With the onset of intensive grazing and active suppression of controlled burning that was used widely by the Ohlone to retain native bunchgrasses, vast tracks of perennial grasslands began to slowly evolve into the annual, non-native grasslands now present around much of the Monterey Bay. Numerous non-native agricultural and horticultural plant species were cultivated. Many other non-native species, including composites, grasses, legumes, and crucifers, were introduced into California because the seeds were in the feed brought for domestic animals.

Substantial biotic changes began to take place with the occupation by Spanish missionaries and large ranching families in the mid-1700's. Land previously grazed by large herds of antelope was now fenced in for cattle and sheep, reaching a peak in the hundreds of thousands. In 1860, Monterey County had more sheep than any county in the United States (Gordon, 1987). Antelope were hunted for food and sport, or simply starved. Tule elk survived a little longer in marshy areas less useable by cattlemen.

#### 1850's - 1900

By the turn of the century, most large carnivorous and grazing mammals had been extirpated; thus introduction of non-native plant and animal species was facilitated, and expansion of some native wildlife populations was able to take place. Those large mammals remaining, marine and terrestrial, were able to alter their behavior in response to their drastically changed environment. Grey foxes, bobcats, coyotes, and mountain lions, which were once commonly seen or even underfoot, are now highly secretive and rarely observed. Sea otters, which now spend their entire lives in the water, were once "readily captured on land" (Margolin, 1978). Numerous non-native agricultural and horticultural plant species were cultivated, and others, including composites, grasses, legumes, and crucifers, were established through various means and reproduced themselves in wilder areas. The clearing of riparian and woody areas for agriculture and ranching, enabled native rodents such as the California ground squirrel and the meadow mouse to proliferate far beyond their aboriginal populations. Altered grassland composition has also benefitted some native bird species, such as western mourning doves and meadow-larks, which have adapted to feed on a variety of non-native grasses and will nest and feed in close proximity to human developments.


#### 1900 - Present


When Moro Cojo and Elkhorn Sloughs were connected by the lower course of the Salinas River and subject, at least seasonally, to tidal influence, their mollusk faunas were similar. But since 1932, little seawater has been able to enter Moro Cojo Slough. The chemical content of the water in the slough has fluctuated greatly. In 1973, the water was brackish (with salt content dropping to around 4 parts per thousand [ppt] in the rainy season; low compared to seawater, which has 34 ppt). But since that time salty drainage water pumped from nearby fields into the slough has increased the salinity significantly (Hansen, 1976).

Evidence of the historic benthic infaunal community exists in the lower slough east of Highway 1. Soils excavated from a ditch near the slough were found to contain dead mollusks, including many bent-nosed clams, Washington clams, jackknife clams, Pacific littleneck clams, and bay mussels. Early hydrologic changes exterminated virtually the entire molluskan fauna of Moro Cojo Slough. All of these mollusks now live in the Elkhorn Slough (Gordon, 1987). In 1975, a large drainage ditch was excavated and a levee constructed along the south side of the slough, extending from its Castroville tributary upslough

to within 200 meters of the railroad crossing. Masses of shells were excavated in levee construction, indicating that a rich marine benthic community, including over a dozen species of mollusks, once extended 3 kilometers inland from the mouth of the slough. Above the railroad crossing, a narrow strip of salt-marsh vegetation (e.g., saltgrass and pickleweed) extends almost to Castroville Boulevard. Beyond Castroville Boulevard the headwaters of the slough are freshwater marshland. Research by Hornberger (Hornberger, 1991) and Schwartz (Schwartz, 1983) verifies that a range of conditions existed in the slough, from full-marine to brackish to full-freshwater.

During this period, the wetlands on the slough margins have been diked and filled, reducing the extent of wetland habitat. Within the last 10 years, much of the Castroville Slough arm was filled as a result of the unauthorized conversion of wetlands to agricultural land. The natural vegetation in smaller tributaries, such as willows, herbaceous hydrophytes or mature coast live oak trees, have been removed for agriculture, or altered due to deposition of sediments from upland erosion. In some areas, these sediment-filled drainages have become a major problem. The habitats of the upper watershed have altered through time. Maritime chaparral and oak woodlands have been modified by residential development and agricultural land uses; non-native vegetation is common, including groves of eucalyptus and residential landscaping. Despite these changes, the watershed still supports unique habitat for wildlife, including habitat for rare, threatened and endangered amphibians such as the California brackishwater snail, SCLTS, California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog.






U.S. COAST SURVEY  
 ANCHORS SYSTEM  
 MAP  
 OF  
 PART OF THE COAST OF CAL.  
 FROM  
 PAJARO RIVER  
 SOUTHWARD  
 Surveyed  
 MAY  
 1864  
 by  
 J. M. ...  
 ...


The Habitat Restoration Group  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cajo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Historic Condition, Circa 1854

2/96  
 705-01  
 Figure 3-1



Note:  
 All the original features shown on this map are shown in solid lines. Features shown in dashed lines are shown in the photo, and features shown in dotted lines are shown in the original survey and are not shown in the original survey.



BRIDGE OVER  
 MORO CAJO SLOUGH  
 (Area of Photo - Figure 3-3  
 taken after 1906 earthquake.  
 This map shows fill in channel.)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR  
 CHART OF THE COAST SERVICE  
 U.S. NAUTICAL INFORMATION SERVICE  
**MONTEREY BAY**  
**PALAJO RIVER SOUTHWARD**  
 CALIFORNIA.  
 Division of Hydrography by S. W. Hildreth, Assistant  
 U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey  
 (Hydrographic Department, Coast of Survey)  
 1910


Scale in feet  
 0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800 900 1000  
 Approved by the American  
 Hydrographic Society  
 U.S. Hydrographic Office  
 WASHINGTON, D.C.  
 1910




**The Habitat Restoration Group**  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cajo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Historic Condition, Circa 1910

2/96  
 705-01  
 Figure 3-2





PART OF THE COAST OF CAL.  
 FROM  
 PALAJO RIVER  
 SOUTHWARD

U.S. COAST SURVEY  
 ALABAMA SYSTEM  
 MAP  
 Surveyed  
 MAY  
 1854



Approximate Scale

The Habitat Restoration Group  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Historic Condition, Circa 1854

2/96  
 705-01

Figure 3-1







Photo apparently showing 1906 earthquake damage to the crossing over the mouth of Moro Cojo Slough. Caption for photo reads: "Ground ruptures in Moss Landing between Monterey Bay and Old Salinas River. View eastward toward bluffs between Elkhorn and Moro Cojo Slough." Although the caption locates the photo between Monterey Bay and Old Salinas River, the road cut in the upper left corresponds to the alignment shown on the 1910 USGS map and the crossing over Moro Cojo Slough. It appears that the road substantially blocked tidal inflow into Moro Cojo. (Source: USGS, 1978.)

The Habitat Restoration Group

Mitchell Swanson & Associates  
 VB Agricultural Services  
 Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cojo Slough  
 Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Photo of Sandholdt Dam  
 After 1906 Earthquake

Figure 3-3  
 2/96  
 705-01



The Habitat Restoration Group

Mitchell Swanson & Associates  
 VB Agricultural Services  
 Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cojo Slough  
 Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Schematic Maps of the Historical Position  
 of the Salinas River Mouth


Figure 3-4  
 2/96  
 705-01

• Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Mono Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Historic Condition, Circa 1940-Present

2/96  
705-01

Figure 3-5




**LEGEND**  
 Disturbed & Degraded  
 Levees & Fill  
 Pitt. Areas  
 Historic Individual Private Property

SCALE

1 MILE

0 2,000 4,000 FEET



## CHAPTER 4 PHYSICAL PROCESSES

### METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

The hydrologic study consists of four elements. The first involves characterizing the geologic, geomorphic, and climatic factors that dictate the hydrologic functioning of Moro Cojo Slough and its watershed. This has been accomplished by reviewing and compiling data from existing reports, maps, and other available information, as well as applying scientific principles and judgement. A topographic survey was conducted to document key flooding elevations and to provide data for the hydraulic analysis. A hydrologic model of the Moro Cojo watershed was developed using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) HEC-1 hydrologic simulation model. A hydraulic model of Lower Moro Cojo Slough was compiled using the COE HEC-2 hydraulic simulation model. The goal for this element is to have a basic understanding of how present and potential restored habitats function, as well as an understanding of the physical definition of other key planning concerns, such as groundwater recharge, water quality, flood control, and infrastructure (bridges and roads) maintenance.

The second element is a quantitative description of the effects that historical land use changes have had on the hydrology of Moro Cojo Slough and its ecosystem. These changes have obvious immediate effects, such as the construction of a dam across the mouth to prevent tidal circulation; however, there are other affected processes that may take some time to fully adjust to the new conditions (sediment transport processes in the slough, for example). Historical conditions were documented through historical mapping of aerial photographs, personal accounts, and historical accounts and maps (Chapter 3).

The third element is to quantitatively define the key planning issues. This includes defining the key flood elevations at points where urban and agricultural areas require protection, the potential tidal volume of the slough, the duration of inundation that would be experienced in restoration areas, and water quality. These factors were determined through field data collection and mapping, tidal level recordings, and analytical methods.

The fourth element involves the hydrologic evaluation of restoration alternatives to assess their potential benefits as well as impacts. This element also includes defining any remaining issues that would require future detailed study and/or data collection.

The following analysis should be considered appropriate for a feasibility level analysis. This report will provide the basis for detailed designs once an overall restoration strategy is defined.

#### Physical Setting

**Description of the Study Area.** Moro Cojo Slough drains a 16.9 square mile watershed located along the eastern edge of Monterey Bay in northern Monterey County, California (Figure 4-1). The watershed extends from the foothills of the southern Santa Cruz mountains near Prunedale and Highway 101 on the east to Monterey Bay on the west, and from Castroville on the south to Elkhorn Slough on the north. Elevations range from over 500 feet above mean sea level (MSL) (equivalent to the National Geodetic Vertical Datum [NGVD] or MSL of 1929) at the eastern headwaters to over 6.0 feet below sea level in the channel at Moss Landing Road. The upper watershed from Castroville Boulevard eastward consists of rolling hills underlain by sand-dominated sedimentary rocks, and incised by several intermittent stream valleys. The predominant land uses in the upper watershed are residential, rural residential, and agricultural.

The lower watershed includes the remnants of Moro Cojo Slough, which is incised within a valley floor of recently deposited estuarine muds. Elevations on the valley floor range from 0.0 feet MSL at the top of the slough channel to about +8.0 feet MSL at the valley edges. The valley floor was once tidally inundated, and field inspection reveals salt marsh and numerous remnant tributary tidal sloughs. The low hills that surround the valley reach elevations 20 to 80 feet above MSL and consist of marine terraces and fluvial terraces constructed by the Salinas River. Terrace surfaces bounding the slough are characteristically flat with gentle to moderately sloping side slopes. Terrace use includes grazing, row crop production, rural residential development, urban cover, and fallow land.

Moro Cojo Slough is an elongated, channel-shaped basin extending over 3.0 miles inland at elevations below 0.0 feet MSL. The lower slough, between Moss Landing Road at the mouth and the confluence with Castroville Slough, exhibits channel widths up to 500 feet, narrowing gradually to less than 50 feet at the SPRR crossing and then to less than 5 feet at its head near Castroville Boulevard. The slough is bounded by broad, flat areas of former tidal marsh that have been diked and drained. A nearly continuous levee system bounds Moro Cojo Slough between the SPRR crossing and Highway 1; behind these levees are drainage ditches serviced by pump systems. A small ditch has been dredged in the bed of Moro Cojo Slough to an elevation of almost -6.0 feet MSL from just upstream of SPRR crossing to a point almost 1,000 feet upstream of Highway One. Castroville Slough drains the northeastern side of the town of Castroville into Moro Cojo Slough about 2.0 miles above Moss Landing Road. Other tributary sloughs have been filled or reclaimed.

Land use in the former marsh plain area adjacent to Moro Cojo Slough consists of fallow agricultural and grazing lands. The National Refractories Plant is located along the north bank of Moro Cojo Slough just east of Highway 1; this plant extracts chemical compounds from seawater before discharging a waste brine through an ocean outfall.

## **GEOLOGY**

### **Description of Landscape Units**

The Moro Cojo Slough watershed lies within a geologic-tectonic unit referred to as the Salinian Block. The Salinian Block is an elongated, northwest-trending segment of the coast ranges bounded to the northeast by the San Andreas Fault and to the southwest by the San Gregorio-Sur Nacimiento fault zone. The Salinian Block has Paleozoic high-grade metamorphic and Cretaceous granitic basement rocks overlain by a sequence of dominantly marine sediments of Paleocene to Miocene Age, and non-marine sediments of Pliocene to Pleistocene Age. In Moro Cojo Slough, recent Holocene (last 12,000 years) continental and marine sediments are several hundred feet thick.

Deposition of the recent surficial sediments that underlie Moro Cojo was controlled by regional tectonics and fluctuations in sea level. The Pajaro, Elkhorn, and Salinas valleys were eroded during a low stand of sea level prior to the last glacial period and were filled in with an upward-fining sequence of sediments as the last glacial period ended. Sea level rose approximately 300 feet.

The eastern half of the Moro Cojo watershed is underlain by roughly 500 to 700 feet of undivided Aromas sands that are, in turn, underlain by the Pleistocene Purisima Formation (Figure 4-2). Aromas Sands are exposed in the upper (eastern) third of the watershed, within valleys incised over the past 50,000 years, including Paradise Canyon and areas near upper Castroville Boulevard. These sediments consist of loosely consolidated fluvial and aeolian (dune) sand, silt, clay, and gravel. The sand dune deposits of the Aromas Formation are the predominant earth material exposed at the ground surface in the Moro Cojo Slough area.

The lower half of the watershed is occupied by recently dissected fluvial and marine terraces. The flight of fluvial terrace surfaces, apparently representing the old uplifted floodplain of the Salinas River, are found at elevations between 10 and 80 feet above MSL. These surfaces are clearly evident along much of the lower watershed and include the gently sloping agricultural fields along Elkhorn Road, Dolan Road, and portions of the city of Castroville. The earth materials associated with these terraces are referred to as the Antioch Terrace Deposits and consist of interbedded layers of sand, silt, and clay.

Found closer to the ocean and at elevations less than 10 feet (MSL) are the Coastal Terrace Deposits of Santa Ynez. These deposits are predominantly marine sands. Overlying these coastal and fluvial terraces are recently deposited aeolian sand dunes. Recent dune sediments are found inland in the vicinity of Meridian Road and near the northern end of Castroville Boulevard within the Moro Cojo Watershed.

### **Recent Geologic History and Seismicity**

The Moro Cojo watershed lies within a very seismically active region of California. The watershed was uplifted by the ongoing tectonic movement along the San Andreas Fault system. Recent studies of estuarine systems near major fault zones (e.g., Humboldt Bay, California and Puget Sound, Washington) reveal that tectonic uplift and earthquake-induced ground movements and liquefaction can significantly affect the hydraulics of tidal estuarine systems. Displacement within the San Andreas system along the plate boundary is taken up along a series of faults of which the San Andreas is the most active. Other significant faults in the vicinity of the Moro Cojo watershed include the San Gregorio, Zayante-Vergales, King City, and Calaveras fault zones. Movement along these faults has resulted in horizontal displacement of several hundred miles as well as local compressional uplift of several thousand feet.

The Santa Cruz Mountains, as well as the uplifted marine terraces along the mouth of Moro Cojo Slough, reflect the uplift along the San Andreas fault system. The regional tectonics of the area has played a dominant role in shaping the Moro Cojo and surrounding watershed. For example, prehistoric fault motions along the San Andreas fault have beheaded the Elkhorn Valley, significantly reducing the watershed draining into Elkhorn Slough (Schwartz and others, 1986). Compressional uplift of the region is responsible for the development of stranded marine and fluvial terraces and may play a role in the natural draining and drying of many local sloughs. Regional uplift of the Moss Landing Harbor on the order of 0.5 feet, was measured following the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. However, there are also reports of land subsidence and greater tidal inundation in Elkhorn Slough following the quake.

Earthquakes occurring along one of the many nearby major faults subject the area to intense seismic ground shaking. Shaking may result in differential settlement, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, causing damage to buildings, roadways and utilities. Seismically induced ground failures were observed after the 1906 (Figure 3-3) and 1989 earthquakes on the San Andreas fault (USGS, 1978; Foxx, Nielsen and Associates, 1990).

Recent geologic history begins during the previous low sea level and glacial period (between approximately 17,000 to 12,000 years ago) when the Moro Cojo drainage was formed by erosions and incision through the surficial sediments described above. The infilling of the valley that holds Moro Cojo Slough occurred during the most recent rise in sea level after the end the last glacial period 12,000 years ago. Sea level rose approximately 300 feet between 12,000 and 5,000 years ago. Sediment inflows from the local watershed and mud inflow from tidal currents laid down a thick sequence of loose plastic and silty clay along the valley floor. These mud basin deposits, typically found at elevations less than 10 feet below sea level, occupy the majority of the valley floor of Moro Cojo Slough.

## SOILS

Information regarding soil characteristics of the Moro Cojo watershed are based solely on published reports by the SCS for Monterey County (SCS, 1978) and some field observations. Soils found in the basin are shown on Figure 4-1 and their hydrologic characteristics are found in Table 4-1.

In general, fine sandy loams are developed on the Aromas Formation in the upper, eastern portion of the watershed. These soils are characteristically moderately-to-well developed with moderate-to-high permeability. The soils developed in the lower portion of the watershed are underlain by the fluvial and coastal terrace deposits; these soils are moderately-to-well developed and poorly drained with slow permeability. When vegetation is removed from these soils, they pose a significant erosion hazard.

## HYDROLOGY

Moro Cojo Slough is a highly altered tidal system with a relatively small upland watershed that is covered by a variety of land uses. Human activity over the past 130 years has had an overwhelming influence on the present hydrologic and geomorphic functioning of Moro Cojo Slough and the amount and quality of its habitat.

There are four major components to the present hydrologic system of Moro Cojo Slough:

- 1) tidal inflows from the Pacific Ocean;
- 2) direct precipitation and stormwater runoff from watershed areas;
- 3) groundwater spring flow; and
- 4) man-made drainage systems.

A past connection to the Salinas River, and at times the Pajaro River, provided seasonal fresh water to Moro Cojo Slough prior to 1910.

### Tidal Inflows

Although much of Moro Cojo Slough is topographically within the tidal range recorded in Monterey Bay, very little inflow occurs because of the highly effective tide gates at Moss Landing Road, which have also been referred to as "Sandholdt Dam" (Gordon, 1987). Figure 4-3 shows recent tidal monitoring results recorded above and below Sandholdt Dam. Only a small tidal inflow of seawater seeps through Sandholdt Dam into Moro Cojo Slough. Within tidal range, Moro Cojo Slough has over 1300 acre-feet of potential tidal volume (technically referred to as "tidal prism") (Figure 4-4). If Sandholdt Dam were not present, seawater would likely reach areas near Castroville Boulevard. Present management of the tide gates by MCWRA allows tidal inflow up to -2.0 feet MSL in elevation. Table 4-2 shows the tidal datums at Moss Landing Harbor and Figure 4-5 shows the tidal duration frequency recorded as part of this investigation in Moss Landing Harbor and in Moro Cojo Slough during summer, 1993.

A variety of hydraulic structures have been constructed in and around Moro Cojo Slough to drain marsh land for agricultural use or to provide road crossings over the slough. Sandholdt Dam has virtually eliminated seawater exchange and tidal inundation. The dam contains a set of four 48-inch diameter culverts, each fitted with a flap gate to prevent tidal seepage; one flap gate has a small 12-inch by 20-inch slide gate that allows minor tidal inflows. The MCWRA manages tidal levels in the slough between -2.0 and -1.5 feet MSL to prevent flooding of residential and agricultural lands.

The Highway 1 crossing forms a constriction with fill and a set of two 4-foot by 6-foot culverts. Levees constructed along the slough restrict or have eliminated the inundation of large former marsh plain areas.

The SPRR crossing consists of fill that blocks a large portion of the valley floor except for a 150-foot bridge section over the channel. The bridge section is supported by numerous timber piles. Castroville Boulevard also has extensive road fill bridged with two 60-inch culverts.

Drainage and tidal flows in the upper half of Castroville Slough are controlled by a tide gate pump system located at Sea Mist Ranch. Above the dam, Castroville Slough drains a mix of agricultural and urban lands up to Highway 156. Below the dam, Castroville Slough is bounded by levees and drainage ditch/pump systems all the way down to Moro Cojo Slough.

### **Precipitation and Stormwater Runoff**

The Moro Cojo Slough watershed produces stormwater runoff during intense or long-duration winter precipitation. Annual rainfall averages 17.3 inches in the Moro Cojo area. Statistical relations for precipitation, depth, duration, and frequency are shown on Table 4-3. Storm peaks are generated in the upper watershed.

Runoff from the low-lying valley surrounding the slough adds to the peak flow volume by filling lower Moro Cojo Slough. No flow records exist for the slough itself. Runoff rates and volumes computed for this study are shown in Table 4-4.

Conveyance of flood flows in Moro Cojo Slough is restricted by artificial hydraulic controls at the SPRR, Highway 1, and Moss Landing Road, and the levee and ditch system surrounding the slough. Tidal elevations at the lower end of Moro Cojo Slough influence flood depths for most of the area up to SPRR. Additional discussion of flood control is provided in sections below.

### **Flood Control**

Flood control facilities in Moro Cojo Slough are managed and administered by the MCWRA. Local farmers operate the Sea Mist Dam and pump system on Castroville Slough, as well as the small scale drainage around farm lands.

The Sandholdt Dam at the mouth of the Moro Cojo Slough is the primary flood control structure for the slough and for the agricultural areas east of Highway 1 extending east of the SPRR crossing. As previously mentioned, the dam consists of road fill and a set of culverts, one fitted with an adjustable slide gate to allow for some tidal inflow. The dam protects buildings located along the west bank of the slough below Moss Landing Road and west of Highway 1. Several buildings are sited below normal tidal range (the lowest foundation is at sea level, 0.0 feet MSL). Figure 4-3 shows the effect of the dam on tidal water levels. During storm runoff and flood conditions, flow from the watershed is stored in the lower slough until the water level difference between the ocean and the slough is approximately 0.2 feet, a difference that creates enough hydraulic force to open the flap gates and drain the slough to a lower water level. This flood control system essentially stores or detains stormwater runoff above Moss Landing Road until low tide. The system is thought to provide protection for a flood of 25-year recurrence (Moffitt and Nicol, 1984; MCWRA, pers. comm., 1993). The worst case for flooding occurs when the peak inflow coincides with a high tide; according to a long-time local resident, this apparently occurred during the April, 1958 flood when flow from Moro Cojo Slough overtopped the west bank below Moss Landing Road and west of Highway 1 and flowed through buildings in Moss Landing. Hydraulic modeling conducted for this study confirms this scenario with a 25-year flood with a tide level of 2.0 feet MSL.

Sandholdt Dam also strongly controls tidal and low water elevations between Highway 1 and the SPRR crossing. The protection afforded by the dam allows for positive draining of adjacent fields by ditching, pumping, and levees.

### Water Quality

The quality of the surface water in Moro Cojo Slough is affected by past and present discharge from adjacent farmlands, seawater and fresh water inflows, and stagnation due to a lack of flushing. Basic water quality parameters have been measured by MCWRA (Koehn, pers. comm., 1993), ABA Consultants (1988 and 1990), and others (e.g., Hansen, 1976). Measurements of toxic pesticide compounds and heavy metals have been taken by the California RWQCB and by Hansen (1976).

The historical hydrologic changes in Moro Cojo Slough have reduced tidal and fresh water flushing while agricultural, industrial, and urban uses were introduced adjacent to the slough. These uses are sources of various chemical contaminants in Moro Cojo Slough.

Lower Moro Cojo Slough just upstream of Sandholdt Dam and west of Highway 1 has retained marine estuarine conditions with the limited seawater exchange allowed by the small slide gate (ABA, 1988). Prior to culvert repairs in 1988, leaky culvert flap gates allowed similar conditions. Salinity in the lower slough has ranged from brackish, during winter fresh water runoff events, to hypersaline when the slough experienced long periods of evaporation. It has been postulated in the past that irrigation and stormwater runoff has leached salts from adjacent agricultural lands and contributed to elevated salinity (Hansen, 1976). MCWRA has measured salinity as well as other water quality parameters at Moss Landing Road and just east of Highway 1; these are presented in Appendix A. This data shows that dissolved oxygen levels have decreased below 7.0 mg/l occasionally in late fall, likely the result of poor water circulation. The pH levels have occasionally been measured above 9.00; high pH levels have been attributed to seepage from the Kaiser Refractories Plant tailings ponds (Hansen, 1976). Fluctuations in pH and salinity have been related to environmental stress on the lower slough fauna (Hansen, 1976).

Nutrient levels in surface waters of Moro Cojo Slough can be elevated by tidal inflow and by point and non-point discharges from adjacent grazing, agricultural, and rural residential lands (ABA, 1989). Contamination can occur by seepage from septic systems. The primary hazard of nutrients is the stimulation of excessive algal growth and oxygen depletion or eutrophication. Nitrate and ammonia, common waste products of cattle, can be entrained in runoff and delivered to the slough. Monitoring by MCWRA for the period 1990-92 show occasional elevated levels of nitrates, ammonia, and phosphate.

A significant water quality problem in Moro Cojo Slough is the presence of residual pesticides and their by-products in the soils, waters, and muds of the slough and adjacent areas. These compounds accumulate in fatty tissues organisms, especially shell fish and aquatic species. Residual pesticide contamination occurs in soils that are transported by stormwater runoff to waterways. Strawberry fields situated on erodible soils are likely sources of contaminants. Contaminant exchange between the slough sediments and the overlying water column occurs when the sediments are disturbed and mobilized. Shell fish and benthic organisms accumulate these substances as they feed in the sediments; higher species, including humans, accumulate pesticide compounds by consumption of contaminated shell fish. Sampling conducted by the RWQCB in 1982 (pers. comm., 1994) found significant levels of DDT, endosulphan, and Toxaphene (Appendix B). High levels of toxicity were also found in sediment samples taken from Moro Cojo Slough. For additional compilation of water quality data, see California Coastal Commission, Data Evaluation Report for Elkhorn Slough Watershed (CCC, Santa Cruz).

Pesticides currently used in area agriculture are chemicals that break down quickly (matter of hours) and present less threat than past chemicals that persist in water, soil and food, and then biologically accumulate in tissue.

Nonpoint source pollution (NPSP) is considered a problem for the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, resulting in the degradation of wetland and riparian resource values. Pollution may occur from several sources, such as sediment/erosion, confined animal facilities, poor nutrient management, poor pesticide management, intensive livestock grazing, new development, failing sewage systems, and stormwater runoff (EPA, 1993). Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA) requires states with Federally approved coastal zone management programs, such as California, to develop and implement Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs to ensure the protection and restoration of coastal waters. Proposals to prepare a more comprehensive NPSP program for the region, and to implement projects to reduce NPSP and facilitate groundwater recharge have been submitted to Federal agencies for funding (AMBAG, 1994). For additional discussion of change detection in the watershed see California Coastal Commission, A Pilot Methodology for Assessing cumulative Impacts of Activities that Generate Polluted Runoff: Elkhorn Slough Watershed, Monterey County, San Francisco, January 1996, especially Appendix C-1. The Coastal Commission is undertaking additional change detection work under a federal grant for "Estuarine Wetland and Watershed Inventory Using NOAA's CoastWatch Change Analysis Project Protocol in California's Central Coast."

## GROUNDWATER

### Aquifers

The Moro Cojo watershed is located in the northwestern corner of the Salinas Valley groundwater basin. Principal aquifers occur in the underlying the Salinas River basin, an elongated basin extending approximately 70 miles along the Salinas Valley from Monterey Bay eastward to San Ardo (Boyle, 1986). Groundwater is a major source of water for agricultural and domestic water uses in the Moro Cojo area. Overdraft has resulted in saltwater intrusion and a significant decay in the water quality of many wells within the lower portion of the groundwater basin, including the Castroville and Moro Cojo Slough area.

The Salinas Valley groundwater basin is comprised of three major water-bearing strata referred to as the 180-foot, 400-foot and 800-foot or deep zone aquifers. The 180-foot aquifer is confined principally to the more recent Quaternary aged sediments; the 400-foot aquifer is found in the Aromas sands; and the 800-foot is composed of the Pliocene Purisima and Paso Robles formations (Johnson, 1980). In the lower Salinas Valley, the 180-foot and 400-foot aquifers are separated by apparently continuous clay deposits that restricts vertical flow between the water bearing units (termed an "aquitar" layer). In areas in upper Moro Cojo Slough watershed above Castroville Boulevard, however, the aquitar is locally discontinuous and a hydraulic link may exist between all three aquifers (Boyle Engineering, 1986 and 1987; Johnson 1980).

In addition to the three confined aquifers, a shallow unconfined groundwater table is present in Moss Landing and in hills surrounding Moro Cojo Slough. Shallow groundwater is commonly found at depths between 0 and 15 feet below the ground surface. Further groundwater information is contained in MCWRA, North Monterey County Hydrogeologic Study, Volume I (MCWRA, 1995).

## Groundwater Movement and Recharge

Water enters the aquifers through recharge from direct precipitation and surface flow in streams in the shallow surface formations. The deeper aquifers are more expansive, receiving most of their recharge from precipitation falling over a larger regional area. Their groundwater movement is controlled by a structural and stratigraphic boundaries. In general, groundwater movement in the deeper aquifers underlying the Salinas Valley is north-westward toward the ocean (Johnson, 1980).

Very little information exists on the groundwater recharge potential of the area surrounding Moro Cojo Slough. The elevated hills in the upper portion of the watershed have moderate-to-high rates of infiltration and likely contribute recharge to all the aquifers. The lower portion of the basin, particularly along the valley floor of the slough, is underlain by a thick layer of silty clay-to-clayey loam soils with apparent low infiltration rates. It is unlikely that Moro Cojo Slough below Castroville Boulevard contributes a measurable amount of recharge to the major aquifers; however, detailed soils and subsurface geologic investigations are needed to clarify the issue.

Historically, springs and seeps around Lower Moro Cojo Slough and Moss Landing have been cited as important hydrological components of the Moro Cojo wetlands (ABA, 1988, 1989). Historic accounts from the early Spanish settlers report that numerous springs and seeps existed along many of the hillsides in Moro Cojo and Elkhorn Slough during the early 1800's. Some accounts refer to fresh water springs and shallow wells at Moss Landing that disappeared in the 1940's. Seeps are still visible in wet areas on top of terraces in cultivated fields. Springs originate from recharge in the shallow surface aquifer, and occur as spring flow where the groundwater table intersects the ground surface. Surface springs and seeps occur in topographically lower areas or in water-bearing units exposed by faulting or other geologic structures. Historically, fresh water inflows from the Salinas River, when its mouth was present near Moss Landing, could have contributed to the recharge of this shallow aquifer; however, the volume of water provided by direct rainfall on elevated recharge areas was likely greater.

## Groundwater Levels and Quality

The 180-foot and 400-foot aquifers are the principal water bearing strata for domestic, commercial, and agricultural use within the Salinas Valley and the numerous wells in the Moro Cojo Slough area. The majority of wells in the lower portion of the Moro Cojo Slough watershed are used for agriculture, whereas more wells in the upper portions of watershed are used for domestic water use.

The primary water quality problem in the lower Salinas Valley is salt water intrusion into the 180-foot and 400-foot aquifers. In the last 75 to 100 years, groundwater levels in the Lower Salinas Valley and the Moro Cojo area have dropped markedly. Since roughly the turn of the century, a measurable drop in groundwater has been recorded in several of the wells within the Moro Cojo Slough area. Boyle Engineering (1986) reports that wells located in the northeastern portion of the Salinas Basin (in the general vicinity of the Moro Cojo Slough), have dropped about 85 feet between 1935 and 1965. Since 1965, the groundwater table appears to have stabilized, however. The drops in water table elevations within the 180-foot and 400-foot aquifer are in direct response to the on-going overdraft of the aquifers. Salt water intrusion was first recorded in the late 1930's when several wells in the 180-foot aquifer became contaminated and were abandoned. Since that time, salt water intrusion has affected about 13,000 acres overlying the 180-foot aquifer, and 8,000 acres overlying the 400-foot aquifer. Salt water intrusion into the 800-foot aquifer has not yet been observed. Other groundwater quality issues facing the Moro Cojo region are nitrates from residential septic leach fields, agricultural fertilizers, and local grazing.

## Seawater Intrusion

There is sea water intrusion in Moro Cojo Slough between the Monterey Bay and the SPRR tracks. Three separate groundwater aquifers occur in the watershed, the 180-foot, the 400-foot, and the 900-foot aquifer. The two upper aquifers have some salt water intrusion. Due to high surface salinity, salt water intrusion occurs 200 feet below the ground surface; therefore, the 180-foot aquifer in this area is contaminated with salt water. The water in this aquifer is no longer usable for domestic or agricultural purposes. Some of the hypersaline water documented in the 180-foot aquifer may be from residual saltiness of the slough environment. The two factors that support this conclusion are (1) the clay layer within the soil above the 180-foot aquifer is minimal, and (2) the water observed in the 180-foot aquifer is highly mineralized and did not have the overall appearance of salt water intrusion (J. Snow, MCWRA, pers. comm., 1993).

In a small area in the southwestern portion of Moro Cojo Slough, and the area southwest of Highway 1 between Moss Landing and Castroville (outside the watershed boundary), the 400-foot aquifer has some salt water intrusion. A well located in this area has a salinity of approximately 500 mg/l. However, a well located in Moro Cojo Slough north of Dolan Road at the Moon Glow Dairy did not have salt water intrusion in 1989 (*ibid*).

Studies indicate that in 1983, greater than 10,000 acres of the 180-foot aquifer in the Castroville vicinity had sea water intrusion, and the effected area was expected to increase at a rate of approximately 250 acres per year (Seawater Intrusion Committee, 1987). The study also states that sea water intrusion has effected an area of approximately 3,000 acres in the 400-foot aquifer, and is expected to increase at a rate of approximately 120 acres per year. The study projects that between 1998 and 2003, the 180-foot and the 400-foot aquifers in Castroville will no longer be usable (*ibid*). Although these areas include a portion of the watershed, the problem appears to be increasing. The MCWRA plans to deliver reclaimed water for irrigation to the Castroville area by 1997 in order to halt the pumping of groundwater in this area (Pete Koehn, MCWRA, pers. comm.).

The Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project will use treated wastewater to augment groundwater supplies for irrigation uses in the Castroville irrigation area. The reclaimed water will be provided by the Monterey Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) will upgrade the plant from a secondary treatment to a tertiary treatment facility as part of the Salinas Valley Reclamation Project. The reclaimed water will be stored in a storage pond, and it will flow by gravity to the reclaimed water distribution system. The distribution system in the Castroville irrigation system area includes transmission and distribution pipelines, supplemental wells, booster pump stations, and an operations center (Figure 4-6). The project also specifies the regulation of wells in the Castroville service area.

7-3

The MRWPCA will operate the reclamation plant and storage pond as part of the regional wastewater treatment plant. The MCWRA will operate the distribution system and regulate wells. The tertiary treatment plant would provide approximately 2,500 acre-feet of reclaimed wastewater per month to the Castroville irrigation system. In months with lower irrigation demand (i.e., October-March), excess secondary wastewater would be discharged through an existing ocean outfall. In months with higher irrigation demand (i.e., April-September), a deficit of reclaimed wastewater would exist, and groundwater would have to be pumped to augment the reclaimed wastewater supply.

The Castroville Irrigation Area Distribution system consists of 48 miles of reclaimed water transmission and distribution pipelines. A network of pipes will distribute reclaimed water to approximately 12,000 acres around Castroville on 220 parcels of farmland. Lateral pipelines, ranging from 8-27 inches in diameter, branch off the main trunk pipeline from the treatment plant (described above) to serve each farm parcel.

To provide a backup in the event reclaimed wastewater production is interrupted and to supplement the reclaimed water supply when needed, MCWRA will operate 24 supplemental wells with a combined discharge rate of 62,000 gallons per minute. Of the 22 wells selected, 19 of them are existing agricultural wells in the project area that will be acquired by MCWRA for rehabilitation and will be configured to discharge into the distribution system. The remaining three wells will be drilled. MCWRA would regulate all existing and future wells in the Castroville service area to minimize the pumping of groundwater in and near the seawater intrusion area.

The project is considered to be consistent with water resource policies to protect groundwater supplies, with agricultural policies to protect agriculture, and with most environmentally sensitive habitat policies to protect environmentally sensitive areas.

**Table 4-1. Soil Characteristics for the Moro Cojo Watershed**  
(from Soil Conservation Service, 1980)

The Hydrologic Soil Group is an empirically derived value that provides a measure of infiltration and runoff potential of the a particular soil group and drainage area.

SCS Symbol	Soil Name and General Description	Approx. Depth (in)	Approx. Permeability (in/hr)	Hydrologic Soil Group <sup>1</sup>	Areas <sup>2</sup> of Exposure in Watershed
Ac	Alviso silty clay loam	45	0.06 - 0.6	D	Lower
Ad	Alviso silty clay loam	45	0.06 - 0.2	D	Lower
Ak	Arnold loamy sand	48	6.0 - 20	B	Upper
Ar	Arnold-Santa Ynez Complex: loamy fine sand	48	6.0 - 20	B	Upper
Cn	Cropley silty clay	69	0.06 - 0.2	D	Lower
Db	Diablo clay	53	0.06 - 0.2	D	Lower
Ed	Elkhorn fine sandy loam	63	0.2 - 0.6	B	Upper, Lower
Ee	Elkhorn Variant fine sandy loam	25	0.06 - 0.2	C	Upper
Oa	Oceano loamy sand	80	6.0 - 20	A	Lower
Rb	Rinde Muck: sapric material	60	0.06 - 0.2	D	Lower
Sh	Santa Ynez fine sandy loam	61	0.06 - 0.2	D	Lower

<sup>1</sup> "A" soils are most the most well-drained while "D" soils are the least permeable.

<sup>2</sup> Upper watershed areas tend to be more well-drained and lower watershed area tend to be the least permeable.

**Table 4-2. Hydrologic Characteristics of Moss Landing Harbor and Adjacent Wetlands**

**MORO COJO TIDAL DATUMS  
ELKHORN SLOUGH AT HIGHWAY 1 BRIDGE**

	DATUMS	
	MLLW	NGVD
ESTIMATED 100-YEAR HIGH TIDE	+8.30 ft.	+5.60 ft.
MHHW	+5.33'	+2.63'
MHW	+4.64'	+1.94'
NGVD (MSL 1929)	+2.70'	0.00'
MLW	+1.08'	-1.62'
MLLW	0.00'	-2.70'

Epoch (1960 - 1978) - Series 4 months (6/76-7/76; 5/77-6/77)

Hydrologic Characteristics of Moss Landing Harbor and adjacent wetlands.  
(Source: NOS, 1978.)

Table 4-3. Point Rainfall Depth for the Moro Cojo Watershed

STORM FREQUENCY

Duration	2-yr	10-yr	25-yr	50-yr	100-yr
5 min.	0.16	0.24	0.27	0.30	0.35
10 min.	0.26	0.41	0.48	0.53	0.61
1 hr.	0.55	0.81	0.95	1.06	1.22
2 hr.	0.78	1.15	1.35	1.49	1.73
3 hr.	0.95	1.41	1.65	1.83	2.12
6 hr.	1.35 1.10	1.99 1.50	2.33 1.65	2.59 1.80	2.99 2.00
12 hr.	1.91	2.82	3.30	3.66	4.23
24 hr.	1.60	2.50	3.20	3.50	4.00

Point rainfall depths for the Moro Cojo Watershed (from Monterey County Department of Public Works Rainfall Intensities Chart; Plate No. 25, 1977, and NOAA, 1977 ).

**Table 4-4. Runoff Peak Flow and Volumes Computed for Selected 12-hour Events  
Calculated by HEC-1 Simulation at Highway 1**


<b>Frequency (year)</b>	<b>Peak (cfs)</b>	<b>Total Volume (acre-feet)</b>
2	506	513
10	891	894
25	1110	1110
50	1280	1277
100	1555	1543

The Habitat Restoration Group  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences


Moro Cajo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Watershed and Soils Map



SCS Symbol	Soil Name and General Description
Ac	Aviso silty clay loam
Ad	Aviso silty clay loam
Ab	Arnold loamy sand
Av	Arnold-Santa Ynez Complex loamy fine sand
Cn	Cropley silty clay
Db	Dabio clay
Ed	Elkhorn fine sandy loam
Ee	Elkhorn Variant fine sandy loam
Oa	Oceano loamy sand
Rb	Runde Muck argic material
Sh	Santa Ynez fine sandy loam



2/96  
705-01  
Figure 4-1







Figure 4-2  
2/96  
705-01

Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
Geologic Profile of the Area Underlying Moro Cojo Slough

The Habitat Restoration Group  
Mitchell Swanson & Associates  
VB Agricultural Services  
Applied Marine Sciences









Figure 4-3  
2/96  
705-01

Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
Tidal Hydrographs for Moro Cojo Slough and Moss Landing Harbor  
Recorded in Summer of 1993

The Habitat Restoration Group  
Mitchell Swanson & Associates  
VB Agricultural Services  
Applied Marine Sciences






Source: Computed from survey data and calculations from Monterey County Water Agency and Mitchell Swanson & Associates


**The Habitat Restoration Group**  
 Mitchell Swanson & Associates  
 VB Agricultural Services  
 Applied Marine Sciences

**Figure 4-4**  
 2/96  
 705-01

**Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan**  
**Plot of Tidal Volume in Moro Cojo Slough - Past and Present**



**MORO COJO SLOUGH**  
Tidal Duration May-September 1993




The Habitat Restoration Group

Mitchell Swanson & Associates  
VB Agricultural Services  
Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cojo Slough  
Management and Enhancement Plan  
Tidal Duration for Recording Stations in  
Moss Landing Harbor and Moro Cojo Slough

Figure 4-5  
2/96  
705-01



## CHAPTER 5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### VEGETATION RESOURCES

A reconnaissance-level botanical survey was conducted for the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. The survey documents the major native and non-native plant communities observed in the watershed. The survey was performed by walking portions of the lower watershed and driving public roads within the upper watershed east of Castroville Boulevard over five visits between June 1993 and March 1994. Both upland and wetland habitat types were observed during this time period, which spanned the blooming period for most species and various hydrological. The reconnaissance-level field survey provided only a cursory overview of much of the watershed. Most of the area is private property; therefore, portions of the survey area were not visible by car or foot. Plant communities within these areas were further documented through aerial photo interpretation.

Plant communities were designated utilizing the descriptions of the Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California (Holland, 1986). The plant community designations of Holland were modified, where necessary, in order to best describe the communities observed on the project site. The plant communities are delineated on 1993 aerial-photograph base maps prepared by Aerial Photometrics, 1993, scale 1"=300' (Figure 5-1). Aerial photographs at a scale of 1"=1,000', provided by the MCWRA, 1993, were used to evaluate the extent of the plant communities east of Castroville Boulevard (Figure 5-2).

The potential for the presence of rare and endangered plant species or habitat for such species was evaluated through a literature review, personal communication with local experts and field survey observations. The California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) was accessed for known populations of State and Federal listed rare, threatened and endangered plant species within the watershed. The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (CNPS, 1988) was used to evaluate the potential for the presence of plant species listed by CNPS. Vern Yadon, a native plant expert in Monterey County, was consulted on the distribution of listed plant species and potential for occurrence within the watershed. The Draft Environmental Impact Report for Manzanita Regional Park (Terra-Sol Ltd., 1980) was researched for information on known populations of species of special concern within the park boundaries.

Sensitive botanical resources are mapped on base maps at a scale of 1"=300' and 1"=1,000' (Figures 5-3 and 5-4). Wetland and riparian habitats are depicted on Figure 5-5.

Plant species were identified utilizing The Jepson Manual (Hickman, 1993) and A California Flora and Supplement (Munz and Keck, 1973) and are listed in Appendix C.

The extent of wetland habitat within the watershed was evaluated by mapping areas dominated by hydrophytic vegetation, conducting periodic soil samples tests, and evaluating the extent of wetland hydrology during field surveys and literature research. National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps for the Moss Landing and Prunedale quadrangles (U.S. Department of Interior, 1972) were reviewed. Wetland designations from these maps, which are based on high altitude aerial photo interpretation, were refined based upon more detailed site reconnaissance (Figure 5-5). A preliminary jurisdictional wetland delineation meeting COE permitting requirements was not performed. A jurisdictional delineation would have to be conducted for any future project in wetlands (including restoration projects).

## PLANT COMMUNITIES

There are 10 natural plant communities in the Moro Cojo watershed, and five non-native communities. The wetland communities include coastal salt marsh, freshwater marsh, and freshwater herbaceous wetlands. A riparian habitat, the central coast arroyo willow riparian forest, and a grassland, the coastal alkali grassland, may also be considered wetlands. Portions of the coastal alkali grassland that are considered wetlands are mapped as wet coastal alkali grassland (Figures 5-1 and 5-3). The grassland communities include coastal alkali grassland, non-native grassland, and mixed grassland. Plant communities in the upper watershed include maritime chaparral, coast live oak woodland and coyote brush scrub. The non-native plant communities are ruderal (roadside/weedy species), poison hemlock scrub, agricultural land, rural residential landscape vegetation, and non-native landscape trees. Representative locations of each mapped habitat are listed on Table 5-1; locations listed are considered representative of the habitat type and display both vegetative and salient environmental features typical for the habitat.

For inaccessible areas the vegetation was interpreted by aerial photographs and the plant communities are mapped as units with multiple plant communities represented.

### Wetlands

**Coastal Salt Marsh.** The coastal salt marsh of Moro Cojo Slough extends from the Moss Landing Harbor to Castroville Boulevard. The degree of salinity in this portion of the slough varies because, although salt water enters the slough at Moss Landing and freshwater drains into the slough at Castroville Boulevard, hypersaline water has been recorded. The hypersaline condition is, in part, due to flushing of salts which are present in the soil. It is also likely the result of summer evaporation in stagnant or slow moving waters. The high salt concentrations within the soil appear to be associated with reclaimed and/or drained land. Although portions of the slough have brackishwater under certain conditions, the coastal salt marsh vegetation persists due to the hypersaline conditions. Hypersaline water has been recorded from the lower slough at the east side of Highway 1 (ABA, 1990). Field estimates of salinity indicate hypersaline water, probably 40 ppt (*ibid.*).

The community is characterized by a dense cover of low-growing perennial herbaceous species. The salt-tolerant hydrophytic species in this community tend to be dormant in the winter. The width of the community varies in relation to topography such that the community widens where flat land borders the slough channel and will narrow where the adjacent slope steepens. The coastal salt marsh also occurs along the arms of the slough as well as the natural and man-made channels. There are large fields of coastal salt marsh vegetation containing natural drainage channels between the SPRR tracks and Castroville Boulevard.

The coastal salt marsh has been significantly disturbed by cattle grazing. In some areas where portions of the marsh are fenced, the marsh confined within the fenced area exhibits dense vegetation and the area outside the fence is nearly bare from grazing impacts. Portions of the slough have been cut off from the natural channel by berms resulting in the conversion of the dominant species from pickleweed to fat hen. In addition, the extent of the coastal salt marsh in these areas has been significantly reduced when compared to historical records of the marsh community in Moro Cojo Slough as depicted on an 1854 U.S. Coast Survey map (Figure 3-1).

Historic draining and ditching for agriculture has resulted in a significant loss of the coastal salt marsh of the slough. Although the flora and hydrology have been altered, many of these areas retain wetland characteristics and could be restored. In the Castroville Slough arm, the coastal salt marsh vegetation has been significantly reduced in recent years. Farming activities have encroached into the slough such

that the width of the slough has been reduced from 100 feet to less than 10 feet (Pamela Byrnes, Moss Landing Marine Laboratory, pers. comm., 1993).

The border of the slough channels and areas that experience frequent flooding are predominantly comprised of pickleweed (*Salicornia virginica*), a species adapted to periodic inundation. The remainder of this community is composed of alkali heath (*Frankenia salina*), jaumea (*Jaumea carnosa*), saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*), alkali bulrush (*Scirpus robustus*), Pacific silverweed (*Potentilla anserina* ssp. *egedii*), fat hen (*Atriplex patula* var. *hastata*), creeping rye grass (*Leymus triticoides*), and rabbitsfoot grass (*Polygonum monspeliensis*). Alga was observed within the slough, both east and west of Highway 1 during the field surveys. The alga mats varied in density depending upon the season. *Ulva* and *Enteromorpha* have been recorded during monitoring studies performed by ABA (ABA, 1991). The alga appear to be an important component of the water ecosystem, providing habitat for the brackishwater snail and other invertebrates.

The agricultural land north of Dolan Road has farming activities in swales that support remnant coastal salt marsh vegetation. These disturbed areas also have vegetation representative of a seasonal wetland. Although flooded in winter, these areas are eventually farmed. The area is mapped as coastal salt marsh/seasonal wetland.

**Freshwater Marsh.** The freshwater marsh occurs east of Castroville Boulevard, and in one arm of the slough west of Castroville Boulevard reaching northerly toward Dolan Road. Freshwater marsh has vegetation that is adapted to survival in ponded water. The community is dominated by herbaceous emergent species and associated hydrophytic species that border the aquatic areas and ponds within the watershed. Portions of this community exhibit a dense undisturbed association of plant species, although some areas of freshwater marsh have been significantly disturbed by cattle grazing activities and agriculture. The freshwater marsh intermixes with the willow riparian community in some areas; these areas are mapped as central coast arroyo willow riparian forest/freshwater marsh and include the freshwater arms of the slough near Castroville Boulevard, and smaller tributaries in the upper watershed. The mapping unit of central coast arroyo willow riparian forest/perennial wetland describes those areas with willows that are interspersed with perennial wetland areas where the overstory vegetation does not occur or has been removed, such as creeks in the upper watershed.

Species that occur in the freshwater marsh include smartweed (*Polygonum punctatum*), acute tule (*Scirpus acutus*), bog rush (*Juncus effusus*), burreed (*Sparganium eurycarpum*), California tule (*Scirpus californicus*), spike rush (*Eleocharis* sp.) and cattail (*Typha latifolia*).

**Freshwater Herbaceous Wetland.** The freshwater herbaceous wetland is associated with the upper watershed of Moro Cojo Slough. The community consists of perennial and seasonal wetlands that occur in depressions, swales, drainages, and along disturbed creek courses. This community is also associated with wet meadow areas. Where the community is interspersed between willow thickets, it is likely that the freshwater herbaceous wetland persists in wet areas, creek channels and drainages where the riparian overstory has been removed. The species composition consists of herbaceous annual and perennial hydrophytic species. Arroyo willow saplings and trees also occur within this community.

Seasonal wetlands were observed throughout the watershed. These areas include intermittent creeks, seeps, ponds and depressions. These areas are characterized by annual species and perennial vegetation adapted to survive the dry season. Examples are the seasonal ponds located along Dolan Road.

Perennial herbaceous wetlands have a constant source of water, but do not support emergent vegetation characteristic of the freshwater marsh. These areas are associated with springs and seeps that provide

surface and subsurface water, but do not have sufficient ponding to support significant emergent vegetation, such as the perennial seeps in the Paradise Road area.

One depression near Highway 1 supports seasonal wetlands that surround a ponded area with freshwater marsh vegetation that is mapped as freshwater marsh/seasonal wetland.

Dominant species observed in the freshwater herbaceous wetlands include bog rush (*Juncus effuses*), iris-leaved rush (*Juncus xiphioides*), toad rush (*Juncus bufonius*), willow herb (*Epilobium* sp.), smartweed (*Polygonum* sp.), rabbitsfoot grass, perennial rye grass, and loosestrife (*Lythrum hyssopifolia*).

### Central Coast Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest

This riparian community is associated with the freshwater portions of the slough. The community can form dense thickets of willow trees and shrubs, or can be composed of isolated willow trees. The community intermixes with the freshwater marsh community. Characteristic understory species include California blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), stinging nettles (*Urtica dioica* ssp. *holosericea*), and nut grass (*Cyperus esculentus*).

In the upper watershed, the channels of the tributaries have been impacted by residential development and agriculture such that the course of the original stream channel has been removed, culverted, or filled with sediment. Subsequently, the willow riparian forest vegetation along these tributaries consists of intermittent stands of arroyo willows interspersed with scattered arroyo willow trees. Along Blackie Road, the willow riparian community associated with a creek along the road has recently been significantly limbed and cleared. Willow saplings become established in natural drainages on farm land that have been converted into agriculture run-off drainages and ditches.

### Grasslands

**Coastal Alkali Grassland.** The coastal alkali grassland occurs between the SPRR tracks and Highway 1. In some areas, the grassland is separated from the slough channel by a berm. These grassland areas can experience periodic inundation, saturation, ponding, and/or a high water table. Some of these coastal alkali grassland areas are historical wetlands that were drained for agriculture, but because these areas retain wetland characteristics unsuitable for farming, they are predominantly use for cattle grazing. Currently, these grassland areas have functional and abandoned channels, and ponded low areas. The soil in the coastal alkali grassland has hydric characteristics. The portions of this grassland community that exhibit wetland characteristics are mapped as the wet coastal alkali grassland.

The community is dominated by grass species such as saltgrass, rabbitsfoot grass, perennial ryegrass, foxtail (*Hordeum* sp.) and meadow barley (*Hordeum brachyantherum*). There are inclusions of coastal salt marsh vegetation such as alkali heath, fat hen and spikerush (*Eleocharis* sp.) within the grassland.

Much of the alkali grassland has been impacted by grazing activities. In addition, it is possible that long-term grazing impacts have resulted in the alteration of the species composition of this community such that the density of the native species has decreased, while the density of non-native species has increased. An area near Highway 1 that has undergone intensive grazing is mapped as coastal alkali grassland/non-native grassland.

**Mixed Grassland.** The mixed grassland was observed along the slopes bordering the slough in the vicinity of the mobile home park on Dolan Road. The community is characterized by native bunchgrasses, non-native grasses and wildflowers. The community includes species such as purple needlegrass

(*Nassella pulchra*), perennial rye grass, and creeping rye grass, and curly dock (*Rumex crispus*). Native wildflower species such as Mariposa lily (*Calochortus* sp.) and soaproot (*Chlorogalum pomeridianum*). A CNPS List 1B species, Gairdner's yampah (*Perideridia gairdneri* ssp. *gairdneri*) was also observed in this community. The mixed grassland community could occur in other portions of the watershed that were not surveyed on foot.

**Non-native Grassland.** The non-native grassland is associated with abandoned agricultural areas, hillsides bordering the slough, residential areas, and disturbed areas. The community is predominantly composed of non-native grasses and herbs. Non-native grassland becomes established in areas where the natural vegetation has been removed; thus, non-native grassland is common in the rural areas within the watershed, either as a dominant community or as an understory component of other communities. Representative species include wild oat (*Avena barbata*), perennial ryegrass, ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), English plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), and wild radish (*Raphanus sativus*). Native species such as creeping rye grass and coyote brush shrubs (*Baccharis pilularis*) are also a component of this community.

Disturbed areas and large mapping units of the upper watershed are represented by a mixture of non-native grassland and non-native plant communities. These are named for the dominant components and include non-native grassland/ruderal, non-native grassland/non-native landscape trees, non-native grassland/rural residential vegetation, non-native grassland/rural residential vegetation/ruderal, and non-native grassland/rural residential vegetation/non-native landscape trees.

### **Maritime Chaparral**

The maritime chaparral community occurs within upland areas in the upper watershed of Moro Cojo Slough. Maritime chaparral is associated with hillsides and south-facing slopes from the Paradise Canyon Road vicinity south to Manzanita Park (Figure 5-2). This community tends to intermix with the coast live oak woodland. The community is associated in sandy substrates on coastal hills influenced by the incursion of fog. The xeric conditions associated with sandy soils coupled with the temperate climate and summer fog results in a specialized environment that supports many special status plant species. Rural residential development occurs within this community.

The vegetation is characterized by manzanita species (*Arctostaphylos* spp.), chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*), sticky monkey flower (*Mimulus aurantiacus*), poison oak, (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), and black sage (*Salvia mellifera*). The community is potential habitat for numerous protected plant species including (but not limited to) Pajaro manzanita, Hooker's manzanita (*Arctostaphylos hookeri*), and Monterey ceanothus (*Ceanothus cuneatus* var. *rigidus*), which occur in Manzanita Regional Park.

This community intermixes with coast live oak woodland. Much of maritime chaparral occurs in the Paradise Road/Manzanita Regional Park area where access is limited; therefore, these areas were mapped as large cells with many plant communities including the maritime chaparral/coast live oak woodland, maritime chaparral/coast live oak woodland/rural residential vegetation/non-native landscape trees, and maritime chaparral/coast live oak woodland/non-native landscape tree associations.

### **Coast Live Oak Woodland**

The coast live oak woodland occurs in the upper Moro Cojo Slough watershed. This community is typically associated with the mesic conditions of north-facing slopes, hillsides, and shaded ravines. The woodland intermixes with the maritime chaparral community on inland hills. This community is charac-

terized by an overstory of evergreen coast live oak trees (*Quercus agrifolia*) that reach a height of approximately 25 feet. The dense understory contains herbs and shrubs such as coffeeberry (*Rhamnus californica*), California blackberry, poison oak and bracken fern (*Pteridium aquilinum*). In rural areas, the understory has been disturbed such that non-native grassland has replaced, or intermixes with, native herbs and shrubs. This community has been fragmented by residential development, roads, and farming activities in this area. Rural residential land uses in the upper watershed area east of Castroville Boulevard result in disturbed coast live oak woodland associations that are mapped as non-native grassland/coast live oak woodland/rural residential vegetation/ruderal, coast live oak woodland/rural residential vegetation, or coast live oak woodland/rural residential vegetation/non-native landscape trees.

### **Coyote Brush Scrub**

Coyote brush scrub occurs on hillsides in the upper watershed of Moro Cojo Slough. The density of the community can range from thickets of dense impenetrable shrubs to scattered shrubs interspersed with herbaceous species. The community is dominated by coyote brush shrubs and poison oak. Although coyote brush is a native shrub species, it tends to invade disturbed land; therefore, most areas of coyote brush scrub have resulted from previous land clearing practices. One large disturbed area is mapped as non-native grassland/coyote brush scrub. Other areas that are dominated by coyote brush scrub also have other non-native vegetation components such as the coyote brush scrub/ruderal, coyote brush scrub/poison hemlock scrub, and coyote brush scrub/non-native grassland/ruderal associations.

### **Non-native Plant Communities**

**Ruderal.** Ruderal vegetation consists of native and non-native weed species that tend to invade disturbed areas such as roadsides. Ruderal vegetation can occur as understory vegetation or a component of another plant community (i.e., ruderal vegetation can be a component of non-native grasslands).

Ruderal vegetation is also associated with abandoned agricultural fields and vacant lots. In the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, ruderal vegetation consists of species such as wild radish, bristly ox-tongue (*Picris echioides*), wild geranium (*Malva parviflora*), horseweed (*Conyza canadensis*), and black mustard (*Brassica nigra*).

**Poison Hemlock Scrub.** The poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*) scrub occurs on berms and hills bordering Moro Cojo Slough channels west of Castroville Boulevard. This non-native community is dominated by poison hemlock, although additional non-native species such as wild radish (*Raphanus sativus*) also occur (these areas are mapped as poison hemlock scrub/ruderal). The berms also support coastal salt marsh vegetation; therefore, the vegetation maps depict cells of coastal salt marsh/poison hemlock scrub and coastal salt marsh/poison hemlock scrub/ruderal vegetation.

**Agricultural Land.** The agricultural land consists of mono-cultures of agricultural crops such as strawberry, artichoke and herbs. These fields associated have ruderal and herbaceous hydrophytic species within drainage channels.

**Rural Residential Vegetation.** This mapping unit includes areas that have been landscaped with native or non-native species, residential gardens and orchards, and the ornamental vegetation that is associated with residential homes.

**Non-native Landscape Trees.** The non-native landscape trees in the Moro Cojo Slough watershed includes stands of eucalyptus, as well as Monterey cypress and Monterey pine trees that have been planted

as ornamental trees. Large areas of non-native trees often have an understory of ruderal vegetation and are mapped as non-native landscape trees/ruderal.

## **PLANT SPECIES OF CONCERN**

There are 20 special status plant species with potential to occur within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. Most of these species are associated with the upland habitat of the upper watershed. Table 5-2 outlines the scientific and common name of each species, the habitat(s) where it is known to occur, and the State, Federal and CNPS listings.

Eight plant species of special concern were observed or have been reported to occur within the watershed of Moro Cojo Slough. Three of these species were observed during the 1993 field surveys. Gairdner's yampah was observed within the mixed grassland on the hillside between the mobile home park on Dolan Road and the slough during the 1993 survey. Hooker's manzanita and Pajaro manzanita were observed in the maritime chaparral community of the upper watershed.

Seven of the plant species of special concern have been reported to occur in Manzanita Regional Park including Hooker's manzanita, Pajaro manzanita, Monterey ceanothus, Monterey spineflower, Eastwood's goldenbush, small-leaved lomatium, and Gairdner's yampah (CNPS, 1988). It is likely that these species occur in other portions of the watershed with the maritime chaparral community, such as the area north of Manzanita Regional Park.

It is expected that many populations of rare, threatened or endangered plant species occur within the watershed, predominantly in upland plant communities. Due to access, timing and budget constraints, focused surveys for these populations were not conducted for this plan. Because of the potential for these species in suitable habitat areas, focused surveys for these species are recommended.

## **WILDLIFE RESOURCES**

Reconnaissance-level field surveys to assess existing wildlife habitat conditions were made during June, July, and September 1993, and January, February and March 1994. A literature review and consultation with knowledgeable people augmented the information base for wildlife resources in the study area. Although wildlife literature specific to the Moro Cojo Slough area is limited, research conducted in similar habitats (i.e., Salinas River environs, Elkhorn Slough) in the vicinity of the study area provided valuable reference.

The occurrence of rare, threatened, endangered and State species of special concern was researched for all habitats within the study area. The CNDDDB was accessed for information on the location of existing populations of sensitive wildlife species (CNDDDB, 1989). Limited, focused surveys for sensitive wildlife species were conducted in winter 1993/1994 to further document potential presence of sensitive species. Sensitive wildlife resources are portrayed on base maps (Figures 5-3 and 5-4). Appendix D, Wildlife Species Observed or Predicted to Occur in the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed, identifies which species were observed during the study and which are predicted.

## **WILDLIFE HABITAT**

The Moro Cojo Slough study area is a valuable resource to a great variety of wildlife species. The slough and its associated habitats, along with the Elkhorn Slough system, and the Pajaro and Salinas River mouth areas, are of regional importance to wildlife. Coastal sloughs and associated wetlands of the central California coast are well-known for their importance to migratory birds. Moro Cojo Slough

is one of the few remaining natural coastal wetlands in the Monterey Bay Area. Within the context of the Bay, much of the upper slough area serves as a focal point for wildlife activity. Much of the lower, more saline reaches of the slough have been reclaimed over the last 150 years, for agriculture and other human needs, yet still possess high wildlife value. In the local context, the slough is a focal point for wildlife activity (especially waterbirds), as the project area's natural habitats serve as a refuge for wildlife within the agricultural and urbanized environment of central Monterey Bay.

Studies focusing on the wildlife of Moro Cojo Slough are few and, for the most part, highly qualitative. Wildlife of the Elkhorn Slough, however, has been studied quite thoroughly for many decades and can serve as an important reference in predicting which wildlife species occur in the similar habitats of Moro Cojo Slough.

The Moro Cojo Slough study area is comprised of the following habitats: coastal salt/brackish-water marsh, coastal alkali grassland, non-native grassland, mixed grassland, central coast arroyo willow riparian forest, freshwater herbaceous wetland, coyote brush scrub, poison hemlock scrub, agricultural land, and maritime chaparral. The plant composition of these habitats is described in the vegetation section of this report.

Wildlife species diversity and abundance on the project site varies seasonally and annually, depending on the quantity and quality of resources present. While some wildlife species may be restricted to certain plant communities due to specific habitat requirements, many of them utilize several of the habitats present in the study area.

The slough's overall wildlife value results from its diversity of habitats, and location along the coast adjacent to the highly productive Monterey Bay. The wildlife value is also due to limited human disturbance resulting from limited access along much of the length of the slough. The slough is especially important for migratory waterbirds and shorebirds, and raptors. It may be assumed that of the more than 200 species of birds that may be seen at the Elkhorn Slough, many also make use of the resources in the Moro Cojo Slough area. Allen and Reilly (1980) observed a total of 14 shorebirds and three other bird species in a short survey. Hansen (1976) observed a similar number of species. The waterbird and shorebird total observed in the Elkhorn Slough represents approximately 56% of all the waterbird/shorebird species recorded in California (excluding oceanic species).

The wildlife value of Moro Cojo Slough is affected by intensive agricultural activities (past and present) which surround it, as well as urban development around much of the south and east sides of the upper reaches. Agricultural practices have impacted the wildlife value of the slough through removal of native upland habitat, limiting resources for wildlife.

### **Central Coast Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest**

This habitat type includes the willow riparian forest which occurs along much of the upper reaches of the slough as well as along most of the tributaries flowing into the slough. The riparian habitat of the study area supports a high diversity of terrestrial wildlife species, due to the availability of numerous cover, roosting, nesting, and foraging sites provided by the abundant plant growth and the stratified nature of the vegetation. The riparian woodland is especially valuable as a wildlife refuge from the largely unsuitable habitat conditions of the adjacent agricultural fields. In addition, the riparian habitat functions as a movement corridor for wildlife species between different habitats. Much of the riparian habitat in the study area, however, is highly fragmented, interrupted by agricultural and residential developments, which tends to reduce the complexity of the vegetative layering and, thus, the overall wildlife value.

**Amphibians.** Amphibians are an important ecological component of riparian systems (Brode and Bury 1985). The presence of water, abundant dead and fallen woody material, and the high productivity of insects associated with deciduous vegetation makes this habitat highly suitable for several amphibian species. The adjacent aquatic environment offers an important resource to many frogs, toads, and salamanders that require standing water to complete their life cycles. Dead and downed woody material provides cover which moderates temperatures during the dry season, and creates suitable microclimates for amphibians. The high productivity of insects provides amphibians with an abundant food source.

Some of the amphibian species expected to use this habitat in the study area include California slender salamander, arboreal salamander, Santa Cruz long-toed salamander (SCLTS), California tiger salamander, Pacific treefrog, bullfrog, and western toad.

**Reptiles.** The mesic environment of this habitat is suitable for a variety of moisture dependent/tolerant reptile species, as well as those species which occur in more xeric situations. The abundance of dead and downed woody material offers suitable cover and rest sites, while the abundance of insects provide an important food source. Small mammals and amphibians occurring in this habitat are important food resources for snakes.

Reptiles known or expected to occur in this habitat include western fence lizard, northern alligator lizard, southern alligator lizard, sharp-tailed snake, ring-necked snake, western terrestrial garter snake, common garter snake, and common kingsnake.

**Avifauna.** Birds are the most numerous and diverse faunal group within the riparian habitat. The dense and diversified vegetation provides cover, forage, and nesting and roosting sites. The adjacent estuarine habitat provides various bird species opportunities for foraging, drinking, and bathing. Riparian habitat is an essential resource for migratory birds, offering a resting area where fat reserves can be replenished before continuing long distance flights between wintering and breeding grounds. As a result of migratory and local movements, reproduction, and seasonally changing habitat requirements, bird species richness and diversity in this habitat varies from season to season.

Some of the common representative birds occurring in this habitat include green-backed heron, belted kingfisher, Anna's hummingbird, downy woodpecker, black phoebe, Pacific-slope flycatcher, Swainson's thrush, Wilson's warbler, warbling vireo, black-headed grosbeak, chestnut-backed chickadee, Bewick's wren, bushtit, California towhee, ruby-crowned kinglet, yellow-rumped warbler, yellow warbler, and song sparrow. A large-shouldered kite aggregation has been reported in the vicinity of the Trails End Mobile Manor; over 100 birds have roosted in the willow trees in the late winter of 1987 (M. Silberstein, pers. comm. for Charlie Vierra).

**Mammals.** Most of the mammalian species using this habitat in the study area are largely year-round residents. While some of these are abundant in non-riparian areas, many are dependent on riparian habitat for food, water, dispersal corridors, and escape and thermal cover (Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988). The moist ground conditions and the large population of invertebrates within the soil and woodland litter are especially suitable for insectivorous mammals such as shrews and moles. The vegetated corridor functions as an important passage for the movement of predatory mammals such as gray fox, weasel, and skunk. The shade and presence of water throughout the year make this habitat suitable as refuge for many species occurring in the surrounding xeric habitats.

Some of the mammal species of known or potential occurrence in this habitat include Virginia opossum, ornate shrew, vagrant shrew, broad-footed mole, brush rabbit, raccoon, striped skunk, red fox, gray fox,

long-tailed weasel, muskrat, dusky-footed woodrat, and deer mouse. The red bat may roost in this habitat.

### **Coyote Brush/Poison Hemlock Scrub**

This habitat supports a limited, but distinctive fauna. Coyote brush scrub is used by wildlife species that require dense, brushy habitats for cover and breeding. The interspersed grassy patches within the scrub vegetation create a diversified habitat structure and provide openings for species that forage in open areas adjacent to dense cover.

**Avifauna.** The dense vegetation is especially suitable for breeding bird species such as Bewick's wren, song sparrow, white-crowned sparrow, California towhee and wren-tit. The resident bird population is supplemented by migrant wintering species, such as fox sparrow, Lincoln's sparrow, white-crowned sparrow (migratory *Z. l. gambelii*) and golden-crowned sparrow. The abundance of wintering birds in this habitat creates optimal foraging conditions for American kestrel, merlin, Cooper's hawk and sharp-shinned hawk.

**Mammals.** Small mammals typical of this habitat include brush rabbit, California pocket mouse, deer mouse, brush mouse and house mouse, all of which are prey for raptors, bobcat, gray fox, coyote and long-tailed weasel.

### **Mixed/Non-native/Coastal Alkali Grassland**

The primary habitat type occurring on the project site is grassland vegetation. In the context of the project site, this vegetation type is an important component of the slough ecosystem. Grasslands provide an important buffer for the slough as well as habitat resources to wildlife of the slough.

The grasses and forbs typical of this community produce an abundance of seeds and attract numerous insects, thereby providing food for a variety of rodents, seed-eating birds and insectivores. These species form the prey base for large predators. Aerially-foraging species, such as bats and swallows occur in grassland habitats in search of flying insects.

**Amphibians.** Amphibian use of this habitat is limited due to its arid nature. A few species, such as SCLTS, California tiger salamander, Pacific treefrog and western toad may disperse into these habitats from nearby breeding sites and to forage, and use rodent burrows for shelter during the dry season.

**Reptiles.** Reptiles are common in non-native grassland habitats. The tall grasses and occasional scattered shrubs, provide excellent cover and support prey populations of insects and rodents. Rodent burrows provide additional refuge for snakes and lizards. The western fence lizard is the most common reptile in this habitat. Other species most likely to occur in this habitat include western skink, western yellow-bellied racer, gopher snake, common kingsnake, and western terrestrial garter snake.

**Avifauna.** Grassland habitats are used extensively by raptors, and granivorous and insectivorous birds. Commonly occurring raptors include northern harrier, red-tailed hawk, American kestrel, merlin and black-shouldered kite. Northern harriers are known to nest in grassland habitats throughout the region. Common passerine birds typical of this habitat include black phoebe, Say's phoebe, loggerhead shrike, barn swallow, savannah sparrow, house finch, lesser goldfinch, white-crowned sparrow and golden-crowned sparrow.

**Mammals.** The grasslands also provide food and cover for small rodents and rabbits. In turn, these mammals provide a prey base for larger predatory species. Representative mammals of this habitat include brush rabbit, black-tailed hare, Botta's pocket gopher, deer mouse, California meadow vole, western harvest mouse, striped skunk, gray fox, coyote and long-tailed weasel. Bats, such as little brown myotis and big brown bat, are expected to forage over this habitat.

#### **Freshwater Herbaceous Wetland**

Freshwater wetlands are considered one of the most productive wildlife habitat types in California (Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988). Wildlife species richness and abundance in wetlands are linked to the availability of water, thus wildlife use will vary as hydrologic conditions change. While many of the wildlife species frequenting wetland habitats are dependent upon their moisture regime and associated vegetation for survival, some species exploit the resources of these habitats without being intimately associated with the habitat. For example, bats and swallows forage over wetlands, but do not directly use the vegetation or aquatic habitat.

**Amphibians.** The freshwater herbaceous wetlands are especially suitable for amphibians due to their moist micro-climate and abundance of herbaceous plant growth, which provides cover and supports abundant invertebrate prey populations. These habitats may provide breeding habitat for aquatic-reproducing species, depending upon the availability of surface water. Representative amphibian species of these habitats include Pacific treefrog, western toad and California slender salamander, SCLTS, and California tiger salamander.

**Reptiles.** The moist micro-climate of these habitats is also suitable for a variety of reptiles. Small mammals, amphibians and invertebrates occurring in this habitat are important food resources for snakes such as western terrestrial garter snake, common garter snake, and common kingsnake.

#### **Coastal Salt/Brackish-water Marsh**

Coastal salt/brackish-water marsh habitat tends to be relatively uniform and simple, thus fewer niches for wildlife are available. Therefore, wildlife species richness (number of species) in this habitat is low. Moro Cojo Slough is unique among coastal estuarine systems in that full tidal influence has been largely eliminated by the construction of tide gates at the entrance to the slough at Moss Landing Road (Sandholdt Dam). This has severely limited the benthic communities typically found in tidally-influenced areas, and has allowed plant communities to grow closer to the water's edge, not restricted by limiting tidal influence (Hansen 1976). The salt/brackish-water marsh habitat, however, still plays an important role in the cycling of nutrients in the slough ecosystem. Thus the salt/brackish-water is integral to the ecology of the Moro Cojo Slough area.

Wildlife use of the salt marsh towards the mouth of the slough is limited due to the lack of tributary channels. The value of this habitat for wildlife varies depending upon local variation of the hydrologic regime and plant species composition. At high winter tides, salt water may intrude higher into the slough than is typical, creating brackish conditions in what is normally freshwater habitat. Low-lying areas adjacent to the slough become seasonally inundated, causing terrestrial wildlife to disperse to drier upland areas. Inundation, however, creates suitable conditions for waterbirds.

**Amphibians.** Amphibian use of this habitat tends to be limited due to the relatively high salinity. Amphibians do not breed in areas high in saline (Stebbins, 1985).

**Reptiles.** Reptile use of the coastal salt/brackish-water marsh is limited by the saline conditions. Reptiles from adjacent ruderal, grassland and riparian habitats may forage in the marsh. These species include common garter snake, western terrestrial garter snake, western aquatic garter snake, and gopher snake.

**Avifauna.** The vegetative structure of this habitat provides suitable cover and nest sites for a variety of birds, including shorebirds, raptors, waterbirds, and passerines. Northern harrier, mallard, cinnamon teal, gadwall, American avocet, black-necked stilt, song sparrow, and savannah sparrow are expected to breed in this habitat. American pipit and white-crowned sparrows are expected to occur in the brackish-water marsh during the non-breeding season. Barn owl, short-eared owl, and northern harrier forage in this habitat for small mammals and birds. During periods of inundation this habitat provides foraging sites for black-necked stilt, greater yellowlegs, marbled godwit, willet, long-billed curlew, whimbrel, herons, and egrets.

**Mammals.** The coastal salt/brackish-water marsh supports State Species of Special Concern mammals such as Monterey vagrant shrew, Monterey ornate shrew, and Salinas harvest mouse. These species are known to occur in wetland habitats in the Salinas River region (Williams 1986), and likely occur in the environs of Moro Cojo Slough. The vegetation of this habitat provides these species with seeds and vegetation for forage. Species which occur in the upland transition areas adjacent to marsh habitat include California vole, house mouse, and Norway rat. Gray fox, red fox, striped skunk, and raccoon forage in this habitat during low water periods.

### **Maritime Chaparral**

Central coast maritime chaparral, consisting largely of dense stands of chamise, toyon, lilac and manzanita, provide suitable habitat for a high diversity of terrestrial wildlife species. Due to the availability of numerous cover, roosting, nesting, and foraging sites provided by the abundant plant growth and the stratified nature of the vegetation, this habitat is of high value to numerous species of birds, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians.

Seeds and berries typically produced by this community attract numerous insects, thereby providing food for a variety of rodents, seed-eating birds and insectivores. These species form the prey base for large predators. Many of the bird and mammal species found in riparian and coyote brush/hemlock scrub habitats may also be expected to occur in maritime chaparral. Its dense vegetative structure provides ideal habitat for passerine bird species seeking foraging, nesting, cover, and resting sites. In addition, raptors such as Cooper's hawk and sharp-shinned hawk, specially suited for hunting in dense, heavily wooded areas, are often found foraging on birds and reptiles associated with this habitat.

Amphibian species which may migrate to or through this habitat in the non-breeding season include California slender salamander, SCLTS, California tiger salamander, Pacific treefrog, and western toad.

### **Agricultural/Grazing Land**

Much of the terrain surrounding Moro Cojo Slough has been reclaimed over the last two centuries for agricultural and/or cattle grazing purposes. This land use pattern is highly detrimental to the land's value to wildlife. Natural plant communities are replaced with row crops, providing limited seasonal use for a few insectivorous and granivorous species. Several of the previously-farmed parcels within the study area, however, have lain fallow for a number of years, substantially increasing in value to wildlife over that time. Agricultural land may attract large numbers of granivorous birds during some parts of the year, while grazed parcels have substantially lower value to wildlife. Winter flooding is likely to occur on ag-land in parts of the study area, creating seasonal wetlands suitable as migration stopovers for water-

fowl and other birds. For the much of the year, however, growing season activities such as plowing, fertilizing, seeding, etc., greatly diminish its value to wildlife.

During periods of field rotation or other times of disuse, agricultural fields become highly suitable foraging habitat for a variety of insect and seed-eating birds, mammals and reptiles. Blackbirds, sparrows, starlings and finches and most commonly associated with fallow ag-lands, and raptors such as black-shouldered kite, American kestrel, northern harrier, and merlin are typically found foraging here as well. Mammal species commonly found in association with ag-lands include western harvest mouse, ornate shrew, broad-foot mole, and Botta's pocket gopher. Reptiles such as western fence lizard, western skink, western terrestrial garter snake and gopher snake may also be found foraging in these temporary habitats. Amphibian species such as California slender salamander, SCLTS, California tiger salamander, Pacific treefrog, and western toad may migrate to or through this habitat during non-breeding seasons to seek shelter in rodent burrows.

### **WILDLIFE SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN**

The study area supports use by an impressive array of sensitive wildlife species. Thirty-nine species classified as Federally or State endangered or threatened, candidates for endangered or threatened status, or State species of special concern have been recorded or are expected to occur in the study area. Ten of these have only occurred occasionally, but twenty three are known to make significant use of the study area (Table 5-3). Four additional species which make significant use of the study area do not have listed, candidate, or special concern status, but are still considered "sensitive" by the CDFG (denoted by "\*" on Table 5-3). Of the species listed, the study area has regional importance for: California brackish-water snail, SCLTS, California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, California brown pelican, osprey, northern harrier, peregrine falcon, snowy plover, elegant tern, Caspian tern, short-eared owl, Monterey ornate shrew, and Salinas harvest mouse.

The 14 sensitive species known to occur in the study area, but not listed on Table 5-3 are: (1) occasional, uncommon or rare migrants and winter visitors (e.g., ferruginous hawk, white-faced ibis); (2) species that utilize aerial habitat (e.g., black swift); or (3) have been recorded only 1-3 times (e.g., California clapper rail). These species do not utilize the study area significantly, and, as for the clapper rail, suitable habitat may not be present. Sensitive species in this category include common loon, white-faced ibis, southern bald eagle, golden eagle, prairie falcon, clapper rail, sandhill crane, mountain plover, California least tern, black skimmer, burrowing owl, black swift, purple martin, and tricolored blackbird.

A description of the status and pattern of occurrence for sensitive wildlife species known or expected to occur in the study area, not presented below, are depicted on Figures 5-5 through 5-8, and presented in Appendix E.

#### **California Brackishwater Snail**

The California brackishwater snail is a Federal Candidate 2 species for listing. In the study region it is known to occur toward the mouth of Moro Cojo Slough (Kellogg, 1980) on both sides of the Highway 1 bridge. Focused studies conducted for this plan documented the species occurrence in the lower slough. Please refer to the Aquatic Resources section of this document for detailed information on this species (pages 5-18 to 5-19).

### **Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander (SCLTS)**

The SCLTS is one of five subspecies of long-toed salamanders found in the western United States. It was discovered in 1954 (Russell and Anderson, 1956). Typical of salamanders in the family *Ambystomatidae*, SCLTS is thought to spend most of the year underground. Various terrestrial habitats are used, including riparian woodland, coastal scrub, and live oak woodland. Adult SCLTS migrate from upland refugia to temporary ponds during fall and winter rains (generally during November through February) in order to breed. Overland movements are generally limited to rainy nights. Individuals have been documented to travel about 0.8 miles, with vegetated drainages being favored as migration pathways (Reed, 1978). Males usually precede females to the breeding site. Additional adults may continue to immigrate while post-breeding adults are emigrating. In addition, juveniles typically emigrate from lowlands when rainfall allows.

Mating and egg-laying peak in January and February. Eggs mature and hatch in 30-45 days into gilled larva. Larva grow, develop legs, resorb gills, develop lungs, and transform into juveniles in May or June as the ponds are drying up. Adults are known to live at least five years (Bowler, 1977).

SCLTS was listed as endangered by the USFWS in 1967, one of the first species to be listed under this new legislation. In 1971 it was protected in the State of California by the California Species Preservation Act (subsequently the California Endangered Species Act). A Recovery Plan was published by the USFWS in 1977, followed by a revised Recovery Plan that was approved by the USFWS in 1986, but has not yet been published (Ruth 1988).

There are seven known breeding sites for this subspecies, all clustered in coastal areas of southern Santa Cruz and northern Monterey Counties. These sites are: Ellicott Pond, Valencia Lagoon, Seascape Pond, "Calabasas Pond", McClusky Slough, Bennett/Struve Slough, and upper Moro Cojo Slough. During a 1990 study, four individuals were captured by Dr. Stephen Ruth in several parts of the slough east of Castroville Boulevard.

The first specimen of the SCLTS in the area was identified on January 29, 1978 by Mr. Earnest Groves (Reed 1978). Subsequent field investigations further confirmed the presence of the species in a wetland swale at the end of Shaffi Lane, near the intersection of Castroville Boulevard and Meridian Road, and in several other locations in the headwater areas of Moro Cojo Slough. In 1990, Dr. Stephen Ruth conducted a drift fence study on a parcel north of the high school (ABA, 1990) in which he caught four long-toed salamanders. These may be representative of a much larger metapopulation occurring in the upper Moro Cojo watershed.

### **California Tiger Salamander**

The California tiger salamander is a State species of special concern and a Category 2 candidate for Federal listing as threatened or endangered. Tiger salamanders primarily occur in valley floor and foothill grasslands, and open oak woodland and savannah. Adults utilize rodent burrows for refuge during the non-breeding season. They use aquatic habitat for reproduction, migrating to breeding sites during the rainy season from November to January (Stebbins, 1985). Tiger salamanders move overland up to one-half mile to quiet water of ponds, reservoirs, lakes, temporary rain pools, and occasionally streams. The larvae take 3-4 months to transform into adults, thus the species requires reliable sources of water. The reasons for this species' decline in California include loss of habitat, the introduction of predatory non-native fishes, and the use of larval forms as fishing bait (Stebbins, *ibid.*).

Potential breeding habitat for tiger salamanders exists in many of the freshwater areas of the slough east of Castroville Boulevard. The Arizona sub-species, considered a major competitor of the California tiger salamander, was documented in the study area in 1990 (ABA, 1990). Documentation of the California sub-species is largely limited to anecdotal accounts, which include observations along Meridian Road and near the intersection of Castroville Boulevard and Highway 156.

### California Red-legged Frog

The California red-legged frog is a State species of special concern and was listed as threatened by the USFWS in 1996. The red-legged frog occurs west of the Sierra Nevada-Cascade crest and in the Coast Ranges along the entire length of the State. Red-legged frogs are found in quiet pools along streams, in marshes, and ponds. They are closely tied to an aquatic environment, and favor intermittent streams which include: areas with water >0.7 meters deep, emergent or shoreline vegetation, and a lack of introduced bullfrogs (*Rana catesbeiana*) and predatory non-native fishes. Red-legged frogs are generally found on streams having a small drainage area and low gradient (Hayes and Jennings, 1988). Ponds with suitable vegetative cover are also used by this species. This species' reproductive season spans January to March (Stebbins, 1962). Females deposit 2,000-4,000 eggs on submerged vegetation at or near the surface.

Much of this species' habitat has undergone significant alterations in recent years, leading to extirpation of many populations. Other factors contributing to its decline include its former exploitation as food, water pollution, and predation and competition by the introduced bullfrog and green sunfish (Moyle, 1973; Hayes and Jennings, *ibid.*).

Potentially suitable habitat for this species exists in much of the freshwater ponded habitat adjacent to the slough east of Castroville Boulevard and south of Meridian Road. Dr. Stephen Ruth (ABA, 1990) first documented the presence of this frog in the watershed. Although only one individual was observed, it is likely a larger metapopulation exists in the freshwater habitats of upper Moro Cojo Slough. One particularly noteworthy site was identified in February of this year, 1.1 miles east of the intersection of Meridian and Castroville Boulevard, a few meters south of Meridian Road. Many individuals, mostly yearlings, were observed in a seemingly perennial, levee-retained pond. This is potentially a major (> 500 individuals) breeding location for this species in the bioregion.

### Southwestern Pond Turtle

The southwestern pond turtle is a Federal Candidate 2 species for listing, and a State species of special concern. It occurs in permanent freshwater ponds, lakes, marshes, and rivers. Pond turtles are aquatic, but often bask in the sun on a partially submerged log or rock, or on the shoreline. During the breeding season, females leave the water to dig earthen cavities for deposition of eggs, usually along a sunny portion adjacent to the water's margin (Stebbins, 1954). Their populations are threatened with habitat alteration or loss due to urban and agricultural development. The southwestern pond turtle may occur in the freshwater ponds east and northeast of Castroville Boulevard.

### California Linderiella

California supports 21 species of fairy shrimp, seven of which are unique to the state. USFWS has proposed four species of fairy shrimp for endangered status: the longhorn, Conservancy, vernal pool, and California linderiella fairy shrimp. The California linderiella is the only fair shrimp species known to occur in the Monterey Bay region.

Fairy shrimp live in ephemeral, freshwater aquatic habitats, such as vernal pools, rock outcrop pools, swales, and ponds. They are adapted to the temporary presence of water and to a species-specific set of environmental parameters (e.g., salinity, temperature, and alkalinity). Adult fairy shrimp typically occur between late October and late April.

The vernal pool near the junction of State Highway 156 and Castroville Boulevard is considered potential habitat for fairy shrimp (Jones & Stokes Associates, 1994). No fairy shrimp were found during the reconnaissance-level field survey; however, the survey was conducted outside the time when fairy shrimp are likely to occur. A complete survey during the appropriate period (from the first fall rains until the vernal pool is dry) using USFWS survey protocol would be required to conclusively determine the presence or absence of fairy shrimp at this site (Jones & Stokes Associates, 1994)

### **PROBLEM WILDLIFE SPECIES**

Two mammal species which inhabit nearly all of the habitats in the watershed are the Norway rat (*Rattus norvegicus*) and the red fox (*Vulpes regalis*). Both are non-native, efficient predators. The red fox is known to be responsible for declines in California clapper rail populations in the San Francisco Bay (C. Striplen, pers. obs., 1992), and most likely played a large part in the extirpation of clapper rails in Elkhorn and Moro Cojo Sloughs. Other sensitive species known to suffer population declines in the presence of red foxes include the California least tern, Caspian tern, and western snowy plover. Recent predator management plans indicate that breeding bird populations can recover if predation by red foxes is controlled in nesting areas (USFWS, 1991). The red fox, a non-native species present within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, has been reported to prey upon burrowing owls; red fox predation may be a factor in the distribution and abundance of burrowing owls within the watershed.

The Norway rat has long been known to depredate the eggs of ground-nesting birds, but has only recently been identified as a potentially significant threat to these birds' populations (Striplen 1992). Norway rats are known to be extremely destructive to avian populations in the San Francisco Bay and may have a strong presence in the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. These predators are extremely difficult to control, as they are numerous and widespread, and any use of poisons or rodenticides may jeopardize populations of sympatric special status small mammals, (i.e., Monterey ornate shrew, Monterey harvest mouse).

Feral dogs and cats are expected to occur within the watershed, but were not observed during the field surveys. Feral dogs, especially if formed into packs, can be efficient hunters of native wildlife. Feral cats are efficient hunters, especially of ground-nesting songbirds and amphibians. Domestic dogs and cats, if unsupervised and/or allowed to periodically roam, can impact native wildlife through predation and habitat disturbance. It is expected that the impact of feral/domesticated dogs and cats is highest in the upper watershed within/adjacent to rural residential development.

### **FISHERIES AND AQUATIC RESOURCES**

The Habitat Restoration Group and Applied Marine Sciences reviewed existing data on the fisheries and brackishwater snail resources of Moro Cojo Slough. Field investigations were conducted for the brackishwater snail. Water chemistry measurements were not taken as part of this study.

### **FISHERIES RESOURCES**

Anecdotal accounts indicate that large numbers of red-tailed sea perch (surfperch), steelhead and other fish populated Moro Cojo Slough from before the turn of the century until the 1930's (Hansen, 1976).

ABA Consultants (1988) relates the story of a local resident, Bill Lehman, who as a boy in 1910, had the task of removing from his father's hunting boats steelhead which jumped into the boats at night. Mr. Lehman also reported the presence of numerous steelhead, striped bass and salmon throughout the slough as late as the 1940's (ABA, 1988). On the basis of historical reports it is evident that Moro Cojo Slough once supported a diverse assemblage of fish including an important salmonid resource. Steelhead have apparently been extirpated from the Moro Cojo watershed within the past 50 years.

In 1976, sampling with a beach seine resulted in the capture of only two fish species, threespine stickleback and long-jaw mudsucker. According to ABA Consultants (1988) seven fish species were either known or could be expected to occur in Moro Cojo Slough as of 1981: yellowfin goby, jacksmelt, arrow goby, gambusia, threespine stickleback, long-jawed mudsucker and staghorn sculpin. The 1988 report also notes that the fish populations of the slough are "very poorly sampled and known."

ABA Consultants (1991) sampled Moro Cojo Slough by beach seine on April 7, 1990, resulting in the capture of three species, arrow goby, threespine stickleback and staghorn sculpin. The location of the sampling sites were from east and west of the Moss Landing Road tidegates. The predominant fish captured was the arrow goby (on both sides of the tide gates); one stickleback was captured on the east side and one sculpin on the west side (ABA, 1991).

The 1991 report by ABA Consultants also includes a brief discussion of water chemistry within the slough as measured on October 3, 1990. At that time, water temperature was "normal" throughout most of the slough, approximately 16-18°C. The report continues,

*"However, on the east site of Highway 1 the bottom 10-20 cm of water was much warmer, around 25°C. This odd temperature inversion is probably the result of warm surface water warming, evaporating, becoming hypersaline and therefore heavier, then sinking to the bottom. Field estimates of salinity indicated hypersaline water, probably 40 ppt. The temperature inversion and hypersalinity are manifestations of the lack of mixing currents."*

Please refer to the water quality section for a more complete analysis of water quality data collected by the Elkhorn Slough Foundation.

The ABA report calls the finding of 25°C water temperature in the bottom 10-20 cm as an "odd temperature inversion". In fact, if a salt water lens was present on the bottom of the slough and no wind mixing had occurred, significantly higher temperatures within the lens would be the normal condition (Smith, 1990). The ABA report continues with the statement that the "estimates" of salinity indicated a hypersaline condition, probably 40 ppt. The method used to "estimate" salinity is not specified. It is unclear if salinity was actually measured. Based on the data provided, the temperature and salinity regime of Moro Cojo Slough cannot be reliably assessed.

### **Fish Species of Special Concern**

The tidewater goby, a Federal endangered species, may potentially inhabit the lower slough. The species has been recorded from nearby Bennett Slough; suitable habitat may be present in the slow water areas of Moro Cojo Slough (areas downstream of SPRR). The species may have been present in the slough prior to the installation of the tidegates at Moss Landing Road and/or may have entered the slough through the tide gates (Smith, 1994, pers. comm.). Although not recorded in previous sampling efforts, additional sampling of the slough is necessary to determine presence or absence of the species. Depending upon results of the sampling and a more detailed analysis of suitable habitat conditions, introduction of the species into the slough may be possible (under consultation with USFWS).

## AQUATIC RESOURCES

The California brackishwater snail, *Tyronia imitator*, the only aquatic resource addressed, was evaluated through a qualitative survey of Moro Cojo Slough and other locations in the Elkhorn Slough area, using a hand-held dip net to obtain samples of sediment and algae. The sediment and algae were gently washed in the net and discarded to obtain the snails.

The brackishwater snail has been reported in immergent portions of coastal lagoons, marshes, and sloughs from Sonoma County to San Diego County (Kellogg, 1980, 1985; Taylor, 1978). In these locations it is found associated with fine sediments (i.e., fine sand to mud, although this fine material may overlay gravel) and near-bottom algae, where it feeds on both sediment deposits and epiphytic material (Kellogg, 1985). The brackishwater snail is apparently tolerant to a wide range of salinities. For example, Kellogg (1980, 1985) found it occurring in salinities ranging from 4-32 ppt. Moreover, he found the snails at locations which experience large annual salinity ranges (e.g., <10- >50 ppt, 4-44 ppt, and 0.10-0.35 ppt). Embryos are retained through direct development (Kellogg, 1980; Taylor 1978) which probably limits dispersal to the passive transport of juveniles and adults caught in the surface tension of water and on the feet and feathers of waterfowl (Kellogg, 1985).

The brackishwater snail was nominated for endangered status (Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 8, January 12, 1977), although this status has not yet been approved. It is currently listed as a Category 2 taxon (Federal Register, Vol. 56, No. 225, November 21, 1991). Category 2 taxa are those for which listing as endangered is possibly appropriate, but for which conclusive data concerning vulnerability and threat are not available. The restriction of the brackishwater snail to coastal wetlands makes it vulnerable to habitat destruction associated with coastal development. Historically, it was reported from 34 locations in California, but by 1979 could be found at only 13 sites, including Bennett Slough, Parson's Slough, and Moro Cojo Slough (Kellogg, 1980, 1985). Although Parson's Slough was not surveyed during the present work, no living brackishwater snail could be found in Bennett Slough. Dead shells were, however, found in a tidal pond on the south side of Bennett Slough, west of Jetty Road. The disappearance of the snail from Bennett Slough was probably associated with changes in hydrodynamic conditions resulting from increased tidal exchange after installation of additional culverts under Jetty Road performed when damage from the Loma Prieta earthquake was repaired (M. Silberstein, pers. comm.).

Historically, the brackishwater snail has been reported in Moro Cojo Slough from both sides of Highway 1 (ABA Consultants, 1991; TAMS/Dames & Moore, 1991; Kellogg, 1980). ABA Consultants (1991) and Kellogg (1980) estimated densities of the snail to be at least 10,000/meter<sup>2</sup> in the vicinity of Highway 1.

The survey of Moro Cojo Slough in January 1994 revealed the brackishwater snail to be widespread. It was found from approximately half-way between Moss Landing Road and Highway 1, east to the point where tidal exchange ceases, just upstream of the mouth of Castroville Slough. Isolated ponds of brackishwater found upstream from this point did not contain any snails. Although no estimates of densities were made, the snails were most common just east of Highway 1, associated with a filamentous green alga that filled the water column and formed floating mats. The alga may be a species of *Enteromorpha* (M. Foster, pers. comm.).

At nearly all of the locations in Moro Cojo Slough where the brackishwater snails were found, it was associated with algae and depositional environments. Only in very shallow water at the eastern-most extent of its distribution in Moro Cojo Slough did the snail occur on a firm sediment bottom without nearby algae. At locations from just east of Highway 1 to the western-most site where it was observed, these algae consisted of *Ulva* and *Enteromorpha* that were in contact with the bottom. At several

locations, separate samples collected from the centers and outer edges (i.e., toward mid-channel) of algal clumps yielded different densities of snails, with very few being found on the outer edges, relative to the numbers found in the centers of clumps. These apparent differences in densities over spatial scales of < 1 meter may suggest predation effects on distribution of the snail, as proposed by Kellogg (1985). This spatial variation, when considered with the apparent disappearance of the brackishwater snail from Bennett Slough when tidal currents increased, as well as the presence of the snail in depositional environments, also substantiates the association of the brackishwater snail in Moro Cojo Slough with areas characterized by very low water velocities.

This study suggests that the distribution of the brackishwater snail in Moro Cojo Slough, although extensive in January 1994, may vary substantially according to seasonal freshwater flows into the slough and the presence of suitable algal substrata. The extent of migration between populations in Moro Cojo Slough and other possible populations in the region is presently unknown, so the importance of Moro Cojo Slough as a local habitat for this species can only be inferred from the snail's present widespread occurrence there and the historical reduction in living populations of the species along the California coast.

#### **Aquatic Species of Management Concern**

The Northern Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District has authority to treat wetlands within the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed in order to reduce mosquito populations and therefore, and vector-borne disease transmission. The District has treated the lower slough area for both saltwater and freshwater mosquitos. Treatment can occur from January through August (depending upon rainfall, salinity and level of water in the slough) and has included oil and organophosphate. Approximately 2,000 acres were treated in 1993 during 11 treatments (Northern Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District, pers. comm., 1993).

**Table 5-1. Plant Communities within the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed**

<b>COMMUNITY TYPE</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIVE EXAMPLE</b>
<b>WETLANDS</b>	
Coastal Salt Marsh	Moro Cojo Slough and Highway 1
Coastal Salt Marsh/Seasonal Wetland	North of Dolan Road
Coastal Salt Marsh/Poison Hemlock Scrub	Berms of Castroville Slough
Coastal Salt Marsh/Poison Hemlock Scrub/ Ruderal	Berm east of Southern Pacific railroad tracks
Freshwater Marsh	Upper slough east of Castroville Blvd.
Freshwater Marsh/Seasonal Wetland	North of Highway 1 and Molera Road junction
Freshwater Herbaceous Wetland - Seasonal Wetland	Ponds along Dolan Road
Freshwater Herbaceous Wetland - Perennial Wetland	Desmond Road area
<b>RIPARIAN</b>	
Central Coast Willow Riparian Forest	Ponds along Paradise Road
Central Coast Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest/ Perennial Wetland	Desmond Road area
Central Coast Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest/ Freshwater Marsh	Upper slough east of Castroville Blvd.
<b>GRASSLANDS</b>	
Coastal Alkali Grassland	Moro Cojo Slough east of Highway 1
Wet Coastal Alkali Grassland	East of Highway 1 along slough
Mixed Grassland	Near mobile home park off Dolan Road
Non-native Grassland	Dolan Road vicinity
Coastal Alkali Grassland/Non-native Grassland	East of Highway 1, south of slough
Non-native Grassland/Coyote Brush Scrub	North of Dolan Road
Non-native Grassland/Non-native Landscape Trees	Between Highway 1 and Harbor
Non-native Grassland/Rural Residential Vegetation	Along Dolan Road
Non-native Grassland/Rural Residential Vegetation/Ruderal	Along Dolan Road
Non-native Grassland/Rural Residential Vegetation/Non-native Landscape Trees	Junction of Castroville Blvd. and Elkhorn Road

Table 5-1. Plant Communities within the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed (Cont'd.)

COMMUNITY TYPE	REPRESENTATIVE EXAMPLE
Non-native Grassland/Coast Live Oak Woodland/ Rural Residential Vegetation/Ruderal	Between Meridian Road and Castroville Blvd.
<b>MARITIME CHAPARRAL</b>	
Maritime Chaparral/Coast Live Oak Woodland/ Rural Residential Vegetation/Non-native Landscape Trees	Between Paradise Road and Castroville Blvd.
Maritime Chaparral/Coast Live Oak Woodland/ Non-native Landscape Trees	North of Paradise Road
<b>COAST LIVE OAK WOODLAND</b>	
Coast Live Oak Woodland/Rural Residential Vegetation	Junction of Paradise Road and Castroville Blvd.
Coast Live Oak Woodland/Rural Residential Vegetation/Non-native Landscape Trees	Between Meridian Road and Highway 156
<b>COYOTE BRUSH SCRUB</b>	
Coyote Brush Scrub/Ruderal	Along Blackie Road
Coyote Brush Scrub/Poison Hemlock Scrub	By WaterTek facility
Coyote Brush Scrub/Non-native Grassland/ Ruderal	West of Paradise Road
<b>NON-NATIVE PLANT COMMUNITIES</b>	
Ruderal	Along Castroville Blvd.
Poison Hemlock Scrub/Ruderal	Ponds east of Castroville Blvd.
Agricultural Lands	North of Highway 1 and Molera Road junction
Rural Residential Vegetation	Homes along Moss Landing Road
Non-native Landscape Trees	Along Moss Landing Road

Table 5-2. Plant Species of Concern Known or Have Potential to Occur within the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed

Species Name Common Name	Habitat	State List	Federal List	CNPS List
<i>Arctostaphylos hookeri</i> ssp. <i>hookeri</i> Hooker's manzanita	Chaparral coastal scrub, closed-cone pine forests	-	-	1B
<i>Arctostaphylos pajaroensis</i> Pajaro manzanita	Chaparral	-	C2	1B
<i>Arctostaphylos pumila</i> sandmat manzanita	Chaparral, coastal dunes, closed- cone pine forest	-	C2	1B
<i>Calyptridium parri</i> var. <i>hesseae</i> Santa Cruz Mountains pussypaws	Chaparral	-	-	3
<i>Ceanothus cuneatus</i> var. <i>rigidis</i> Monterey ceanothus	Coastal scrub, closed cone pine forest	-	C2	4
<i>Chorizanthe pungens</i> var. <i>pungens</i> Monterey spineflower	Coastal dunes	-	FT	1B
<i>Clarkia lewisii</i> Lewis' clarkia	Chaparral, coastal scrub, woodland	-	-	4
<i>Cordylanthus rigidus</i> ssp. <i>littoralis</i> seaside bird's-beak	Chaparral, coastal scrub, closed-cone forest, woodland	CE	C1	1B
<i>Ericameria fasciculata</i> Eastwood's goldenbush	Maritime chaparral, coastal scrub, closed-cone forests	-	C2	1B
<i>Friillaria liliacea</i> fragrant fritillary	Coastal scrub, grasslands	-	C2	1B
<i>Holocarpha macradenia</i> Santa Cruz tarplant	Coastal prairie, grasslands	CE	C1	1B
<i>Lomatium parvifolium</i> small-leaved lomatium	Closed-cone forests	-	-	4
<i>Monardella undulata</i> var. <i>undulata</i> curly-leaved monardella	Chaparral, coastal scrub, coastal dunes	-	-	4
<i>Pedicularis dudleyi</i> Dudley's lousewort	Maritime chaparral, grasslands	CR	C2	1B
<i>Perideridia gairdneri</i> spp. <i>gairdneri</i> Gairdner's yampah	Grasslands, chaparral	-	C2	4
<i>Petunia parviflora</i> wild petunia	Margins of ponds in many commu- nities (chaparral, coastal scrub)	-	-	4
<i>Piperia yadonii</i> Yadon's piperia	Maritime chaparral, closed cone forests	-	C1	1B
<i>Potentilla hickmanii</i> Hickman's cinquefoil	Wet meadows, closed-cone forest	CE	C1	1B

Table 5-2. Plant Species of Concern Known or Have Potential to Occur within the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed (Cont'd.)

Species Name Common Name	Habitat	State List	Federal List	CNPS List
<i>Psilocarphus tenellus</i> var. <i>globiferus</i> round woolly marbles	Coastal dunes, vernal pools	-	-	4
<i>Stebbinsoseris decipiens</i> Santa Cruz microseris	Chaparral, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, broad-leaved upland forests	-	C2	1B

<sup>1</sup> State Listings: CE=Endangered, CR=Rare, CT=Threatened;

<sup>2</sup> Federal Listings: FE= Endangered, FT=Threatened, PE=taxa proposed to be listed as endangered, PT=taxa already proposed to listed as threatened, C1=Enough data on file to support listing, C1\*=Enough data to support listing but plant presumed extinct, C2=threat and/or distribution data insufficient to support listing, C2\*=threat and/or distribution data insufficient to support listing, presumed extinct, C3a=Extinct, C3b=Taxonomically invalid, C3c=Not threatened;

<sup>3</sup> CNPS Listing: List 1A=Plants presumed extinct, List 1B=Plants rare throughout their range and considered vulnerable due to limited habitat or low numbers individuals per population, List2=Rare, threatened or endangered in California, but common elsewhere, List3=Review list of species which may be rare, threatened or endangered but additional data is needed, List4=A watch list of species with a limited distribution which are not currently threatened.

<sup>4</sup> Species on CNPS Lists 1A, List 1B and List 2 are protected by Section 1901, Chapter 10 of the California Department of Fish and Game Code (Native Plant Protection).

**Table 5-3. Sensitive Wildlife Species Known or Predicted to Occur in the Moro Cojo Slough Study Area**

Species	Status	Occurrence	Habitat
California Brackishwater Snail	2	K	S
Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander	FE,SE	K	FP,G,WR,C
California Tiger Salamander	2,CSC	P	FP,G,WR,C
California Red-legged Frog	FT,CSC	K	FP,WR,C
Southwestern Pond Turtle	1,CSC	K	FP
Common Loon	CSC	K	S,FP
American White Pelican	CSC	K	FP,S
California Brown Pelican	FE,SE	K	S
Double-crested Cormorant	CSC	K	S
Great Blue Heron	*	K	S,MF,M,SM
Great Egret	*	K	S,MF,M,SM
Snowy Egret	*	K	S,MF,M,SM
White-faced Ibis	2,CSC	K	S,M,SM
Bufflehead	CSC	K	S,FP
Golden Eagle	CSC	K	G,CS
Southern Bald Eagle	FE,SE	P	FP
Black-shouldered Kite	*	K	M,G,WR,C
Northern Harrier	CSC	K	M,G,WR,C
Sharp-shinned Hawk	CSC	K	WR,C,CS
Cooper's Hawk	CSC	K	WR,C,CS
Osprey	CSC	K	S,FP
Merlin	CSC	K	FP,M,G,C
Prairie Falcon	CSC	K	G,CS
American Peregrine Falcon	FE,SE	K	S,MF,G,C
Greater Sandhill Crane	ST	P	G,M
Long-billed Curlew	CSC	K	MF,SM
California Clapper Rail	FE,SE	P	S,SM
California Gull	CSC	K	S,MF,FP
Elegant Tern	2, CSC	K	S,FP
Caspian Tern	*	K	S,FP
Forster's Tern	*	K	S,FP
Black Skimmer	CSC	P	S,MF

**Table 5-3. Sensitive Wildlife Species Known or Predicted to Occur in the Moro Cojo Slough Study Area (Cont'd.)**

Species	Status	Occurrence	Habitat
Short-eared Owl	CSC	K	M,G
Black Swift	CSC	P,a	G,WR,CS
Purple Martin	CSC	P,a	G,WR,CS
Bank Swallow	ST	P,a	G,WR,CS
Yellow-breasted Chat	CSC	P	WR,C
Willow Flycatcher	FSS,SCE	K	WR,C
Tricolored Blackbird	2,CSC	K	G,FP,M
Yellow Warbler	CSC	K	WR,C
Monterey Ornate Shrew	2,CSC	P	M,G
Monterey Harvest Mouse	*	P	M,G
California Linderiella (fairy shrimp)	1	P	FP

**STATUS KEY:**


- SE - Listed as Endangered by the State of California
- ST - Listed as Threatened by the State of California
- SCE - Candidate for listing as Endangered by the State
- FE - Listed as Endangered by the Federal Government
- 1 - Category 1 candidate for Federal listing as per U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 2 - Category 2 candidate for Federal listing as per the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- FSS - Federal Sensitive Species (U.S. Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management)
- CSC - California Department of Fish and Game Species of Special Concern
- \* - "Sensitive" species as per CDFG Special Animals 1990
- FT - Listed as Threatened by the Federal Government

**OCCURRENCE KEY:**

- K - Species of known occurrence
- P - Species of potential occurrence
- a - Expected to occur primarily as an aerial transient


**HABITAT KEY:**

- S - Slough/Aquatic Habitats
- MF - Mudflats
- FP - Freshwater Pond (open water and shoreline)
- M - Marsh (brackish or freshwater)
- SM - Salt Marsh (including shoreline)
- G - Grasslands
- WR - Willow Riparian
- CS - Coyote Brush Scrub
- C - Chaparral



The Habitat Restoration Group  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences


Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Plant Communities of Lower Watershed




**SYMBOL LEGEND**  
 DESCRIPTION OF SYMBOL

W1C	WATERWAY
W1D	WATERWAY
W1E	WATERWAY
W1F	WATERWAY
W1G	WATERWAY
W1H	WATERWAY
W1I	WATERWAY
W1J	WATERWAY
W1K	WATERWAY
W1L	WATERWAY
W1M	WATERWAY
W1N	WATERWAY
W1O	WATERWAY
W1P	WATERWAY
W1Q	WATERWAY
W1R	WATERWAY
W1S	WATERWAY
W1T	WATERWAY
W1U	WATERWAY
W1V	WATERWAY
W1W	WATERWAY
W1X	WATERWAY
W1Y	WATERWAY
W1Z	WATERWAY
W2A	WATERWAY
W2B	WATERWAY
W2C	WATERWAY
W2D	WATERWAY
W2E	WATERWAY
W2F	WATERWAY
W2G	WATERWAY
W2H	WATERWAY
W2I	WATERWAY
W2J	WATERWAY
W2K	WATERWAY
W2L	WATERWAY
W2M	WATERWAY
W2N	WATERWAY
W2O	WATERWAY
W2P	WATERWAY
W2Q	WATERWAY
W2R	WATERWAY
W2S	WATERWAY
W2T	WATERWAY
W2U	WATERWAY
W2V	WATERWAY
W2W	WATERWAY
W2X	WATERWAY
W2Y	WATERWAY
W2Z	WATERWAY
W3A	WATERWAY
W3B	WATERWAY
W3C	WATERWAY
W3D	WATERWAY
W3E	WATERWAY
W3F	WATERWAY
W3G	WATERWAY
W3H	WATERWAY
W3I	WATERWAY
W3J	WATERWAY
W3K	WATERWAY
W3L	WATERWAY
W3M	WATERWAY
W3N	WATERWAY
W3O	WATERWAY
W3P	WATERWAY
W3Q	WATERWAY
W3R	WATERWAY
W3S	WATERWAY
W3T	WATERWAY
W3U	WATERWAY
W3V	WATERWAY
W3W	WATERWAY
W3X	WATERWAY
W3Y	WATERWAY
W3Z	WATERWAY


2/96  
 705-01  
 Figure 5-1


























## CHAPTER 6 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

### METHODOLOGY

The agricultural areas within the study area were examined by first field checking the watershed area both by car and foot. Maps used were County parcel maps. The study began in June 1993 and continued at least once every two weeks through October 1993 to observe production patterns. In June, letters were written to all agricultural landowners explaining the project and asking for interviews. Approximately one-third of the land owners responded positively to this request.

Interviews were held with landlords and lessees of the properties. Most growers and landlords were very cooperative and were informative as to operations by other growers in the area. Discussions were also held with farm advisors, Agricultural Commissioner's office personnel, and SCS employees who had worked in the region. Information from marketing boards and other pertinent literature was reviewed to prepare an overview of each crop. Existing agricultural uses are portrayed on Figure 6-1.

### EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Moro Cojo Slough watershed area has approximately 5,000 acres in agriculture production, (i.e., artichokes, strawberries, flowers, vegetables and cattle operations). In the last 100 years this area has undergone major changes, allowing this type of production to occur. Diking, ditching and draining of lands occurred to allow the current row crops to be grown year-round. Before these land reclamation activities occurred, most of the ground was used for cattle, which could be moved to another location during the winter when water was present.

Land ownership has not greatly changed over the last 50 years; however, there have been changes in landowner involvement with agriculture. Most farmers are now working on leased land, with less participation by the landowners. This requires both landowners and lessees to be informed on both agricultural and environmental issues.

In the past 30 years, in the Salinas/Watsonville area, strawberry acreage has more than doubled. In 1965, the area had 4,470 acres in strawberries and in 1993 the acreage was 10,445. Thirty years ago this area had very few strawberries mainly due to the fact that in the 1960's strawberries were flood irrigated, which is not possible on the rolling hills found in the slough. Drip irrigation allowed the strawberry production to occur here and become the predominant crop.

#### Artichokes

**Crop Production.** The only company farming artichokes in this area is Sea Mist farms, also known as Cal-Choke. Currently they are farming approximately 875 acres of artichokes surrounding the slough area. These ranches are referred to by the names Blackie Road Ranch, Desante Ranch and the Salla Ranch.

Artichokes are a very labor-intensive crop with 40-50% of the costs going to labor for planting, harvesting, weeding, etc. Artichokes are available throughout the year with peak season occurring between March through May and again in October.

Artichokes are grown ideally in frost-free areas with cool foggy summers. Plantings usually last seven years. Plants are normally spaced 4 feet × 9 feet, amounting to about 1,450 plants/acre. Rows are placed according to natural land drainage to prevent plant loss in the winter.

Before planting, lime, fertilizer, and manure is added to achieve proper crop conditions. Artichokes are not a crop that heavy pre-plant fertilizers are needed. Planting occurs June-August, then plants are stumped (i.e., tops cut off) three times a year (December, January, and March), with first harvest occurring in March. Ditching occurs in the fields before the rains come, usually in October.

Irrigation normally occurs by sprinklers, but Sea Mist farms has begun experimenting with drip irrigation. The use of drip irrigation reduces the overall amount of water used and thereby may reduce the amount of salt delivered to each plant. The main reason for trying this is that the high salt content in water from wells less than 180 feet deep. Seawater intrusion has occurred in past years due to groundwater over-pumping. Salty water can burn the new roots, adversely affecting plant growth and production. Irrigations occur roughly twice a month in July and August, then once a month in the remaining months of the year. Each irrigation lasts about 12 hours. Agricultural users are still obtaining waters from wells within the 180-foot aquifer, however, salt water intrusion has occurred (see Chapter 4 for a discussion on the effect of sea water intrusion into the 180-foot, 400-foot, and 800-foot aquifers). A study in 1987 estimated that between 1998 and 2003, the 180-foot aquifer will no longer be usable. The MCWRA plans to deliver reclaimed water for irrigation to the Castroville area by 1997. A detailed description of the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Program is contained in Chapter 4.

**Soil Fertility and Pest Control.** Fertilization can occur through irrigation water or by broadcast. Usually three fertilizations occur from July - October. Common materials used are 10-5.5-.8 and 32% N. (N refers to actual amount of nitrogen in percentage, with the other two materials being phosphorous and potassium.) The first fertilization is the heaviest, at approximately 80 gallons/acre; the other two are relatively small at 20 gallons/acre. These fertilizations are used along with stumping to try to manipulate the plant to produce at different times.

Herbicides (weed killers) are used primarily after planting; then again to keep ditches clear in the winter time, so the water will drain off properly. Common materials used are Kerb and Princep pre-emergents (pre-emergent means "before the intended crop is planted"); they are used to kill grasses and weeds such as lambsquarters and purslane. Poast is a post-emergence (after planting) herbicide selectively used to kill grasses in November. Goal may also be applied at this time for weeds such as lambsquarter, malva, mustards and groundsel. Roundup™ is used in the winter time only in the drainage ditches with the use of quad runners.

The main problem insect is the Artichoke Plume Moth. The damage occurs to the buds when the newly hatched larvae bore into the developing buds. If no control measures are taken, the larvae can destroy 60% of the yearly crop. A normal field is treated 10-12 times. Even with these treatments 5-10% damage is common. One percent damage in a field results in a loss of at least \$35/acre.

When treating for the artichoke plume moth, sprays are designed to obtain maximum foliage coverage. Once the worm is inside the bud it can not be controlled. Control difficulty occurs also because generations (life cycles, egg-to-adult) overlap between July-February, with about four generations. Sprays will target both adults during egg-laying and newly emerged worms before they have a chance to bore into the buds.

Growers are beginning to use biological control agents in the field with a material called Biovector. Biovector is actually nematodes suspended in a solution that attack the artichoke plume moth larvae.

Field sprays with this have not worked well because the nematodes need moisture to move and stay alive, but a pre-plant dip (before the plant is put in the soil) shows good results. The crowns (center of plant with minimal roots and no top growth) are soaked in the Biovector with a cellulose solution to keep the nematodes alive longer. This can keep a newly planted field clean from the plume moth larvae for almost two months.

Other pesticides used for control include Supricide, Phosdrin, Furadan and Guthion used in the vegetative state, and Asana and Ambush used during bud production. Supricide and Asana are the most commonly used insecticides. These chemicals are broad-spectrum insecticides that will also kill aphids, leaf miners and thrips, other common insects in artichokes. None of these pesticides are known to leach into soil or water bodies. Also these pesticides may be fairly toxic when first sprayed, but break down quickly in sunlight. When snails and slugs become problems in wet years, a Sevin bait is used for control. A new pest, the Cribate weevil has become a problem with no real control measures available.

In recent years field mice and voles have also become a major problem. The main reason for the increase in activity is the removal from use of a material called Rozol. The main ingredient in this rodenticide is an anticoagulant in a bait form. In other words the animal has to ingest the material in sufficient amounts to cause death. This keeps it very target-specific. EPA is currently working on re-registration.

Other problems exist, such as the fungus called powdery mildew. Bayleton, a very effective fungicide, has just received registration for artichokes. If a particular market is targeted, Pro-Gibb 4%, a growth regulator, can be sprayed to accelerate maturity. This would be applied at bud initiation, approximately six weeks prior to harvest.

All pesticides are applied by an outside contracted company, Kleen-Globe. Kleen-Globe recommends the pesticides, does the actual application, and keeps records.

All the artichoke fields surrounding the slough had good planning before production occurred. Eighteen-foot drive roads are next to all the slough waterways. This would prevent irrigation runoff, fertilizer runoff, or pesticide over-spray from entering the slough. Also, no soil erosion problems were noted during the field surveys; however, the surveys were not conducted during the rainy season.

For artichoke growers to stay in production, the salt intrusion problem will have to be addressed. Concerns have also been raised as to the proper width of the ditches surrounding the fields leading to the slough. This will have to be addressed so cultivation practices do not encroach into the wetlands, causing drainage problems to the Moro Cojo Slough.

### Strawberries

**Crop Production.** Strawberries are, by far, the largest crop in production on the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. The berries are farmed off Elkhorn Road, Castroville Boulevard, Highway 156, and Blackie Road, for a total of approximately 2000 acres. All the ground is farmed by lessees, and not the property owners. Leases tend to be renewed on a yearly basis. Most farms are roughly 10-50 acres in size.

The area contains many varied soil conditions. However, the majority of strawberries in the watershed are farmed on fine sandy loams (Elkhorn and Santa Ynez soil types). These soils provide the best soil conditions for strawberry production since they fumigate well, accumulate less salt over the production year, make land preparation (i.e., beds drawn-up and cultivation) easier, and adapts better to frequent harvest and irrigation patterns. These soils are shallow (less than 36 inches) and are underlain by a soft sandstone which restricts drainage. The rolling hills also complicate tractor work, irrigation, and

harvesting and can accelerate runoff of winter rains if not managed properly. The average lease is \$700/acre.

Three varieties of strawberries are planted in this area. These are named Pajaro, Selva, and Seascape. Planting of Pajaro is in late August or September, and the Selva and Seascape are planted in October to December. Harvest begins in March, continuing until November, depending on variety and weather conditions.

Production differs greatly by grower but, in this area, 4,500 fresh market crates of strawberries per acre would be considered good. A grower may also pick freezer berries or juice berries that are used in processing. The same field will be picked an average of twice a week for the entire season.

Fields are normally only one year old because after one year, berry size and production falls drastically. If the grower keeps the same field for two years, the berries are small, and 80% will go to freezer or processing. About 40% of the strawberry fields in this area are second-year, a higher percentage than in most of California. Growers keep second-year fields only because they do not have the money to replant.

**Soil Fertility and Pest Control.** Before planting, many things occur to the soil. The soil must be worked well, disked to remove clods, and ripped to 18 inches in both directions for good drainage. Soil amendments such as manure, lime, gypsum, and formulated fertilizer like 6-20-20, may be spread at this time. Soil will then be irrigated to achieve proper soil moisture before fumigation.

Fumigation is necessary for high-yielding annual strawberry production. Currently in the industry the only material used is a combination of Methyl Bromide and Chloropicrin. This will kill weed seeds, nematodes, and plant diseases. After at least two weeks, the beds will be drawn up. Pre-plant fertilizer may be added. This is a slow release fertilizer which will carry the plant until the beginning of harvest, usually formulated at 20-7-12 and applied at 300-600 pounds/acre, depending on how much the grower wants. This is very expensive and the only reason a grower doesn't use this is due to the fact he may not be able to afford it. At this time the drip irrigation tape may be put in the field.

Planting occurs by hand placement in grooves dug by a tractor. Transplants come from northern California nurseries, so the plant has the proper number of cold hours to add vigor to the plant. Spacing differs by grower, but 10 inches across the bed and 12 inches down is common. The density per acre is roughly 20,000 plants/acre, depending on how many beds the grower can fit in one acre. Sprinklers are used at this point for initial root establishment. No more cultivation will occur in the field except maybe once to run bottoms in the furrows to break up the soil and kill weeds.

After the plants have established, irrigation is accomplished by drip irrigation methods. A thin plastic hose placed down the center of the bed with small holes every 8 inches. Frequency and amounts differ by water quality, soil type, and climate. Amounts for the entire year from planting to last harvest vary from 2.2-4.0 acre feet/acre.

In late winter or early spring the plants are mulched. Mulching is a placement of a clear or white plastic over the soil of the beds and between the plants. This warms the soil and keeps the temperature more consistent. Consistent temperature helps the fruit ripen more evenly. The plastic also keeps the fruit off the wet soil reducing rotten and dirty fruit. Mulching can be done just down the middle covering the irrigation tape, or can cover the entire bed. The entire-bed method is preferred but much more expensive.

Throughout the year fertilization will occur by liquid feed through the drip tape. Common materials used are AN 20, CAN 17, and mixes such as 15-10-30. This fertilization will occur once every week or 10 days until harvest ends. Less of this liquid fertilizer needs to be used if pre-plant was used during planting. Foliar fertilizers may also be applied for micro-nutrients added with pesticides in the spray tanks.

Strawberries are a heavily sprayed crop with over 20 regularly used pesticides. Most fields will be sprayed once or twice after planting and before the rains, then continually every 10-14 days when picking season begins. All spraying is done by the farmer himself to coincide with picking schedules. This large amount of spraying has greatly increased the resistance to pesticides by most diseases and insects found in strawberry fields.

Major insects found in strawberries are snails and slugs, aphids, lygus bugs, thrips, cyclamen mites, two-spotted spider mites, cutworms, leaf rolling caterpillars, and weevils. All of these can cause major problems but the most sprayed for are two-spotted spider mites and lygus bugs.

Mites are found under the leaf sucking out plant juices. Heavy mite populations can devastate a field lowering production and leaving leaves red. Four pesticides are commonly used to control mites. These are Omite, Vendex, Avid, and Kelthane. Vendex and Kelthane are not used much due to pest resistance. Omite can only be used under cool conditions or it will burn the plant. Avid is under a special registration, only allowing four sprays a year but resistance is still occurring. Avid is the safest material because the insect must ingest it to die, making it specific to mites.

Biological control is available to kill mites. These are called persimillis mites, which are mass-produced for releases, and work well if the grower does not spray pesticides or fungicides for two weeks. The cost for biological control is expensive, and therefore not greatly used in this area. Cost for the average Avid spray is \$50/acre and for a persimillis release, \$120/acre.

Lygus bugs feed on newly formed seeds causing deformed fruit. A type of tractor-mounted vacuum has been used for control of these but agreement is not reached on whether it works well. No other types of control exist except for pesticides. No grower in this area uses a bug vacuum. Depending on the year, a field may be sprayed as much as 10 times in the growing year. All pesticides used are broad spectrum, meaning they kill lots of insects in the field. This can sometimes create a problem because other insects such as mites can get out of control when predators are exterminated.

Pesticides used to kill lygus bugs include: Dibrom, Malathion, Phosdrin, and Lannate. Phosdrin and Lannate are dangerous materials, as they are very strong and can kill all insects in the field. Dibrom and Malathion can be used effectively in the field only on young lygus bugs. Heavy resistance occurs with all these pesticides.

Many plant diseases occur in strawberry fields. Gray mold or Botrytis and powdery mildew are the most important. Others include Phytophthora root rot, Bacterial leaf spot, and Anthracnose. Good, safe fungicides are available for control if the grower begins his sprays early. These include sulfur, Benlate, Captan, Dyrene, Rally, Rovral, and Thiram.

Due to the large number of lessee growers, many are not adequately informed by the landowners as to where the slough wetlands begin and how close to the slough they should be cultivating. Plants are often placed right next to waterways, resulting in sprays and fertilizers drifting into the slough. The growers may also not be capable of better growing techniques, due to lack of knowledge or money. Soil erosion is occurring from improper field layout and management. Due to varied terrain, some furrows run down

the slope rather than along the contour of the hill. However, the major source of erosion is from access roads on strawberry ranches. These roads receive the runoff from contoured furrows and severe gullying can occur if the road surface is not adequately prepared in the fall prior to the winter rains (SCS, 1984a; SCS, 1984b; SCS, 1994; Mountjoy, 1993). Relatively impervious sandstone underlying the fields contributes to accelerated runoff and erosion and can cause saturation of the soil and resulting pathogen growth. Most strawberry lands are replanted annually with no crop rotation or cover cropping to rest the soil. In the absence of soil improvements, uncontrolled erosion is expected to destroy the productivity of these lands within 20 years.

Interviews with five landlords and over 20 growers revealed that there is very little communication between the two groups. Over 90% of the strawberry farmers are Hispanic and speak little English. Some growers were actually subleasing from someone else and actually did not even know who owned the property.

### **Vegetable Production**

**Crop Production.** Vegetables are grown in many areas of the slough by different companies off of Highway 1 and Dolan Road. All of these companies farming vegetables have been farming in this area for decades and are excellent growers. Vegetables grown include brussel sprouts, broccoli, lettuce, spinach and cauliflower.

Chemicals used are similar to the ones used in the artichokes. The main concern with vegetable production is the high use of nitrogen fertilizers used. Sometimes amounts can be as high as 500 pounds/acre/year.

The current growers appear interested in protecting their water and soil quality. All growers employ the same techniques used by the artichoke growers, in that 18-foot roads surround the slough, and soil erosion is not a problem. One brussel sprout grower does not even farm about 20% of his ground because the ground tends to be too heavy and retain too much moisture.

All irrigation is by overhead sprinklers, or furrow irrigation on one flat piece. No major irrigation runoff was observed. All these growers cover-crop their fields once every two or three years to help build the soil back up to a good fertile level.

Off of Highway 1 on Washington Street in Castroville is a vegetable transplant nursery. This nursery grows vegetable plants for transplantation into fields. A ditch exists directly behind this nursery which feeds in to the slough. The irrigation water comes directly off the 4 inches of soil where the plants are grown. Irrigation is done a few times a day in small increments to avoid run off. Even though plants are highly fertilized and sprayed, excessive runoff has not been noted.

### **Cut Flower Production**

**Production.** Nurseries farming flowers occur near Amaral and Elkhorn Roads. Pesticides are seldom sprayed on flowers for two reasons: few pesticides are registered for use, and they are expensive considering the financial return of the product. Both growers stated they just plant different varieties if possible. All fields and greenhouses will be fumigated with Methyl Bromide and Chloropicrin before new plants are introduced to fight off nematodes and root rot. The pesticides that are used are safe materials with low toxicity such as Cycocel, Daconil, Diazinon, Dipel, Kelthane, Avid, Sulfur, Vendex, and Thiodan.

**Erosion.** Irrigations occur by sprinklers and drip tape. Fertilizers are placed in the water with the same concept as the strawberries but at small rates. Soil erosion problems were noted on the Amaral Road hillside. Topsoil runs off in large amounts in the winter time because proper ditching had not been done. This actually affected lower strawberry fields. The SCS has recently assisted with the problem, and it should be resolved.

The Amaral Road area has been farmed for many years and a hardpan exists approximately 3-4 feet below the surface.

#### **Cattle: Feedlots and Dairies**

Cattle operations are located off Highway 1, Highway 156, Dolan Road, and Castroville Boulevard. No person operating cattle operations was willing to talk about their operations for this study. The few people who did expressed the belief that all that would come of this study was a government agency stealing their land. All observations were made from adjoining properties; no trespassing occurred.

Two dairies are located in the watershed area, Moon Glow Dairy and Glen Dolan's dairy, both located off Dolan Road. Glen Dolan's dairy actually touches one arm of the slough, with no fence line separating it from water. Moon Glow Dairy is across the street; no direct drain activity or access to above-ground water in the slough was observed.

Basic dairy operations require barns where the cows will enter the facility 2 or 3 times a day to be milked. Other barns are used for holding and feeding. The milking barns are extremely clean areas constantly sprayed down with water to remove feces and urine. This area directly outside barns has been studied intensively to determine if leaching of nitrates occur. In both these dairies, manure was observed being taken off and spread to discourage this type of over-accumulation. Also these dairies were not overly crowded with cows.

Surrounding the barns, the cattle have pasture land to roam. Requirements per cow are roughly 500 square feet per animal as recommended by the University of California. All animals had well over this requirement.


Other observances noted are dumping of feed, such as hay or carrots on the pasture surrounding the dairies. These feeding areas were always rotated.

Overall these dairies are clean, well-managed operations. Due to rising costs of operations and no significant rise in milk prices over the past 15 years, it is surprising that these two are still in business. One reason may be that both dairy operations are also the landowners.


The other cattle operation is a feed lot and grazing operation, run by Pete Dennis. Mr. Dennis leases land that would not be suitable for growing row crops. Most of this land will flood in winter, so the cattle are moved to higher ground. Mr. Dennis only grazes a few hundred head of cattle.

Land problems from grazing were not observed. Less desirable weed species and brush have resulted from the lack of freshwater on the land.

Smaller grazing operations exist throughout the slough. These include homes on large acreages where a person may have livestock (i.e., horses, pigs, chickens, and cattle). This land is zoned for rural development. Although water quality problems could exist from some operations, this was not able to be addressed within the scope of the project.







## CHAPTER 7 LAND USE

### EXISTING LAND USE

The Moro Cojo Slough study area is under the primary jurisdiction of Monterey County, although the Monterey County School District and other special purpose districts, including MLHD, have limited jurisdiction in different portions of the area. A number of other jurisdictions also potentially affect land use within and adjacent to the study area. These agencies include the CCC, COE, USFWS, the California State Lands Commission and CDFG.

Ten land use categories exist within the Moro Cojo Slough study area: high/moderate density residential, rural residential, agricultural, wetlands, heavy industrial, light industrial, commercial and outdoor recreation (Figure 7-1). Most of the acreage within the study area is rural residential, agriculture and wetlands (Moro Cojo Slough), and with the exception of the Highway 1 corridor, the region in general reflects a rural low density and agricultural character. Along the Highway 1 corridor are enclaves of residential, roadside commercial and heavy industrial land uses (Figure 7-1).

Access to the study area is provided by Highway 1 and Moss Landing Road on the west, Dolan Road on the north, Castroville Boulevard to the east, and Highway 156 to the south and east.

Rural residences are scattered throughout the upland areas at densities ranging from 2.5-40+ acres per unit. Many residences on larger parcels are associated with commercial agricultural operations, while some on smaller parcels include small scale "weekend farms" with limited livestock grazing. More densely developed residential areas include the Oak Hills/Monte Del Lago Mobilehome Community north of Highway 156, Trails End Mobile Manor off Dolan Road, and portions of the urbanized Castroville community.

Wetlands within the study area include the salt/brackish-water wetlands and freshwater aquatic areas of Moro Cojo Slough, as well as upper watershed stream channels that drain into the slough. Environmental characteristics of the slough and upper drainages are described in other sections of this report.

#### Outdoor Recreation Areas

Manzanita Regional Park, a County park, encompasses approximately 464 acres in the northeastern portion of the Moro Cojo study area. The park provides picnic areas, active recreation (baseball complex), and equestrian complex and passive recreational uses (hiking and nature study). Limited passive recreational activities (i.e., bird-watching) also occur within the Moro Cojo Slough complex, primarily on private lands. Moss Landing Harbor has created a deep-water channel with berthing facilities at the mouth of Moro Cojo Slough thereby providing outdoor recreation facilities.

#### Agricultural Lands

Agricultural lands occur on flatter terraces in the westerly portion of the study area, as well as in the sandy hill areas to the east. Artichokes are the major crop grown on larger parcels near Highway 1, while strawberries and flowers predominate in the more erodible sloping lands to the east. Cattle grazing and dairy farms also occurs on lands with marginal soil conditions. A more detailed discussion of the agricultural uses in the study area is contained in Chapter 6.

## **Other Land Uses**

Other less prevalent land uses in the Moro Cojo Study area include commercial uses in Moss Landing, Castroville, and in scattered locations along major roadways. Industrial uses are concentrated primarily in the Moss Landing area. Light industrial activities include fish processing and harbor support facilities on Sandholdt Road, as well as agricultural packing plants and greenhouses throughout the study area. National Refractories and Minerals, just north of the slough; the adjacent PG&E power plant; and an assembly plant on Meridian Road are the major heavy industrial facilities in the study area.

## **NORTH COUNTY LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM**

Monterey County's North County Land Use Plan (LUP, 1982) and Coastal Implementation Plan - Part 1 & 2 (1988) establish the framework for future development and land use changes within the study area. The LUP and County implementation regulations were mandated by the California Coastal Act (1976) as the mechanisms to carry out various policies of the State Coastal Act at the local level. The Coastal Act contains a number of provisions which need to be incorporated into each LUP. The significant policy provisions relating to this management plan involve protection of environmentally sensitive habitats, protection of viable agricultural lands, designation of development priorities on other lands, and providing public access to the coast.

The North County LUP contains a number of policies and recommended actions to carry out requirements of the Coastal Act. The LUP is divided into the following major sections: resource management, public service systems, land use and development, public access, and implementation, with a separate discussion on the Moss Landing Community Plan. The reader should refer to the LUP (1982, amended) for the complete text.

## **RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

The plan defines environmentally sensitive habitats as "areas in which plant or animal life or their habitats are rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem, and which could be easily disturbed by developments." These areas include wetlands (Moro Cojo Slough) and endangered species' habitat. A number of policies establish protection measures, limitations on diking, dredging, and filling, setbacks and further detailed resource management planning in order to preserve and enhance these resources. This plan is a recommended action of the LUP (Section 2.3.4.2).

The LUP also recognizes the problem of rapid soil erosion in the Upper Moro Cojo Slough watersheds, and the resulting impacts from siltation causing, among other things, biotic impacts and loss of wetlands. LUP policies suggest Land Disturbance Targets (LDT), or limits on the cumulative amount of bare ground in each subwatershed. These limits would allow development and agricultural conversion only on non-critical erosion land as a way to return erosion/siltation to historic (pre-development) rates.

Agriculture is recognized as an important land use which make a substantial contribution to the area's economy. Protection of agricultural land is a key LUP and Coastal Act policy. However, several economic and environmental management issues are involved in the long-term viability of agriculture in Moro Cojo watershed. One is encroaching urbanization and rural residential development, particularly in Castroville and smaller communities like Moss Landing and Oak Hills. Residential development raises property values and taxes for nearby farmlands. One method for combating high taxes and land speculation was the Williamson Act passed by the State in 1965. The Act offers significant property tax reductions for owners signing contracts to maintain land in agricultural use for 20 years. There are Williamson Act contracts in effect in the study area, covering approximately 200 acres. The County,

Coastal Commission and willing property owners have used other types of easements to restrict development on agricultural or non-agricultural lands. These easements include scenic, open space, public access, flood control and agricultural conservation easements. These easements generally restrict development on or use of property to preserve the particular value sought by the easement. In some cases a single easement can be used to protect multiple values (e.g., open space easement). As an example, an offer of dedication from public access and open space easement were made in 1989 for a 100-foot strip on the easterly side of Moro Cojo Slough between Moss landing Road and Highway 1.

## **LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT**

The LUP future land use plan (Figure 7-2) reflects existing land uses throughout the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. New development is designated only where compatible with agriculture and sensitive resource protection. Buildout of undeveloped residential area parcels of Castroville Boulevard is allowed at low rural densities (2.5-40 acre/dwelling unit). High density residential use is allowed on two sites adjacent to Castroville Boulevard with site-specific review for resource and public facility constraints. Small-scale commercial uses are encouraged in specific areas to serve local neighborhoods. Industry is limited to coastal-dependent uses in areas where they presently exist, although some build-out of harbor-related light industry is recognized in the Sandholdt Road area.

Development and new agricultural operations in Moro Cojo and Elkhorn Slough watersheds are subject to a permit process to ensure compliance with slope, erosion and development density policies in the LUP. In addition, Watershed Restoration Areas were established to monitor LDT and implement land restoration measures for particular sub-watersheds subject to high erosion levels. Five watersheds (#28-33) cover the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed (see North County, LCP Resource Map Book). Watersheds #31 and #32 are designated watershed restoration Areas pursuant to North County Land Use Plan policy 2.5.2.4. ✱

## **PUBLIC SERVICES**

The LUP indicates the need to improve Highway 1, Highway 156, and local roads consistent with resource and agricultural protection. The Plan also notes that septic system failures have caused water quality problems in Moro Cojo Slough; as well as local public health hazards. Plans are underway to service high-density residential areas with sewers. North County High School, for example, has been sewerred. On-site wastewater management systems are recommended for lower density rural areas.

## **PUBLIC ACCESS**

The Plan recognizes the need to provide public access to shoreline and public recreational areas in the coastal zone. In the study area, new access locations or access improvements are shown in the Moss Landing-Sandholdt Road beach area, and a circular trail system from Castroville Boulevard to Moro Cojo Slough in the vicinity of the high school. A more detailed description of public access is contained in Chapter 9.

## **WATER SUPPLY AND QUALITY**

The LUP also addresses water supply for future development and agriculture. The LUP recognizes groundwater overdraft problems and indicates "managing the demand for water generated by agricultural... residential and commercial development will be a major challenge for the [North County] in coming years." A key policy of the plan is to protect water quality and control new development at levels that can be served by identifiable, available, long-term water supplies. Potential water sources


include the San Felipe project or construction of a dam on the Arroyo Seco River (North County Local Coastal Program, 1982). Recently, treated wastewater injection wells have been suggested as a method to reduce seawater water intrusion and provide water for agricultural irrigation. A detailed description of the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Program is contained in Chapter 4.


Nonpoint source pollution (NPSP) is considered a problem for the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, resulting in the degradation of wetland and riparian resource values. Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA) requires the development and implementation of a Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program to ensure the protection and restoration of coastal waters. This is consistent with LUP policies and the County has participated in proposals to prepare a more comprehensive NPS Pollution program for the region, and to implement projects to reduce NPSP and facilitate groundwater recharge.

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

The Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan documents (Parts 1 and 2, 1988) provide a series of zoning ordinances and permit regulations to implement the LUP. Part 2 contains a series of regulations for development in the LUP area.







The Habitat Restoration Group  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Morro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 North County Land Use Plan


**LEGEND**


- AP/P** Agricultural Preservation/  
Prime Farmland 40 Acre  
Minimum
- AP** Agricultural Preservation/  
40 Acre Minimum
- AC** Agricultural Conservation  
40 Acre Minimum
- RC** Resource Conservation
- MD** Medium Density  
1-4 Units/Acre
- HD** High Density  
5-10 Units/Acre
- RD** Rural Density  
5-40 Acres/Unit
- LD** Low Density  
2.5-10 Acres/Unit
- OR** Outdoor Recreation
- LI** Light Industrial
- HI** Heavy Industrial
- P** Public/Quasi-Public
- C** Commercial
- R** Residential



SCALE  
 1 MILE  
 0 1000 2000 3000 4000 5000 FEET

2/96  
 705-01  
 Figure 7-2






**LEGEND**

- Zone 29 Boundary
- ..... Proposed Pipeline
- Farm Turnout
- ▲ Proposed Supplemental Well
- Slough Stream Crossings
- - - Future Pipeline R.O.W.

Source: Monterey County Water Resources Agency




**The Habitat Restoration Group**

P.O. Box 4006 • 6180 Highway 9 • Felton, CA 95018  
 Telephone (408) 335-6800 • Fax (408) 335-6810  
 California Landscape Contractors License #571037

Moro Cojo Slough Management  
 and Enhancement Plan  
 Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project  
 Proposed Facilities

Figure 7-3  
 2/96  
 705-01



## CHAPTER 8 WASTEWATER

### INTRODUCTION

Municipal and domestic wastewater in the Moro Cojo Slough watershed is managed through a combination of regional treatment facilities, local treatment facilities, and dispersed septic systems.

### WASTEWATER FACILITIES

Two sanitation districts handle and process wastewater in the Moro Cojo slough watershed: Castroville County Sanitation District and Moss Landing County Sanitation District (Figure 8-1). These districts collect wastewater effluent that is transported out of the basin and treated at the Monterey Regional County Sanitation District facility, in Marina.

Within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed boundaries, one local package treatment plant is currently operating, one facility has been abandoned, and one new facility has been proposed. The WaterTek wastewater treatment currently serves the Oak Hills community near Castroville Boulevard. This treatment plant consists of two percolation ponds and a spray field. A sod farm utilizing the treated wastewater has been proposed for this facility; in addition, WaterTek is also proposing to raise the berms surrounding the percolation ponds. The now-abandoned wastewater system for the Monte del Lago Mobilehome Community was in use from 1975 to 1985. The abandoned treatment ponds are still in place along the border of the slough, and the wetlands within them have been restored. The restored wetlands are now managed by CDFG. There is a proposal for a local package treatment plant that will service 10-15 residential units on Trails End Road (off Dolan Road). The proposed facility will dispose of effluent through a leach field.

Most of the development within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed are on septic systems (e.g., farms and rural residential land uses). The Monterey County Department of Environmental Health (MCDEH) has about 30 years of records on septic system permits and septic repair permits; however, because the information has not been synthesized, data regarding failed septic systems along Moro Cojo slough could not be provided (B. First, MCDEH, pers. comm., 1994). A former North County inspector for MCDEH can recall only one septic repair within 100 yards of the slough (M. Jorvina, MCDEH, pers. comm., 1994). Overall there are no specific trends of septic failures along the slough (M. Dias, MCDEH, pers. comm., 1994).

Although the potential for wastewater seepage to the slough exists. Septic systems can fail, especially under wet winter conditions, as well as in areas with clay soils, sandy soils, or a high water table. Before the implementation of a 1968 ban on septic systems and the formation of the Moss Landing County Sanitation District, numerous septic systems problems reportedly occurred in the Moss Landing area; this is likely due to high groundwater and shallow, sandy soils.

The contamination problems associated with the slough include nitrate, chlorine, and heavy metals (Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department, 1980). Agriculture practices can result in increased levels of salts including sodium, sulfates and chlorine. In addition, fertilizer and pesticide run-off into the slough can result in an increase in the levels of nitrates and phosphates in the water. Much of the phosphates are absorbed by clay soils; however, nitrates can create a water quality problems in the soil. Septic tank failures can result in increased levels of nitrates and soluble organic residue in groundwater (*ibid.*). Run-off from the dairy farm and pig farm along Dolan Road flows into the wetlands of

the slough, resulting in increased nitrate concentrations from the animal wastes. Cattle are also allowed to graze in the slough. Most of the grazing occurs west of the Southern Pacific railroad tracks along the north and south banks of the slough; however, cattle have been observed in the slough in the area adjacent to North Monterey County High School (M. Jorvina, pers. comm., 1994). Individual rural residences within the watershed also have farm animals that encroach into the slough or its tributaries. Some heavy metals may be present in wells that occur in the upper watershed areas; heavy metals have been documented in wells west of San Miguel Canyon Road (Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department, 1980).


Surface water in the slough is contaminated with excessive sodium concentrations. Sources of the sodium include leachage of salts from the soil during the wet season, run-off of agricultural irrigation, and seepage from the holding ponds at the National Refractories facility. Poor water circulation and drainage contribute to the high levels.

Registered underground storage tanks and hazardous material storage sites are sparsely distributed throughout the watershed; however, they are concentrated in the commercial industrial areas of Castroville and Moss Landing (Figure 8-1). Registered hazardous material storage sites are also associated with farms.

Groundwater degradation from solid waste facilities has not been documented for the Moro Cojo Slough area. There are no solid waste facilities within the watershed boundaries.

• Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Macro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Existing Wastewater Facilities



SCALE 1 MILE


**LEGEND**

- Castroville County Sanitation District<sup>1</sup>
- Moss Landing County Sanitation District<sup>1</sup>
- Waterrek Treatment Facility (Oak Hills)<sup>1</sup>
- Oak Hills Service Area<sup>1</sup>
- Nitrate Contamination Area<sup>2</sup>
- Auto Wrecking Yards<sup>1,3</sup> Hazardous Materials Storage<sup>3</sup>
- Underground Storage Tanks (approximate locations)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>North County Local Coastal Program, 400 Series Background Data Report, 1980.  
<sup>2</sup>Monterey County Planning Dept.  
<sup>3</sup>Monterey County Dept. of Environmental Health

2/96  
705-01

Figure 8-1



## CHAPTER 9 PUBLIC ACCESS AND EDUCATION

### EXISTING PUBLIC ACCESS

Within the Moro Cojo Slough study area, access to the slough is limited for all modes of transportation. Private property limits public access to the slough, except for intersections of public roads and some public facilities (i.e., schools).

#### Vehicular Access

Vehicular access is supplied by intersections of the slough with county roads and State Highway 1, in addition to intersections with private driveways and farm roads. Major county roads that intersect the slough include Castroville Boulevard, Elkhorn Road, Blackie Road, Dolan Road and Meridian Road.

At present vehicular access is limited to private land uses, most notably farming activities and residential uses. The North County High School property provides for limited vehicular access along the perimeter of the school site.

Public parking is limited to on-street turnouts from local roadways, roadside businesses along State Highway 1 and some parking at the High School during non-school hours. An unpaved Park-and-Ride facility abuts State Highway 1 near Dolan Road.

#### Pedestrians and Bicyclists

Little pedestrian activity occurs within the slough area because of the rural character of the study area, except for students travelling to and from Castroville to North County High School. No sidewalks, crosswalks or pedestrian signals currently exist along the county roads or State Highway 1. The SPRR tracks traverse the study area; while not currently designated as a public thoroughfare, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County has discussed potential acquisition of the railway for pedestrian and/or light rail service.

Existing and proposed trails associated with Moro Cojo Slough are outlined in the North County Trails Plan (Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department, 1989). The only existing trails in the watershed are the hiking/equestrian trails of Manzanita Regional Park and the Pacific Coast Bicycle Route (formerly the Bicentennial Bicycle Route) that predominantly follows Highway 1 (Figure 9-1). Most local bicyclists prefer to use Elkhorn Road and Castroville Boulevard. Hikers and equestrians using the California State Park trails of Salinas River State Beach can access these trails from Moss Landing Road or Potrero Road. An unpaved parking lot exists at the end of Potrero Road. Ad hoc trails occur in scenic easements associated with the Oak Hills Development.

The Trails Plan (*ibid.*) also proposes numerous new trails in the Moro Cojo Slough watershed (Figure 9-1). These trails predominantly follow existing roadways such as Dolan Road and Castroville Boulevard, or are associated with scenic easements. The trails connect major recreational features such as Manzanita Regional Park, Elkhorn Slough, and Moss Landing. The proposed trails focus on bicycle and equestrian use groups, although a multi-use trail is proposed along Blackie Road, and a hiking trail is proposed for a scenic easement area along the slough.

Manzanita Regional Park provides equestrian and hiking trail facilities within the 464-acre park. Providing access to the slough is a component of the Moss Landing Wetland Park proposed by the Elkhorn Slough Foundation. Trails are proposed near the mouth of the slough on parcels that are either currently dedicated as a scenic conservation easement or owned by the Elkhorn Slough Foundation (Figure 9-1). The Foundation intends to restore and enhance the wetland habitat of Moro Cojo Slough in conjunction with the development of this park.

A trail along the entire coast of California has been proposed since the late 1970's (Willard, pers. comm., 1994). A coastal trail, managed by the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District (MPRPD), currently exists in Monterey County. The trail, named the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail, will be incorporated into the state-wide coastal trail network. This 35-mile long trail extends south from the City of Marina to Point Lobos, although numerous gaps in the trail currently occur. The MPRPD has recently received a grant to install a bicycle/hiking trail that will run from Marina to Elkhorn Slough, passing through the community of Castroville. The purpose of the trail is to service bicycle commuters and recreational users (G. Tate, MPRPD, pers. comm., 1994).


## **EDUCATION**

There are five public schools within the boundaries of Moro Cojo Slough watershed, including North Monterey High School; Joseph Gambetta, Castroville and Elkhorn elementary schools; and the Geil Street Headstart and Adult Education schools. These schools are part of the North County School District. The close proximity of the schools to the slough provides excellent educational opportunities and a potential for the involvement of school-age children with the enhancement and long-term protection of the slough's biotic resources. One agreement made prior to the construction of North Monterey County High School indicates that the school provide educational programs focusing on the wetland habitat of Moro Cojo Slough, although the school has not yet implemented this program.

Manzanita Regional Park provides an opportunity for educational programs. The park occurs in the upper (eastern) portion of the watershed and currently functions as a sports complex. The park currently has a volunteer program that utilizes individuals for park maintenance activities. The volunteer program could be expanded to include a team of people interested in wetland enhancement and restoration.

The Habitat Restoration Group  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Maro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Existing and Approved Public Access and Educational Facilities



**LEGEND**

- Existing Bike Route
- Existing Hiking & Equestrian Trail
- Proposed Hiking Trail
- Proposed Equestrian Trail
- Proposed Bike Route
- Proposed Combined Use Trail
- Proposed Hiking & Biking Trail
- Scenic Easement Areas (approximate boundaries)
- Ⓢ School
- ▨ Manzanita Regional Park
- ▨ Proposed Moss Landing Wetland Park


North County Trails Plan, 1989, Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Dept.

SCALE: 0 1200 2400 3600 4800 6000 FEET

1 INCH = 1 MILE

2/96  
705-01

Figure 9-1



## CHAPTER 10 PREFERRED LOWER WATERSHED PLAN

### INTRODUCTION

Five alternatives to enhance resources within the lower watershed of Moro Cojo Slough (e.g., Moss Landing Road to Castroville Boulevard) were developed. These alternatives were evaluated by the RAC, who then selected the preferred resource management alternative for the lower watershed. The five alternatives reviewed were; Alternative A, Tidal Regime; Alternative B, Partially Tidal Regime; Alternative C, Enhanced Existing Conditions; Alternative D, Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions; and Alternative E, No Project.

Each of the five alternatives evaluated suggest actions to protect existing significant biotic resources, increase overall habitat values within the slough environs, resolve existing resource problems and land use conflicts and provide passive recreational/educational uses. Each action was analyzed as to its potential benefits (i.e., ability to meet stated goals and objectives of the plan) and potential impacts. Measures to reduce impacts were also identified. A general description of each alternative and why they were not selected by the RAC is presented below; a full description and analysis of each alternative is in Volume II - Resource Enhancement and Alternatives Report on file at Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. The reader is directed to the Resource Enhancement and Alternatives Report for representative cross-sections and conceptual features of the alternatives not selected by the RAC.

### Selection of the Preferred Plan

The RAC reviewed each of the alternatives presented in the Resource Enhancement Alternatives report and, through consensus, selected a preferred alternative. The RAC, in addition to the goals and objectives developed for the watershed-wide plan, identified several habitat and/or land use criteria that they felt were necessary for the preferred lower slough watershed plan. Each of the alternatives were evaluated by these criteria:

RAC criteria for lower slough:

- 1) retain both saltwater and freshwater habitats within the lower slough,
- 2) maintain known habitat for rare and endangered species (i.e., brackishwater snail and SCLTS),
- 3) maintain existing saltwater flow in the lower slough below SPRR bridge,
- 4) utilize treated, reclaimed water to recharge aquifers,
- 5) create freshwater conditions in lower slough (east of Highway 1),
- 6) retain water in the lower slough through the creation of impoundments,
- 7) maximize freshwater in lower slough through increased run-off and use of reclaimed water,
- 8) utilize eco-engineering,
- 9) recognize the need for maintenance and monitoring, and
- 10) maximize buffers between wetlands and adjacent land uses.

Based on these criteria, the RAC selected Alternative D, Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions as the Preferred Plan.

The preferred plan, as presented in this report, is conceptual; additional analysis, design, and agreements with willing landowners will be required prior to implementation or construction. The actions proposed to occur under the preferred alternative are listed on Table 10-1. The ability of a proposed action to meet

the objectives of the management and enhancement plan are identified below; please refer to Chapter 2 for the list (and codes) of the various objectives. The potential impacts of implementing the Preferred Plan, and recommended mitigation measures to mitigate such impacts, are described below and summarized in Table 10-2. (Note: Nothing in this plan shall be construed as legitimizing any violations of nor superseding any required remediation pursuant to the Coastal Act, Local Coastal Program, or other agency requirements.)

The RAC has recommended phasing the implementation of the management actions into four phases (I-IV), estimated years of 1995 through 2005 (Table 10-2).

**Phase I - Education and Enforcement through Existing Programs  
(Year 1 and on-going)**

- Develop Moro Cojo Management and Enhancement Plan framework.
- Identify management plan objectives and develop management plan monitoring program and success criteria.
- Formulate and implement a broad, watershed-wide education program.
- Initiate wetland restoration of previously converted wetland areas and easements through cooperation of landowners.
- Initiate regulatory permitting with applicable agencies and Monterey County.
- Identify potential funding sources and secure monies for implementation of the management plan actions.
- Provide for pilot projects on public, and/or non-profit agency owned lands in Years 1 through 10 to test the effectiveness of the management actions and to evaluate any impacts they may have on adjacent agricultural activities; thereby offering modifications to correct any deficiencies to remaining management actions through the remaining phases.

**Phase II - Establish Buffers between Wetlands and Other Lands with Willing Landowners  
(May be modified after the implementation and evaluation of a pilot project in Phase I)**

- Create buffers with willing landowners.
- Initiate land management (e.g., move fences/cattle, install signs).

**Phase III - Ecological Engineering  
(May be modified after the implementation and evaluation of a pilot project in Phase I)**

- Obtain necessary permits from regulatory agencies and Monterey County.
- For Highway 1/Dolan Road/Castroville Triangle, design and implement educational and demonstration projects.
- Design eco-engineered structures for freshwater impoundments, evaluate effectiveness, and initiate construction of the impoundments utilizing chosen techniques.
- Investigate placement of flashboard dam at Castroville Slough, conduct design studies.
- Design selected BMP features, such as retention ponds and filter swales with willing landowners.

**Phase IV - Design and Implement Structural Engineering Actions  
(May be modified after the implementation and evaluation of a pilot project in Phase I)**

- Install flashboard dam at SPRR and Castroville Slough.
- Design and construct waterfowl island.
- Design and construct levees, install agricultural drainage pumps.

- Design and construct other plan features to protect structures and/or agricultural lands from flooding.
- Install selected BMP features on applicable lands.

## **PREFERRED PLAN - WINTER/SPRING FRESHWATER CONDITIONS**

### **General Description of the Preferred Plan**

The Preferred Plan — Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions creates areas for freshwater impoundments within the lower slough watershed between Moss Landing Road and Castroville Boulevard. The plan does not modify the existing tidal environment below the SPRR. The tide gates at Moss Landing Road will be retained and operated in the same manner as the existing operation. A flashboard dam will be installed at SPRR to restrict tidal movement and to allow upstream impoundment of freshwater during the winter and spring. Freshwater impoundments would also be created in existing alkali grasslands, and/or excavated into the grassland, between Highway 1 and the SPRR. The RAC has recommended the use of "eco-engineering" (e.g., hay bales) to create barriers between the freshwater impoundments and the main slough channel. The hay bale barriers will need to be constructed so they are effective in impounding water, to create the desired freshwater "lakes", as well as preventing excessive leakage of freshwater into the adjacent salt/brackish main slough channel, to protect habitat for the brackishwater snail. Existing brackishwater areas above the SPRR would convert to more freshwater conditions due to the construction of a flashboard dam at the SPRR overcrossing. Areas currently freshwater near Castroville Boulevard would persist. Most areas below the 10-foot contour between Highway 1 and SPRR would be subject to freshwater inundation during the winter and spring, depending upon rainfall. The RAC has recommended the use of reclaimed water to maintain the freshwater impoundments during the winter and spring, if rainfall and/or runoff from the watershed is not sufficient to keep the impoundments inundated. The preferred plan incorporates agriculture and/or grazing on lands above the 10-foot contour.

### **Benefits and Constraints of the Preferred Plan**

The preferred plan offers several features that meet the project goals and objectives (see pages 2-2 and 2-3) and the RAC's 10 criteria (see page 10-1). The plan also poses several constraints, including hydrologic, biological, and agricultural land use issues. The preferred plan will also require several permits from regulatory agencies and a program for maintenance and monitoring. An analysis of the key actions and the anticipated impacts and mitigations of this alternative are described below and summarized on Table 10-2.

**Creation of Freshwater Impoundment Areas.** The plan proposes the creation of winter/early spring freshwater impoundment areas within the marsh plain of the lower slough (below SPRR) and retainment of freshwater within the main slough upstream of SPRR. An "eco-dam" or a flashboard dam would be installed at the confluence of Castroville Slough and Moro Cojo Slough (Action H-3). These actions will not result in any modification of the tide gates at Moss Landing Road or saltwater flow below SPRR (RAC criteria 3). The freshwater impoundments are expected to enhance the existing grassland areas for waterfowl nesting and foraging (Action B-7), thus addressing plan Objectives G-1, B-1, B-5, B-6, W-4, W-5, A-2 (see pages 2-2 and 2-3), and the RAC criteria 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8 (see page 10-1).

The creation of the freshwater impoundments may result in partial or full inundation of approximately 375 acres below the 10-foot contour between the SPRR and Highway 1; these areas will require purchase or conservation easements from willing landowners (Actions L-1, L-2, A-1 [see Table 10-1]). Additionally, adjacent agricultural lands will require protection from flooding. Inundation of the alkali grassland

west of SPRR may cause a gradual conversion of the area to freshwater plant species (Action B-1). Likewise, freshwater impoundments east of SPRR may convert the brackishwater marsh areas to a more freshwater habitat (Action B-2). Mitigation would include the construction of earthen berms at the 10-foot contour and management/upgrade of existing agricultural drainage pump systems (Actions F-1 and F-2). These actions will increase habitat values of the slough system, addressing Objectives G-1, B-2, B-5, B-6, A-3, L-1 (see pages 2-2 and 2-3), and the RAC criteria 5, 6, 7, and 8 (see page 10-1). The impoundments may utilize treated, reclaimed water runoff to recharge aquifers (RAC criteria 4). Additionally, the plan would allow some public access and citizen involvement in implementing the plan (Objectives P-1 and P-2).

The operation of the freshwater impoundments could impact 65 acres of known habitat for the brackish-water snail and potential habitat for the tidewater goby in the main slough channel downstream of the SPRR. As mitigation, the plan incorporates measures to control the release of freshwater into the main slough channel. The RAC has proposed the use of "eco-engineering" to create the impoundments (Action H-6), such as the use of hay bales (Objective G-2 and RAC criteria 2 and 8). This methodology is less costly than more traditional methods, such as the installation of flashboard dams. As discussed above, the use of a method such as hay bales, should be tested as to their effectiveness in preventing excessive leakage of freshwater into the main slough. The integrity of the impoundments will need to be periodically checked, and repairs made as necessary, throughout the winter and spring, particularly after storm events (RAC criteria 9 and Objective W-7). If hay bales are not deemed effective, it is recommended that flashboard dams be installed. With either of the methods, some leakage of fresh water is expected and there may be some loss of habitat immediately adjacent to the dam outlets. More detailed design of the dams, coupled with sampling of snail populations and sampling to determine the presence of tidewater goby is required to determine the significance of the potential impacts. Consultation and/or permitting with regulatory agencies will be required.

If the freshwater impoundments are to be excavated in the alkali grassland, rather than allowing inundation of the existing grasslands, there will be disturbance of existing wetland and/or removal of some contaminants from the slough area. The feasibility of excavation and deposition of this material within receiving waters (i.e., Monterey Bay) or onto adjacent lands will require a more detailed analysis and consultation/permitting with appropriate regulatory agencies (i.e., NOAA, COE, RWQCB). A sediment management plan for pollutants will be prepared (Action H-5).

The plan proposes to maintain the existing tidal activity within the main slough channel between Highway 1 and SPRR (Action H-4, Table 10-1, and RAC criteria 3). This is not expected to result in significant changes in existing saltmarsh mosquito management. The creation of freshwater impoundments during the winter and early spring, however, is expected to result in an increase in the freshwater winter mosquito population (P. Ghormely, North Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District, pers. comm., 1994) (Action B-5, Table 10-1). The freshwater winter mosquito has increased its presence in the region over the last nine years and is considered a serious public health and resource management concern (*ibid.*). The life cycle begins in November-December and lasts through the spring. The species produces one brood per year and they are vicious biters. The mosquito population is difficult to manage through conventional means, as treatments such as oil and Bt have little effect (*ibid.*). A cooperative research project is currently underway to determine suitable treatments for this species of mosquito. The preferred management action to control this species is to drain seasonal wetlands or to have impoundments of constant water level with little/no vegetative breeding habitat. This management action, however, is contrary to the intent of the preferred plan. It is expected that freshwater winter mosquito populations will be a management concern in the impoundment areas both upstream and downstream of the SPRR. If aerial spraying of oil is utilized as a management action, for example, it is estimated to cost

approximately \$6,000 per application. Implementation of the preferred plan will be coordinated with the mosquito abatement district (Objective W-6).

**Creation of Island for Waterfowl Breeding.** The plan includes the opportunity to create an island within the slough to facilitate breeding by shorebirds or waterfowl (Action B-6, Table 10-1). As proposed, the island would include a deep water channel to discourage predation by mammals. Of particular concern are red fox and feral dogs; the deep water channel may discourage their access to the breeding island (addresses Objective B-4). A more detailed sediment transport study is needed to determine whether the creation of the deep water channel would significantly impact existing brackishwater snail habitat. Additional study is needed to determine if sediments will accumulate in the channel over time and if periodic dredging would be necessary (Action H-5). Permits from regulatory agencies would need to be acquired prior to implementation of this action.

**Erosion and Flooding.** The preferred plan is not expected to cause erosion of the marsh plain, since the grade control structure at Highway 1 will be maintained (Action H-1, Table 10-1). This action addresses Objective W-2.

Flood flows may result in flooding of existing properties between Highway 1 and Moss Landing Road; however, the extent of flooding may be reduced by the capture of runoff in the freshwater impoundments. It is expected that floodwalls or purchase of property would still be required (Action F-2).

**Modification of the SPRR Track Overcrossing to Install a Flashboard Dam.** The installation of a flashboard dam at SPRR (Action H-2) will require the modification to the SPRR overcrossing. The installation of the dam is expected to gradually convert the existing brackish marsh areas upstream of SPRR to a more freshwater habitat (Action S-2, Table 10-1). This may affect approximately 200 acres. This action addresses Objective B-2 (see page 2-2) and the RAC criteria 5, 6, and 7 (see page 10-1).

The installation of the flashboard dam at SPRR is not anticipated to impact existing breeding areas of the SCLTS, tiger salamander and red-legged frog, unless inundation levels occur within the breeding areas. Proper maintenance and management of the flashboard dam is expected to prevent impacts to the breeding areas. The need for maintenance and monitoring is recognized in RAC criteria 9 and Objective W-7.

**Creation of Buffers between Existing Agriculture and Wetland Resources.** The plan includes the creation of buffers between existing wetlands and agricultural land uses (Actions L-1, A-2, B-3 [Table 10-1]). These buffers are for two general areas: 1) areas downstream of the SPRR, and 2) areas upstream of SPRR. The buffer areas downstream of SPRR are proposed to be situated along the 10-foot contour adjacent to the flood control berms/levees (Action F-1). The buffers are intended to provide area for the construction of retention basins, filter swales or other features to reduce impacts to the adjacent wetlands from agricultural and/or grazing land uses (Action A-3). Buffer areas upstream of SPRR will be established between wetland areas and agricultural and/or grazing lands. The establishment of buffer areas would be pursuant to purchasing land or obtaining conservation easements from willing landowners. Assuming a 50-foot-wide buffer zone, approximately 75 acres of agricultural land would be affected above the SPRR; below the SPRR, approximately 375 acres may be affected. The establishment of buffer and water quality management features addresses Objectives B-5, B-6, W-1, W-2, W-3, A-1, A-2, A-4 and RAC criteria 10. If needed, the buffer areas could be revegetated with native species and invasive plants removed (Objectives B-3 and B-8).

**Widening Castroville Slough to 1977 Dimensions.** This proposed action (Action B-4, Table 10-1) is intended to restore habitat values within portions of Castroville Slough through the re-establishment of wetland habitat. Working with willing landowners, there may be opportunities to improve agricultural

drainage and other drainage/flooding problems through a re-design of the slough (Action A-4, Table 10-1). Suggested designs include a one-bank widening with a lowered berm upon which native wetland habitat can be established. A more detailed investigation of 1977 conditions, identification of wetland-agricultural conflicts, an analysis of design opportunities, and cooperation with landowners is required for implementation of this action. Based on a preliminary analysis of aerial photos, over 10 acres of agricultural land may be affected. Addressing these land use conflicts and restoring habitat along Castroville Slough addresses Objectives A-5, B-5, B-7 and RAC criteria 5.

According to available information, there are no known official violations with the COE for actions along Castroville Slough. Previous activities may have resulted in the fill of wetlands, however they have not been cited as violations by State or Federal regulatory agencies. Recent filling of apparent wetlands within the Castroville area occurred through an adjustment of the coastal zone boundary by CCC. Violations to the County's riparian setback policy have been addressed by the County and a restoration plan has been prepared. If filling occurs in the future and the COE assumes jurisdictional authority, they may require re-establishment of impacted areas. In similar instances within the region, the COE has required re-establishment of habitat based on conditions five years previous to the citation (i.e., 1989). The RAC, as part of the preferred plan, has recommended restoration of Castroville Slough to its dimensions as of January 1, 1977, the date Section 404(f) of the Clean Water Act was enacted (see Chapter 2, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). The RAC wants to use this as the baseline date for management and enhancement; however, the date should not restrict enhancement objectives (RAC, August 1994).

#### **OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BY THE RAC**

The following alternatives for the lower watershed were considered by the RAC, but were rejected. A brief description of each alternative and the rationale for its rejection is presented below.

##### **Alternative A - Tidal Regime**

Alternative A, The Tidal Regime, is an alternative that would create an open tidally-influenced system from Moss Landing Road to Castroville Boulevard. The alternative is modeled after the conditions believed to be present within the lower watershed in the 1850's, prior to the installation of tide gates at Moss Landing Road. The alternative incorporates agriculture and/or grazing on lands above the 10-foot contour (believed to be the condition in the 1850's), and periodic tidal inundation of lands currently being grazed below the 10-foot contour.

**Benefits and Constraints of Alternative A.** This alternative offers several features that meet the project goals and objectives. The alternative also poses several constraints, including hydrologic, biological, and agricultural land use issues. The alternative would also require several permits from regulatory agencies. The removal of tide gates at Moss Landing Road (Sandholdt Dam) is one of the key actions of this alternative. Removal of the tide gates will allow tidal circulation within the slough. In conjunction with the installation of tide gates at SPRR, a fully tidal saltmarsh environment, including mudflats, marsh habitat and adjacent habitat is expected between Highway 1 and SPRR. In addition to the removal of the tide gates at Moss Landing Road, several breaks will be made in the existing levee system to allow inundation of grassland below the 10-foot contour. These habitats are expected to increase the areas value to tidal marsh-dependent wildlife.

As proposed in the Preferred Plan, an island, with a deep water channel to discourage predation by mammals, would be created. Tidal activity is expected to maintain the deep water channel, however if sediments accumulate, periodic dredging may be necessary. Restoring tidal activity in the lower slough

may cause erosion of the marsh plain. As mitigation a new grade control structure would need to be installed at Highway 1.

Increased tidal flows may result in partial or full inundation of approximately 375 acres below the 10-foot contour between the SPRR and Highway 1; as with the Preferred Plan, these areas will require purchase or conservation easements from willing landowners and protection from flooding and/or tidal flows. This alternative includes the creation of buffers between existing wetlands and agricultural land uses as proposed in the Preferred Plan. The increased tidal action may affect adjacent agricultural lands (i.e., artichokes) below SPRR if salts rise within the root zone ( $\pm 3$  feet below surface) by capillary action.

The increased tidal activity could impact approximately 65 acres of known populations of brackishwater snail, a species of special concern. The tidewater goby, a Federally endangered species, which may inhabit the slough, would potentially be impacted by this alternative. Mitigation would include the construction of shallow tidal channels to create compensation habitat for these species. More detailed sampling of snail populations and sampling to determine the presence of tidewater goby and consultation with regulatory agencies is required. The creation of shallow channels would require dredging of marsh sediments; this may result in the disturbance and/or removal of some contaminants from the slough area. The feasibility of deposition of this material within receiving waters (i.e., Monterey Bay) onto adjacent lands will require a more detailed analysis (Action H-7) and consultation/permitting with appropriate regulatory agencies (i.e., NOAA, COE, RWQCB).

Increased tidal activity between Highway 1 and Castroville Boulevard is expected to create conditions unsuitable for mosquitos. The daily tidal activity is expected to reduce potential breeding habitat for saltmarsh mosquitos. Mosquitos may remain a management concern in upper reaches of the slough where areas are more brackish-fresh. Mitigation measures could include the construction of runnels (i.e., channels) or other drainage features in coordination with the Mosquito Abatement District.

The increased tidal activity to Castroville Boulevard will require the modification to the SPRR overcrossing. The crossing will need to be enlarged to allow additional flow. The increased flows are expected to gradually convert existing freshwater marsh areas upstream of SPRR to a more tidally-influenced habitat. This may affect approximately 225 acres. The increased tidal activity upstream of the SPRR may impact existing breeding areas of the SCLTS, tiger salamander and red-legged frog, encompassing three known sites over approximately 90 acres. Mitigation would include the construction of berms/levees around breeding ponds to preserve the habitat. A more detailed analysis of this action would need to be explored with regulatory agencies in order to evaluate its effectiveness.

Increased tidal activity above the SPRR has the potential to affect seawater percolation into groundwater where the upper and lower aquifers may be connected. This potential impact requires a more detailed investigation of groundwater movement and tidal activity.

This alternative recommends restoring habitat values within portion of Castroville Slough through the re-establishment of wetland habitat to 1989 conditions. Based on a preliminary analysis of aerial photos, approximately 10 acres of agricultural land may be affected.

**Reason for Rejection of Alternative A.** The RAC rejected this alternative due to the potential impacts (and recommended mitigation measures) to endangered species (i.e., brackishwater snail below the SPRR, and SCLTS above SPRR) and the numerous structural changes that would be required (i.e., modification to Moss Landing Road culverts, construction of tidal channels). The RAC also was concerned that regulatory permitting for this alternative would be extensive.

## **Alternative B - Partially Tidal Regime**

Alternative B - Partially Tidal Regime creates a tidal environment upstream to SPRR. As in Alternative A, the tide gates at Moss Landing Road will be removed; however, tidal influence will be prevented past the SPRR. Existing brackishwater conditions (a short distance upstream of SPRR) and freshwater conditions upstream of SPRR to above Castroville Boulevard would persist. Similar to Alternative A, existing areas below the 10-foot contour between Highway 1 and SPRR would be subject to tidal inundation. The alternative incorporates agriculture and/or grazing on lands above the 10-foot contour.

**Benefits and Constraints of Alternative B.** As in Alternative A, one of the key actions of this alternative is the removal of the tide gates at Moss Landing Road to allow full tidal circulation within the slough. The removal of the tide gates and several breaks in the existing levee system would allow inundation of grassland below the 10-foot contour.

As proposed in Alternative A, Alternative B includes the opportunity to create an island within the slough to facilitate breeding by shorebirds, partial or full inundation of lands below the 10-foot contour between the SPRR and Highway 1. The increased tidal activity is expected to adversely impact a portion of the known populations of brackishwater snail, a species of special concern. Approximately 3,000 linear feet (24 acres) of snail habitat may be affected. Increased tidal activity between Highway 1 and SPRR is expected to create conditions unsuitable for mosquitos. The daily tidal activity is expected to reduce potential breeding habitat for saltmarsh mosquitos. Mosquitos are expected to remain a management concern in the slough above SPRR where areas will be dominated by freshwater. This alternative includes the creation of buffers between existing wetlands and agricultural land uses, as described in Alternative A. Please refer to the discussion in Alternative A regarding the benefits and constraints of these actions.

The installation of tide gates at SPRR will require the modification to the SPRR overcrossing. The installation of tide gates is expected to gradually convert the existing brackish marsh areas upstream of SPRR to a more freshwater habitat. This may affect approximately 200 acres. The management of the tide gates at SPRR is not anticipated to impact existing breeding areas of the SCLTS, tiger salamander and red-legged frog. Although tide gates may leak, the influence of the leakage is not expected to extent upstream to the breeding areas. Increased tidal activity to the SPRR has the potential to affect seawater percolation into groundwater where the upper and lower aquifers may be connected. This potential impact requires a more detailed investigation of groundwater movement and tidal activity; however, the impact is less likely than in Alternative A since the tidal exchange will stop short of the potential recharge areas. This action, if deemed a significant impact, would be contrary to Objective W-5.

**Reason for Rejection of Alternative B.** The RAC rejected this alternative due to the potential impacts to endangered species (i.e., brackishwater snail) and the numerous structural changes that would be required (i.e., modification to Moss Landing Road culverts, construction of tidal channels). The RAC was also concerned that regulatory permitting for this alternative would be extensive.

## **Alternative C - Enhanced Existing Conditions**

Alternative C - Enhanced Existing Conditions creates a modified tidal environment upstream to SPRR. The tide gates at Moss Landing Road will be retained, but modified to allow greater the tidal influence to the SPRR. Existing brackish (for a short distance upstream of SPRR) and freshwater conditions upstream of SPRR to above Castroville Boulevard would persist. Similar to Alternative A, existing areas below the 10-foot contour between Highway 1 and SPRR would be subject to tidal inundation. The alternative incorporates agriculture and/or grazing on lands above the 10-foot contour.

**Benefits and Constraints of Alternative C.** This alternative proposes a modification of the tide gates to allow tidal circulation within the slough to SPRR. This is expected to enhance the existing tidal saltmarsh environment, including creating some additional channels for mudflat and pickleweed marsh habitat. These habitats are expected to enhance the value of the lower slough to tidal marsh-dependent wildlife. The alternative includes several breaks in the existing levee system to allow inundation of grassland below the 10-foot contour.

This alternative includes the opportunity to create an island within the slough to facilitate breeding by shorebirds. The increased tidal flows may result in flooding (tidal and flood-related) of existing properties between Highway 1 and Moss Landing Road. Increased tidal activity between Highway 1 and SPRR is expected to create conditions unsuitable for mosquitos. The daily tidal activity is expected to reduce potential breeding habitat for saltmarsh mosquitos. This alternative includes the creation of buffers between existing wetlands and agricultural land uses. Please refer to the discussion in Alternative A regarding the benefits and constraints of these actions.

Modification of the tide gates, while retaining the culverts at Highway 1, is not expected to cause erosion of the marsh plain. This action addresses Objective W-2. Increased tidal flows may result in partial or full inundation of approximately 375 acres below the 10-foot contour between the SPRR and Highway 1. These areas will require purchase or conservation easements from willing landowners (Action L-1). Additionally, adjacent agricultural lands will require protection from flooding and/or tidal flows. Mitigation would include the construction of earthen berms at the 10-foot contour and management/upgrade of existing agricultural drainage pump systems (Action F-1). This action will increase habitat values of the slough system.

The increased tidal activity is expected to adversely impact a portion of the known populations of brackishwater snail, a species of special concern. Approximately 1,200 linear feet (8 acres) of snail habitat may be affected. The tidewater goby, a Federally endangered species, which may inhabit the slough, would potentially be impacted by this alternative. Mitigation would be similar to Alternative A, where shallow tidal channels will be constructed to create compensation habitat for these species. The installation of tide gates at SPRR will require the modification to the SPRR overcrossing. The installation of tide gates is expected to gradually convert the existing brackish marsh areas upstream of SPRR to a more freshwater habitat. This may affect approximately 200 acres.

The small modification of tidal activity has the potential to affect seawater percolation into groundwater where the upper and lower aquifers may be connected. This potential impact requires a more detailed investigation of groundwater movement and tidal activity; however, the impact is considered low since the tidal exchange will stop short of the potential recharge areas, as described in Alternative A.

**Reason for Rejection of Alternative C.** The RAC rejected this alternative due to the potential impacts to endangered species (i.e., brackishwater snail). The RAC also was concerned that regulatory permitting for this alternative would be extensive.



Table 10-1. Summary of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan Actions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan, By Phase

Action	Phase
<b>PHASE I</b>	
<b>Hydrologic Actions</b>	
H-4. Maintain existing operation of tide gate at Moss Landing Road (Sandholdt Dam) to allow for tidal action and storms. (Addresses RAC criteria 1, 2 and 3; Plan Objectives B-2, B-5, W-4 and A-2.)	I
<b>Agricultural Actions</b>	
<p>A-4. Through willing landowners, <u>obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchange</u> to restore Castroville Slough to its 1977 dimensions. Investigate various designs, such as a <u>lowered berm on one bank</u>, to allow wetland restoration, compatible with adjacent agricultural land use and water quality protection. (Addresses RAC criteria 5; Plan Objectives B-2, B-5, B-7, W-2, A-5, P-2 and P-3.)</p> <p>Conduct pilot projects on public and/or non-profit agency-owned lands to test effectiveness of the management actions and to evaluate any impacts they may have on adjacent agricultural activities; thereby offering modifications to correct any deficiencies to remaining management actions through the remaining phases.</p>	I
<b>Biotic Resource Actions</b>	
B-4. Begin to <u>restore wetland habitat</u> along Castroville Slough to 1977 dimensions. (See A-4, above.)	I
<b>PHASE II</b>	
<b>Land Use Actions</b>	
L-1. Through voluntary landowner involvement, obtain conservation easements, purchase or land exchange for pasture and/or agricultural lands below the 10-foot contour between SPRR and Castroville Boulevard to provide <u>buffer between agricultural lands and wetlands</u> . (Addresses RAC criteria 10; Plan Objectives B-6 and A-5.)	II
<b>Agricultural Actions</b>	
A-2. Through willing landowners, obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchanges for the conversion of marginal agricultural land adjacent to the slough between SPRR and Castroville Boulevard to wetland/agricultural buffer area. (Addresses RAC criteria 5 and 6; Plan Objectives B-5, B-7, B-8, W-2, W-3, A-5, L-1 and P-2.)	.II

**Table 10-1. Summary of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan Actions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan (Cont'd.)**

Action	Phase
A-3. Through willing landowners, obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchange to minimize potential conflicts between agricultural land practices and habitat protection by <u>constructing grass-lined swales, sediment control structures, and perimeter ditches</u> . (Addresses RAC criteria 8, 9 and 10; Plan Objectives G-2, B-5, W-1, W-2, W-3, W-7, A-3, A-4, P-2 and P-3.)	II
A-4. Through willing landowners, obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchange to restore Castroville Slough to its 1977 dimensions. Investigate various designs, such as a lowered berm on one bank, to allow wetland restoration, compatible with adjacent agricultural land use and water quality protection. (Addresses RAC criteria 5; Plan Objectives B-2, B-5, B-7, W-2, A-5, P-2 and P-3.)	II
<b>Biotic Resource Actions</b>	
B-3. Protect existing wetlands and riparian habitat through creation of wetland/agricultural buffers. (Addresses RAC criteria 10; Plan Objectives B-6 and A-5.)	II
B-4. Continue to restore wetland habitat along Castroville Slough to 1977 dimensions. (See A-4, above.)	II
<b>PHASE III</b>	
<b>Hydrologic Actions</b>	
H-3. Install "eco-dam" or a flashboard dam at the confluence of Castroville Slough and Moro Cojo Slough to limit/control tidal movement in Castroville Slough and control releases of freshwater into Moro Cojo Slough. (Addresses RAC criteria 1, 2 and 8; Plan Objectives G-1, B-1, B-5, W-4, W-5, W-6 and A-2.)	III (eco dam)
H-6. Install barriers (e.g., eco-engineered hay bales or flashboard dams) between freshwater impoundments and main slough channel to create impoundments. Preserve brackishwater character of main slough. (Addresses RAC criteria 2, 3, 5 and 6; Plan Objectives G-1, B-1, B-5, W-6 and A-2.)	III
<b>Flood Control Action</b>	
F-1. Provide tidal/flood water protection for agricultural lands west of SPRR through construction of levees, berms, pump systems, as needed. (Addresses Plan Objectives W-4, W-7, A-2, A-5 and P-2.)	III

**Table 10-1. Summary of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan Actions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan (Cont'd.)**

Action	Phase
<b>Agricultural Actions</b>	
A-3. Through willing landowners, obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchange to minimize potential conflicts between agricultural land practices and habitat protection by constructing grass-lined swales, sediment control structures, and perimeter ditches. (Addresses RAC criteria 8, 9 and 10; Plan Objectives G-2, B-5, W-1, W-2, W-3, W-7, A-3, A-4, P-2 and P-3.)	III
A-4. Through willing landowners, obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchange to restore Castroville Slough to its 1977 dimensions. Investigate various designs, such as a lowered berm on one bank, to allow wetland restoration, compatible with adjacent agricultural land use and water quality protection. (Addresses RAC criteria 5; Plan Objectives B-2, B-5, B-7, W-2, A-5, P-2 and P-3.)	III
<b>Surface Water Actions</b>	
S-2. Impound available freshwater in impoundments during spring and summer. (Addresses RAC criteria 5 and 6; Plan Objectives G-1, B-1, B-5, W-4, W-5 and A-2.)	III
<b>Biotic Resource Actions</b>	
B-1. Gradually convert alkali grassland to freshwater plant species west of SPRR. (Addresses RAC criteria 5 and 7; Plan Objective G-1.)	III
B-3. Protect existing wetlands and riparian habitat through creation of wetland/agricultural buffers. (Addresses RAC criteria 10; Plan Objectives B-6 and A-5.)	III
B-4. Restore wetland habitat along Castroville Slough to 1977 dimensions. (See A-4, above.)	III
B-5. Potential change in species composition and abundance of mosquito populations. (Addresses RAC criteria 5; Plan Objective W-6.)	III
B-7. Create freshwater impoundment areas for waterfowl habitat. (Addresses RAC criteria 2, 5 and 6; Plan Objectives B-1 and B-5.)	III
<b>PHASE IV</b>	
<b>Land Use Actions</b>	
L-2. Through voluntary landowner involvement, obtain conservation easements, purchase or land exchange for pasture and/or agricultural lands below 10-foot contour west of SPRR for construction of freshwater impoundments. (Addresses RAC criteria 5 and 6; Plan Objectives G-1 and B-1.)	IV

**Table 10-1. Summary of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan Actions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan (Cont'd.)**

Action	Phase
<b>Hydrologic Actions</b>	
H-1. Replace Highway 1 crossing with a spanning bridge to allow additional flows; maintain grade control structure. (Addresses RAC criteria 1 and 3; Plan Objectives W-2.)	IV
H-2. Modify the SPRR track overcrossing to accommodate additional flows, and install flashboard dam to impound water. (Addresses RAC criteria 2, 5 and 6; Plan Objectives G-1, B-1, B-5, W-4, W-5, W-6 and A-2.)	IV
H-3. Install "eco-dam" or a flashboard dam at the confluence of Castroville Slough and Moro Cojo Slough to limit/control tidal movement in Castroville Slough and control releases of freshwater into Moro Cojo Slough. (Addresses RAC criteria 1, 2 and 8; Plan Objectives G-1, B-1, B-5, W-4, W-5, W-6 and A-2.)	IV (flashboard dam)
H-5. Develop sediment management plan for pollutants. (Addresses Plan Objectives W-2 and W-3.)	IV
H-6. Install barriers (e.g., eco-engineered hay bales or flashboard dams) between freshwater impoundments and main slough channel to create impoundments. Preserve brackishwater character of main slough. (Addresses RAC criteria 2, 3, 5 and 6; Plan Objectives G-1, B-1, B-5, W-6 and A-2.)	IV
<b>Flood Control Actions</b>	
F-1. Provide tidal/flood water protection for agricultural lands west of SPRR through construction of levees, berms, pump systems, as needed. (Addresses Plan Objectives W-4, W-7, A-2, A-5 and P-2.)	IV
F-2. Provide protection of private property/structures in Moss Landing from flood water inundation (7 parcels). (Addresses Plan Objective A-5.)	IV
<b>Agricultural Actions</b>	
A-1. Through willing landowners, obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchange for the conversion of existing pasture and/or agricultural lands west of SPRR to managed wetland habitat (i.e., remove or limit cattle activities). (Addresses RAC criteria 5 and 6; Plan Objectives B-5, B-7, B-8, W-2, W-3, A-5, L-1 and P-2.)	IV

**Table 10-1. Summary of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan Actions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan (Cont'd.)**

Action	Phase
A-3. Through willing landowners, obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchange to minimize potential conflicts between agricultural land practices and habitat protection by constructing grass-lined swales, sediment control structures, and perimeter ditches. (Addresses RAC criteria 8, 9 and 10; Plan Objectives G-2, B-5, W-1, W-2, W-3, W-7, A-3, A-4, P-2 and P-3.)	IV
A-4. Through willing landowners, obtain conservation easement, purchase or land exchange to restore Castroville Slough to its 1977 dimensions. Investigate various designs, such as a lowered berm on one bank, to allow wetland restoration, compatible with adjacent agricultural land use and water quality protection. (Addresses RAC criteria 5; Plan Objectives B-2, B-5, B-7, W-2, A-5, P-2 and P-3.)	IV
<b>Surface Water Actions</b>	
S-2. Impound available freshwater in impoundments during spring and summer. (Addresses RAC criteria 5 and 6; Plan Objectives G-1, B-1, B-5, W-4, W-5 and A-2.)	IV
<b>Biotic Resource Actions</b>	
B-1. Gradually convert alkali grassland to freshwater plant species west of SPRR. (Addresses RAC criteria 5 and 7; Plan Objective G-1.)	IV
B-2. Allow natural conversion of brackishwater marsh areas east of SPRR to a more freshwater plant association. (Addresses RAC criteria 5 and 7; Plan Objective G-1.)	IV
B-3. Protect existing wetlands and riparian habitat through creation of wetland/agricultural buffers. (Addresses RAC criteria 10; Plan Objectives B-6 and A-5.)	IV
B-4. Restore wetland habitat along Castroville Slough to 1977 dimensions. (See A-4, above.)	IV
B-5. Potential change in species composition and abundance of mosquito populations. (Addresses RAC criteria 5; Plan Objective W-6.)	IV
B-6. Provide island along main slough to facilitate waterfowl breeding. (Addresses Plan Objective B-4.)	IV
B-7. Create freshwater impoundment areas for waterfowl habitat. (Addresses RAC criteria 2, 5 and 6; Plan Objectives B-1 and B-5.)	IV

**Table 10-2. Analysis of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan - Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan**

how many acres  
get more detail

ISSUES AND CONCERNS	WINTER/SPRING FRESHWATER CONDITIONS	
<b>PROJECT COSTS</b>		
Easements/Land Purchase	\$3.7 million	(\$8,000/acre)
Construction/Planning	\$2.0 million	
Mitigation/Revegetation	\$1.0 million	
Maintenance (5 yrs)	\$1.0 million	
Mosquito Abatement (5 yrs)	\$0.1 million	
Total Cost	\$7.8 million	
<b>GENERAL DESCRIPTION</b>	Creation of impoundments between Highway 1 and Castroville Blvd. to hold freshwater during winter/early spring. Install flashboard dam at SPRR. Widen portions of Castroville Slough to 1977 dimensions. Utilize "eco-engineering" in early phases and test effectiveness.	
<b>BENEFITS OF PLAN</b>	Creates areas for freshwater impoundments for waterfowl nesting and foraging. "Eco-engineered" barriers (i.e., hay bales) or flashboard dams installed between impoundments and main slough to protect existing habitat of brackish-water snail and potential tidewater goby habitat. Creation of island to facilitate breeding by waterfowl. Converts brackish/freshwater habitat upstream of SPRR to predominantly freshwater habitat; retains existing endangered species habitat (i.e., salamander). Enhancement of habitat values within Castroville Slough by widening portions of the marsh plain.	
<b>HYDROLOGY: IMPACTS, MITIGATIONS AND ENHANCEMENTS</b>		
<b>Tidal Inundation</b>	<b>Impact:</b> Action H-1. Replace Highway 1 crossing with spanning bridge will inundate agriculture. <b>Mitigation:</b> See F-1 and F-2.	
	<b>Impact:</b> Action H-2. Modifying SPRR track overcrossing with flashboard dam will inundate agriculture. <b>Mitigation:</b> See F-1 and H-3.	
	<b>Impact:</b> Creation of freshwater impoundments may affect salinity of slough <b>Mitigation:</b> Action H-6. RAC proposes to utilize "eco-engineered" hay bales between impoundment and slough. If not effective, install flashboard dams between freshwater impoundments and main slough channel to keep slough brackish. Action H-3. Install tide gate at confluence of Castroville and Moro Cojo Sloughs.	
<b>Flood Control</b>	<b>Impact:</b> Potential flooding of existing agricultural lands below SPRR. <b>Mitigation:</b> Action F-1. Construct earthen berms at 10-foot contour between Highway 1 and SPRR; inundate 375 acres with freshwater.	

**Table 10-2. Analysis of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan - Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan (Cont'd.)**


ISSUES AND CONCERNS	WINTER/SPRING FRESHWATER CONDITIONS
Flood Control (Cont'd.)	<p><b>Impact:</b> Potential flooding impacts (flood related) to properties between Highway 1 and Moss Landing Road.  <b>Mitigation:</b> Action F-2. Construct floodwalls below Highway 1; acquire selected parcels below Highway 1.</p>
	<p><b>Impact:</b> Potential flooding impacts to structures and properties upstream of Castroville Blvd.  <b>Mitigation:</b> Requires more detailed topography and analysis.</p>
Surface Water/ Groundwater	<p><b>Impact:</b> The volume of freshwater stored will be highly dependent upon rainfall. Based upon an initial water balance analysis, it appears that this alternative will create only seasonal wetlands in some years.  <b>Mitigation:</b> Action S-2. Release freshwater during spring and summer from flashboard dams, if water is available to release. RAC recommends use of reclaimed water to supplement freshwater impoundments.</p>
<b>WATER QUALITY</b>	
Deposition of Fill	<p><b>Impact:</b> Removal of some contaminants from slough, and deposition of contaminated dredge material into receiving waters or adjacent lands for construction of impoundment; detailed sediment analysis and dispersal study required.  <b>Mitigation:</b> Action H-5. Sediment management plan for pollutants.</p>
<b>BIOTIC RESOURCES: IMPACTS, MITIGATIONS AND ENHANCEMENTS</b>	
Vegetation	<p><b>Impact:</b> Action B-1 will inundate existing alkali grassland below 10-foot contour with freshwater during winter and spring; may result in gradual conversion of alkali grassland to freshwater plant species (375 acres).  <b>Mitigation:</b> see Land Use</p>
	<p><b>Impact:</b> Installation of flashboard dam at SPRR will prevent tidal inundation above SPRR and allow for gradual conversion of brackishwater marsh areas east of SPRR to more fresh water plant association (200 acres).  <b>Mitigation:</b> None</p>
	<p><b>Impact:</b> Freshwater impoundments will be created above and below the SPRR, totalling 250 acres.  <b>Mitigation:</b> see Land Use</p>
	<p><b>Impact:</b> Action B-3. Protects existing habitat via creation of wetland/agricultural buffers.  <b>Mitigation:</b> see Land Use</p>
	<p><b>Impact:</b> Action B-4. Create wetland habitat along portions of Castroville Slough to 1977 dimensions.</p>

**Table 10-2. Analysis of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan - Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan (Cont'd.)**


ISSUES AND CONCERNS	WINTER/SPRING FRESHWATER CONDITIONS
Wildlife	<p><b>Impact:</b> Action B-6. Provide island along slough to facilitate waterfowl breeding.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> Requires permit from COE to alter existing wetland and deposition of dredged material. Investigate if this would significantly impact brackishwater snail or tidewater goby.</p>
	<p><b>Impact:</b> Inundation of additional lands with freshwater may result in an increase in freshwater winter mosquito populations. Treatment may affect wildlife resources depending on the method employed (e.g., use of mosquito fish).</p>
Fisheries and Aquatic	<p><b>Impact:</b> Modification of the water regime (i.e., increase in storage/release of freshwater) may result in loss of 8,000 linear feet (65 acres) of brackishwater snail habitat.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> Action B-5 will install "eco-engineered" hay bale dams between the freshwater impoundments and the main slough to protect existing brackishwater snail habitat. Monitoring is needed to test effectiveness of hay bales to prevent excessive release of freshwater into the slough in order to prevent impact to the snail. If not effective, flashboard dams should be utilized.</p>
	<p><b>Impact:</b> Inundation of additional lands with freshwater may result in an increase in freshwater winter mosquito populations within the lower watershed.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> It is not known if the "eco-engineered" hay bales will allow sufficient manipulation of water levels to reduce breeding habitat for mosquitos and minimize mosquito abatement operations. The winter/spring freshwater regime will be very favorable for mosquitos; mosquitos may be of significant management concern. Runnels and other drainage features could be used to reduce standing water but may be contrary to design plan. Cost of mosquito abatement may be high. Treatment may affect aquatic resources, depending on method.</p>
Agricultural Resources	<p><b>Impact:</b> Increased inundation of lands below 10-foot contour will remove 375 acres from existing grazing and/or other agricultural use.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> Action A-1; obtain conservation easement to convert pasture and/or agricultural lands west of SPRR to managed wetland habitat.</p>
	<p><b>Impact:</b> Creation of buffers between agriculture and wetlands will remove 75 acres from agriculture.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> Action A-2 will purchase or obtain conservation easement to convert pasture and/or agricultural land between SPRR and Castroville Blvd. to wetland/agricultural buffer.</p>

**Table 10-2. Analysis of Lower Watershed Preferred Alternative Plan - Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions, Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan (Cont'd.)**

ISSUES AND CONCERNS	WINTER/SPRING FRESHWATER CONDITIONS
<b>Agricultural Resources (Cont'd.)</b>	<p><b>Impact:</b> Creation of retention basins, grassland swales and perimeter ditches in buffer between agriculture and wetlands upstream of SPRR will remove 75 acres from agriculture.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> Actions A-2 and A-3 will purchase or obtain conservation easement to create a wetland/agricultural buffer to minimize conflicts between agricultural land practices and habitat protection (i.e., grass-lined swale, sediment control, perimeter ditches).</p> <p><b>Impact:</b> Widening of portions of Castroville Slough to restore wetlands along Castroville Slough to 1977 dimensions will remove more than 10 acres of existing agriculture.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> Action A-4 would encourage landowners that have filled wetlands without COE permits to re-establish wetlands along the slough.</p>
<b>LAND USE</b>	
<b>Land Ownership/Property Rights</b>	<p><b>Impact:</b> Conversion of agricultural land to wetland habitat.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> Action L-2. Obtain conservation easements for pasture and/or agricultural lands below the 10-foot contour west of SPRR to construct fresh-water impoundments (375 acres). Some landowners may be reluctant to give conservation easement and may make action unfeasible.</p> <p><b>Impact:</b> Opportunity to redesign Highway 1 with CalTrans project.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> None.</p>
<b>REGULATORY PERMITS</b>	
<b>Monterey County</b>	<p>M-1. Environmental Impact Report.</p> <p>M-2. Development permit for construction/grading.</p>
<b>CDFG</b>	<p>C-1. Streambed alteration agreement for work in channel.</p>
<b>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</b>	<p>COE-1. Section 404 permit required for excavation of slough channels and deposition of materials onto wetlands for levee construction; probable mitigation of wetlands at minimum 1:1 acreage.</p> <p>COE-2. Federal environmental review FONSI/EIS.</p>
<b>CA Regional Water Quality Control Board</b>	<p>RB-1. Certification of water quality compliance.</p>
<b>NOAA</b>	<p>N-1. Permit for deposition of fill into National Marine Sanctuary and possible migration of contaminants into Elkhorn Slough, if deposition utilized.</p>
<b>USFWS</b>	<p>U-1. Section 7 consultation for potential impacts to endangered species; tidewater goby, long-toed salamander, red-legged frog, brackishwater snail, if listed.</p>
<b>Moss Landing Harbor District</b>	<p>HD-1. Permit required for activity within slough.</p>



This conceptual plan is for discussion purposes only and is not intended for construction. The plan is for preliminary planning purposes. For the Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Plan for the Lower San Joaquin River, Volume 1, at the County of Monterey with an appendix and comments.



- CREATE FRESHWATER IMPOUNDMENTS
- MAINTAIN EXISTING SLOUGH CHANNEL AND LEVEES
- CONSTRUCT LEVEES TO PROVIDE FLOOD PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL LANDS (10' CONTOUR) (-----)
- MANAGE EXISTING SLOUGH FOR BRACKISH WATER SNAIL D/D1 (SEE FIGURE 10-2)


**The Habitat Restoration Group**


Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Maro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Preferred Plan for Lower Watershed

2/96  
 705-01

Figure 10-1







The Habitat Restoration Group  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Cross-section Showing Design of Lower Watershed Preferred Plan-Winter/Spring Freshwater Conditions (D/D1)

2/96  
 705-01

Figure 10-2





## CHAPTER 11 PROJECT-WIDE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Best management practices (BMP's) are recommended for the entire watershed to provide resource protection and enhancement (Figure 11-1). The BMP's are consistent with guidance documents developed as part of Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA). This act requires states with Federally approved coastal zone management programs, such as California, to develop and implement Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs to ensure the protection and restoration of coastal waters. A funding request, to prepare a more comprehensive NPS Pollution program for the Natividad/Gabilan Creek watershed (which includes the Moro Cojo Slough drainage), was submitted to the EPA under Section 205(j)(2) of the Clean Water Act (AMBAG, 1994). The project was funded and the report is expected to be completed by August 1996 (AMBAG, pers. comm., 1996). A companion project, under Section 319(h) of the Clean Water Act, proposes to implement several wetland restoration projects to demonstrate their value as natural filters for reducing nonpoint source pollution and facilitating groundwater recharge (*ibid.*; this project has also been approved for funding). The State programs must include management measures in conformity with those specified in EPA's management measures. The state will have some flexibility in that they may adopt either the measures specified in the EPA's guidance or alternative measures, provided the alternative measures are as effective as EPA's measures in controlling coastal nonpoint pollution (EPA, 1993).

Another water quality program of note is the planning effort begun led by the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary office. The Water Quality Protection Program (WQPP) implements a key provision of a Memorandum of Agreement adopted by eight federal, state, and local agencies in September 1992 when Congress and the President established the Sanctuary. This program, using a watershed approach to address coastal water quality, is investigating a broad range of problems including toxic pollutants in sediments, fish and shellfish, human health problems, sedimentation and low flows in rivers and streams, wetlands alteration and habitat loss. The Protection Program will develop and carry out a plan containing specific strategies and actions that address these problems while sustaining the region's economic viability. Strategies might include public education, technical assistance, research and monitoring, and regulations and enforcement, where necessary. One major component of the WQPP will be the development of a Model Urban Runoff Program. Two Model Urban Runoff Ordinances will be drafted. Another component of the WQPP will be the development of an Agricultural Runoff Management Program.

Nonpoint source pollution (NPSP) is a problem for the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, resulting in the degradation of wetland and riparian resource values. The BMP's address sediment/erosion, confined animal facilities, nutrient management, pesticide management, livestock grazing, new development, sewage systems, pollution prevention, stormwater runoff, protection and restoration of wetland and riparian areas, and public education. The BMP's also recommend actions to protect and manage rare, threatened, endangered and locally unique plant and animal species and their habitats. The California Coastal Commission has a federal grant to produce a linked GIS, Database, and Modeling methodology for applying BMPs within critical Moro Cojo Slough subwatersheds. For a fuller discussion on how to implement BMPs see California Coastal Commission, Procedural Guidance Manual: Addressing Polluted runoff in the California Coastal Zone, San Francisco, forthcoming.

The locations for each action are depicted in Figure 11-1 and described below. Plan objectives, listed in Chapter 2 (pages 2-2 and 2-3), that are achieved through implementation of each action are also identified. For additional information on these actions, please refer to the following sections of the Technical Appendix:

G: Best Management Practices for Water Resources

H: Best Management Practices for Agriculture

I: Best Management Practices for Control of Selected Invasive Non-native Plant Species

J: Plant Species Suitable for Development Activities Adjacent to Oak Trees

Landowners are encouraged to voluntarily implement these actions in order to meet the overall project goal of enhancement and resource values of the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. Each action is intended to be implemented by/with willing landowners. Funding mechanisms for implementation are discussed in Chapter 2, Implementation Program.

## **HYDROLOGY, WATER QUALITY, AND WASTEWATER**

**BMP-1.** To enhance water quality of the slough, construct grass-lined swales between the slough and adjacent agricultural operations to filter runoff (see Agriculture Resources).

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective A-4, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-5, B-6, W-1, W-2, W-4, A-1, A-2, A-4, P-2, and P-3.

**BMP-2.** To enhance water quality within the slough, construct sediment retention basins adjacent to medium to high-density development areas within the watershed. The basins will filter runoff and collect sediment.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective W-3, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-5, W-1, W-2, W-3, P-2, and P-3.

**BMP-3.** To enhance water quality within the slough, conduct periodic maintenance in retention basins.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective W-3, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-5, W-1, W-2, W-3, A-1, A-2, A-4, P-2, and P-3.

**BMP-4.** Encourage Monterey County to install and maintain stormwater treatment facilities for new and existing developments that drain into Castroville Slough.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective W-3, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-5, W-1, W-2, W-7, P-3.

**BMP-5.** To assess the effect of the retention basins and stormwater treatments facilities, monitor water quality within the slough on a regular, on-going basis during high and low water levels.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective W-7, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-5, W-1, W-2, W-3, and P-3.

## Wastewater

- BMP-6.** Encourage Monterey County Department of Health to compile data on septic tank failures within the watershed to evaluate the potential threat to both surface and groundwater.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective W-1, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-5, B-6, W-1, W-2, and W-7.

## BIOTIC RESOURCES

- BMP-7.** To enhance/preserve existing locally unique grassland plant species, implement management program for selected alkali grassland and native/mixed grassland areas (i.e., prescribed burning, mowing, grazing management, removal on invasive, non-native plant species).

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective G-2, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-3, B-5, B-6, W-2, L-1, and P-2.

- BMP-8.** To enhance habitat values of riparian corridors, implement revegetation program for selected degraded riparian habitat areas and remove invasive, non-native plant species. Develop planting list of appropriate plant species, and planting techniques, for dissemination to affected landowners. Encourage voluntary revegetation of degraded areas. Develop list and description of invasive, non-native plants to be removed; see Appendix I for management techniques. Where necessary, fence riparian area to exclude domestic animal access. Establish buffers between riparian habitat and confined animal facilities and other developments.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective B-7, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-3, B-5, B-6, B-8, W-2, L-1, and P-2.

- BMP-9.** To enhance/preserve existing habitat for endangered wildlife species, implement management program for selected amphibian habitat areas (i.e., preserve pasture/grassland, agricultural ponds, grazing management, control of feral animals). Encourage landowners in area to preserve breeding/potential breeding ponds. Conduct education program with affected landowners on land use activities compatible with habitat protection.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective G-2, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-3, B-5, B-6, W-2, L-1, and P-2.

- BMP-10.** To enhance/preserve existing habitat for endangered wildlife species, install culverts under Meridian Road to facilitate amphibian migration (Figure 4-4).

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective G-2, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-5, B-6, P-2, and P-3.

- BMP-11.** To enhance/preserve existing habitat for wildlife species utilizing the slough, establish program to resource agencies to control feral animals, including red fox. Consult with USFWS on measures utilized at Salinas River NWR.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective G-2, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-3, B-5, B-6, W-2, L-1, and P-2.

**BMP-12.** To preserve existing maritime chaparral and oak woodland habitats, encourage residents within these areas to utilize compatible plant species in residential landscaping and remove invasive, non-native plant species (Appendix J). Disseminate information to affected landowners. For new development, this practice is in effect through the County's review of landscaping plans.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective B-7, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-3, B-5, B-6, B-8, W-2, L-1, and P-2.

**BMP-13.** To preserve existing grasslands for rare and endangered plant and amphibian species, encourage residents within mixed grassland and selected non-native grassland habitats to maintain these areas as open space. Conduct education program with affected landowners on land use activities compatible with grasslands.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective B-5, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives G-2, W-2, L-1, and P-2.

### **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

**BMP-14.** To minimize impacts to wetland and riparian resources adjacent to the slough, manage agricultural uses (including grazing activities) through the creation of buffers and seasonal closures (i.e., winter closures for grazing below the 10-foot contour). Obtain conservation easements with willing landowners for land to at least the 10-foot contour and compensate landowners for the cost of removing existing agriculture or cattle grazing operations from selected areas. Erect fencing to separate grazing lands from wetlands; place fencing at least 3 feet back from grazing edge to accommodate grazing activity that occur through the fence (i.e., cattle put their heads through the fence to graze).

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective B-5, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives G-2, B-6, W-1, A-1, L-1, P-2, and P-3.

**BMP-15.** To enhance water quality within the slough, construct sediment and wastewater retention ponds adjacent to nurseries and confined animal facilities. The ponds will filter runoff and collect sediment.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective W-3, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-5, W-1, W-2, W-3, A-1, A-2, A-4, P-2, and P-3.

**BMP-16.** To minimize soil erosion and transport of fertilizers and pesticides from strawberry fields and other crops, implement resource management systems which encourage on-site soil and water conservation. Examples of systems which reduce overland flow of rainfall include conservation tillage, contour farming, grassed waterways, and mulching. Examples of systems which reduce erosion and sediment transport include diversion channels, lined waterways, underground outlets, and corrugated plastic pipe furrow pickup lines. Design specifications and technical assistance for the installation of these and other systems are available from the SCS.

Implementation of these measures will primarily address objectives A-3 and A-4, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives A-1, A-2, G-1, W-1, and W-2.

BMP-17. To minimize introduction of agricultural nutrients and pesticides into slough and upstream wetlands, reduce application of agricultural chemicals through use of nutrient management plans and integrated pest management (IPM). Nutrient plans allow for reduced nutrient inputs on farms by monitoring soil conditions, assessing crop yield expectations, and considering environmental hazards of the site. Pesticide management also reduces chemical use in the watershed by improving the timing and efficiency of application in accordance with pest economic thresholds.

Implementation of these measures will primarily address objectives A-1 and A-3, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives A-2, A-4, and W-1.

BMP-18. To remove sediments and associated farm chemicals from agricultural runoff before entering the slough, construct sediment basins to settle out eroded material, or establish biological filter strips at base of cropped fields. These systems should be used in combination with systems which prevent in-field erosion and runoff (BMP-16).

Implementation of these measures will address objectives A-2, A-3, A-4, W-2, B-6, and W-3.

BMP-19. To encourage proper agricultural practices that benefit agricultural and wetland resources (i.e., contour plowing, use of sediment retention basins, buffer zones) for lands within the watershed, establish an "agriculture best management practices" awareness program. Program could be conducted through local soil conservation service office. Conduct outreach program with both landowners and growers. Implement BMP "practice demonstration projects" at one or more locations with willing landowners.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective A-3, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives G-2, B-5, B-6, W-1, W-3, W-4, W-5, A-1, A-2, A-4, L-1, P-2, and P-3.

BMP-20. To increase wetland resource values and minimize impacts to sensitive biotic resources, convert marginal agricultural lands to managed wetland habitat. Obtain conservation easements or purchase marginal agricultural lands from willing landowners, providing compensation for removal of agriculture. Implement wetland restoration and management actions.

Implementation of this measure addresses objective B-5, G-2, B-6, W-1, A-1, L-1, P-2, and P-3.

## LAND USE

BMP-21. To reflect the existence of high/moderate density residential development near Dolan Road, amend the North County LUP to depict this development.

Implementation of this measure does not address a specific plan objective.

BMP-22. To preserve existing grasslands for rare and endangered plant and amphibian species (upland refugia), evaluate revision to North County Land Use Plan to retain existing pasture land along Castroville Boulevard (northeast of high school and south of Monte Del Lago Mobilehome Community).

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective G-2, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives B-3, B-5, B-6, W-2, L-1, and P-2.

 **BMP-23.** To oversee restoration and management actions in the watershed, establish a private non-profit organization. Conduct community outreach programs (residents and growers) and seek grants, funding, and private donations to implement management plan actions. Encourage the development of watershed-wide and/or neighborhood public education/watershed stewardship program. Develop BMP practice demonstration area at the Castroville Boulevard/Highway 156/Meridian Road triangle. 

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective P-2, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives G-2, B-3, B-5, B-6, B-7, B-8, W-1, W-2, W-3, W-4, W-5, W-6, W-7, A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, L-1, P-1, and P-3.

#### **PUBLIC ACCESS AND EDUCATION**

**BMP-24.** To provide passive recreational needs, encourage implementation of trails within the watershed as adopted in the North County Trails Plan.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective P-1, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives P-2, and P-3.


**BMP-25.** To provide passive recreational and alternative transportation link, create a pedestrian trail linkage between the high school and Oak Hills residential development, perhaps utilizing land adjacent to the WaterTek Treatment Facility.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective P-1, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives P-2, and P-3.

**BMP-26.** To provide an interpretation on the natural and agricultural resources within the watershed and concurrent with implementation of trails, as proposed in the North County Trails Plan and BMP-23, above, install interpretive signs describing natural resources and management of the Moro Cojo Slough watershed. Develop a recreation and education area at the Castroville Boulevard/Highway 156/Meridian Road triangle area.

Implementation of this measure will primarily address objective P-1, but will also contribute to meeting project objectives P-2, and P-3.







The Habitat Restoration Group  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Maro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Cross-section Showing Project-wide Best Management Practices: Agricultural Buffer Area and Grass-lined Swale



2/96  
 705-01

Figure 11-2






Stormwater Wetland in Upper Watershed:



Sediment Retention Basin Adjacent to Slough




The Habitat Restoration Group


- Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services
- Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
Schematic Design of Project-wide Best Management Practices: Sediment Retention Basin

2/96  
705-01

Figure 11-3







**The Habitat Restoration Group**  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

**Mono Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan**  
 Schematic Design of Project-wide Best Management Practices: Culvert Crossings for Amphibian Migration


2/96  
705-01

Figure 11-4






Raised Boardwalk Section



Plan




NOTE: All dimensions shown are subject to verification by a structural engineer and are shown for schematic purposes only.

**The Habitat Restoration Group**  
 • Mitchell Swanson & Associates • VB Agricultural Services  
 • Applied Marine Sciences

Moro Cojo Slough Management and Enhancement Plan  
 Schematic Design of Project-wide Best Management Practices:  
 Raised Boardwalk within Wetland Areas and Interpretive Signs

2/96  
 705-01

Figure 11-5



**CHAPTER 12**  
**REFERENCES AND LITERATURE CITED**

- ABA Consultants. 1988. Biological Assessment of Wetland Environments Impacted by Culvert Installation at the Mouth of Moro Cojo Slough. Prepared for Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.
- ABA Consultants. 1989. Elkhorn Slough Wetland Management Plan. Prepared for Monterey County and State Coastal Conservancy.
- ABA Consultants and Dr. Stephen B. Ruth. 1990. Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander Survey in Upper Moro Cojo Slough, Monterey County, CA. Prepared for Saratoga Savings and Loan Association and CH2M Hill.
- ABA Consultants. 1991. Moro Cojo Tidegates 1990 Monitoring Report. Prepared for Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Elkhorn Slough Wetland Management Plan, unpubl. report prepared for the California State Coastal Conservancy and the Monterey County Planning Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. Moro Cojo Tidegates 1990 Monitoring Report, unpubl. report prepared for the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.
- Allen, Bernadette, and Michael Reilly. 1980. Biological Resources Survey for Moss Landing Harbor.
- Anderson-Nichols & Co. 1983. Reconnaissance Flood Control Study - Lower Reaches of Moro Cojo Watershed. Unpublished report to Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.
- Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. 1994. Non-Point Source Pollution in Coastal Harbors and Slough of the Monterey Bay Region: Problem Assessment and Best Management Practices. Work Plan for Water Quality Management Planning Program [Section 205(j)(2)]. Marina, CA.
- Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. 1995. Personal communications with Frank Barron.
- Boyle Engineers. 1986. Salinas Valley groundwater model, unpubl. report prepared for the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.
- Boyle Engineers. 1987. Salinas Valley Groundwater Model Alternative Analysis, unpubl. report prepared for the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.
- Boyle Engineers. 1986. Final Report: Salinas Valley Groundwater Model. Unpubl. report prepared for the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.
- Broenkow, W.W. 1971. Chemical and Physical Effects of Discharging Kaiser Waste Effluent into Monterey Bay and Moro Cojo Slough. Moss Landing Marine Laboratory Tech. Pub. 71-3, Chapter 2.
- Byrnes, Pamela. Moss Landing Marine Laboratory. 1993. Personal communication.

- ✕ California Native Plant Society. 1988. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California. Sacramento, CA.
- California Native Plant Society. 1988. Vascular Plants, Manzanita Regional Park. Prepared for Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District.
- ✕ California Natural Diversity Data Base. 1989. California Department of Fish and Game. Moss Landing and Prunedale quadrant. Sacramento, CA.
- Clark, D.T. 1991. Monterey County Place Names. Kestrel Press, Carmel Valley, CA.
- Dondero, S. 1984. Preliminary Report on Archaeological Testing, CA-Mnt-229, Elkhorn Slough, California. California Department of Transportation, Office of Environmental Analysis.
- Elkhorn Slough Estuarine Reserve Advisory Committee (RAC). 1994. Meeting minutes from Planning and Facilities Sub-committee Meeting, August 31, 1994.
- Engineering Science [ES]. 1983. Lower Salinas River Groundwater and Biological Monitoring Study - Year One Annual Report. Prepared for Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, Monterey, CA.
- Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual, Technical Report Y-87-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.
- Fisher, E. 1934. Early fauna of the Monterey Region, California. Journal of Mammology 15:253.
- Foster, M. Moss Landing Marine Laboratory. 1994. Personal communication.
- Foxx, Nielsen and Associates. 1990. Geologic Investigation of Woodward Marine Moss Landing, Monterey County, California, unpubl. report prepared for Woodward Marine.
- Galvan, P. Michael. 1968. The Ohlone story. *In*: The Indian Historian, Vol. 1, No. 2, San Francisco, CA.
- Gobalet, K. 1990. Prehistoric Status of Freshwater Fishes of the Pajaro Salinas River System of California, Copeia, No. 3.
- Gordon, Burton L. 1987. Monterey Bay Area: Natural History and Cultural Imprints (2nd ed. reprint). The Boxwood Press. Pacific Grove, CA.
- The Habitat Restoration Group, County of Monterey Intergovernmental Affairs Office, and the Salinas River Lagoon Task Force. 1989. Salinas River Lagoon Management and Enhancement Plan - Plan of Work and Budget. Prepared for Carol Arnold, State Coastal Conservancy.
- The Habitat Restoration Group, Philip Williams and Associates, and Wetland Research Associates. 1992. Expanded Initial Study for Salinas River Lagoon Management and Enhancement Plan. Prepared for the Salinas River Lagoon Task Force.


- Hansen, John C. 1976. Soil Control Lab Technical Report No. 76-4; Pilot Study - Moro Cojo Slough Environmental Analysis. Prepared for Central Coast Regional Commission and California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission.
- Harvey and Stanley Associates, Inc. 1985. Resource Management of Moss Landing Area. Prepared for RPM.
- Harvey and Stanley Associates, Inc. 1988. Biotic Assessment of Salinas River Lagoon Levee Restoration and Sandbar Breaching. Prepared for Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.
- Hickman, James C. 1993. The Jepson Manual: Higher Plants of California. University of California Press. Berkeley, CA.
- Holland, R. 1986. Preliminary Descriptions of Terrestrial Plant Communities of California. California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA.
- Johnson, M.J. 1980. Groundwater in North Monterey County, California, U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report.
- Jones and Stokes Associates, Inc., and John Gilchrist and Associates. 1989. Moss Landing Harbor Mitigation Plan. Prepared for Moss Landing Harbor District, Moss Landing, CA.
- Jones and Stokes Associates, Inc. 1994. Moro Cojo Affordable Housing Project Draft EIR. Prepared for Monterey County.
- Jones, Terry. 1978. Aboriginal activity at Elkhorn Slough. A senior thesis, UC Santa Cruz.
- Kellogg, Michael G. 1980. Status of the California Brackishwater Snail (*Tyronia imitator*) in Central California. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Endangered Species Program.
- Koehn, Peter. Monterey County Water Resources Agency. 1993. Personal communication.
- Kollmorgen Instruments Corporation, 1988. Munsell Soil Color Charts. Baltimore, MD.
- Kukowski, Gary E. 1972. A Checklist of Fishes of the Monterey Bay Area including Elkhorn Slough, the San Lorenzo, Pajaro, and Salinas Rivers. Moss Landing Marine Labs Technical Publication 72-2.
- Madrone Associates. 1976. Biological Assessment for Proposed Moss Landing Harbor Expansion - Moss Landing Harbor Development Plan (Cheney) Volume III. Prepared for Moss Landing Harbor District, Moss Landing, CA.
- Margolin, Malcolm. 1978. The Ohlone Way: Indian Life in the San Francisco - Monterey Bay Area. Heyday Books. Berkeley, CA.
- Mayer, K.E. and W.F. Laudenslayer (eds.). 1988. A Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California. Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

- Monterey County Building and Inspection Department. 1980. North County 400 Series, Draft Background Data Reports. Salinas, CA.
- Monterey County Department of Environmental Health, 1994. B. First, M. Jarvina, M. Dias. Personal communication.
- Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. 1982. North County Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan. Salinas, CA.
- Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. 1988a. Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan, Part 1: Coastal Zone Regulations, Regulations for Coastal Development Permits, General Provisions and Exceptions, Title 20 (Zoning Ordinance). Salinas, CA.
- Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. 1988b. Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan, Part 2: Regulations for Development in the North County Land Use Plan Area. Salinas, CA.
- Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. 1989. North County Trails Plan. Salinas, CA.
- Moss Landing Harbor District. 1986. Moss Landing Harbor District Master Plan. Moss Landing Harbor District, Moss Landing, CA.
- Mountjoy, Daniel C. 1993. Farming Practices Survey and Outreach Recommendations for Elkhorn Slough Water Quality Project. AMBAG, Marina, CA.
- Munz, P. and D. Keck. 1973. A California Flora and Supplement. University of California Press. Berkeley, CA.
- North Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District. Ghormely, P. 1994. Personal communication.
- Oliver, J.S., J.A. King, M. Hornberger, D.L. Schwartz. 1993. Extensive Salt Marsh Erosion Caused by Human Activities in Elkhorn Slough, California. In Press: Wetlands Journal. 1993.
- Patch, Dorothy A. 1979. The paleoecology of Elkhorn Slough: Implications for human subsistence. Senior thesis, UC Santa Cruz.
- Pilling, D.E. 1955. Relationships of prehistoric culture among the Indians of Coastal Monterey County. Kroeber Anthropological Soc. Papers #12.
- Regional Water Quality Control Board. 1994. Personal communication.
- Robertson, D. and C. Tenney (eds.). 1993. Atlas of Breeding Birds of Monterey County, CA, Monterey Peninsula Audubon Society, Carmel, CA.
- Schwartz, D.L., Mullins, H.T., and D.F. Belknap. 1986. Holocene Geologic History of a Transform Margin Estuary: Elkhorn Slough, Central California, Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, Vol. 22.
- Seawater Intrusion Committee. 1987. The Salinas Valley Seawater Intrusion Program. Prepared for Monterey County Board of Supervisors.


- Silberstein, Mark. Elkhorn Slough Foundation. 1994. Personal communication.
- Smith, J.J. 1990. The effects of sandbar formation and inflows on aquatic habitat and fish utilization in Pescadero, San Gregorio, Wadell, and Pomponio Creek Estuary/Lagoon systems, 1985-1989. Report to California Department of Parks and Recreation.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1978. Soil Survey of Monterey County, California. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1984a. Strawberry Hills Target Area: Watershed Area Study Report, Monterey, California. USDA Soil Conservation Service; Davis.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1984b. Technical Report: Strawberry Hills Target Area, Monterey, California. USDA Soil Conservation Service; Davis.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1987. Hydric Soils of Santa Cruz County, California. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1994. Elkhorn Slough Watershed Project: Watershed Plan and Environmental Assessment. USDA Soil Conservation Service; Davis.
- Soil Conservation Service, 1994. Elkhorn Slough Watershed Project. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Salinas, CA.
- State of California - The Resources Agency. 1987. Salinas River State Beach General Plan. Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, CA.
- Striplen, C.J. 1992. Effects of predation on hatching success of the California clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*) in the south San Francisco Bay Area and characterization of nest predators through use of artificial nests and captive animals. Unpubl. senior thesis. Biology/Environ. Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- TAMS/Dames and Moore. 1991. Route 1 Improvement Study: Castroville to Santa Cruz County. EIR - Section 3.
- Tate, Gary. Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District. 1993. Personal communication.
- Terra-Sol Ltd. 1980. A Focused Draft Environmental Impact Report for Manzanita Regional Park. Prepared for Monterey Regional Park District.
- U.S. Department of Interior Geological Survey. 1978. Historic Ground Failures in Northern California Associated with Earthquakes, Geological Survey Professional Paper 993. Washington D.C.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1993. Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs: Program and Development and Approval Guidance. U.S. EPA Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds and NOAA Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management. EPA-840-B-92-002, January 1993.

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1991. San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge predator management plan and final environmental assessment. K.S. Foerster and J.E. Takekawa (authors). SFBNWR, Newark, California.
- Whitaker, B. 1976. Ethnobotany of the Costanoans. Unpubl. senior thesis, UC Santa Cruz.
- Willard, Charlie. 1994. California Department of Parks and Recreation, State Trails Coordinator. Personal communication.
- Williams, Daniel F. 1986. Mammalian Species of Special Concern in California, CDFG Report No. 86-1.
- Yadon, Vern. 1993. Personal communication.

**Moro Cojo Slough  
Management and Enhancement Plan  
Technical Appendices**



**Appendix A**  
*Water Quality Data Collected*  
*by*  
*MCWRA 1990-1992*



1991

MORO COJO SLOUGH WATER QUALITY MONITORING  
STATION EAST OF HIGHWAY 1 BRIDGE

<u>Date</u>	<u>Temp. in C</u>	<u>Salinity in PPT</u>	<u>dO in mg/l</u>	<u>Turbidity in NTV*</u>	<u>pH</u>	<u>Observations</u>
1/27/91	12.2	35.0	4.9	18.0	7.52	Shallow, clear water
2/22/91	16.8	32.2	10.8	4.0	7.98	Enteromorpha on edge of water
3/5/91	15.0	26.9	13.7	29.0	8.07	Clamers digging
4/28/91	19.0	28.0	13.8	15.0	9.60	Enteromorpha on edge, clear
5/18/91	18.0	32.0	12.8	6.0	9.48	Enteromorpha on edge, coots
6/7/91	20.3	32.1	17.6	4.5	8.72	Moderate Breeze, Enteromorpha 30%
7/13/91	22.5	38.0	19.6	9.5	8.93	Clear water
8/25/91	22.0	32.0	12.0	14.0	8.22	Enteromorpha 30%
9/22/91	19.9	31.9	10.3	6.5	8.78	Higher water than usual
10/30/91	14.9	Off scale	14.5	20.0	8.95	Enteromorpha 30%
11/11/91	16.9	31.5	14.6	2.0	8.55	Enteromorpha 30%
12/14/91	10.8	32.0	11.8	3.8	8.49	Enteromorpha 50%

\*NTV is Nephelometric Turbidity Units

qa5/quality.pk

1991

MORO COJO SLOUGH WATER QUALITY MONITORING  
STATION SOUTH OF MOSS LANDING ROAD

<u>Date</u>	<u>Temp. in C</u>	<u>Salinity in PPT</u>	<u>dO in mg/l</u>	<u>Turbidity in NTV*</u>	<u>pH</u>	<u>Observations</u>
3/5/91	14.0	24.0	9.2	6.0	7.81	Started monthly monitoring
4/28/91	17.2	28.5	11.1	4.0	8.24	Enteromorpha on edge, calm
5/18/91	14.0	29.0	10.0	13.0	8.21	Enteromorpha 50%, ulva on edge
6/7/91	17.0	31.3	11.4	4.5	8.39	Gentle Breeze, Enteromorpha 75%
7/13/91	16.5	32.0	8.5	5.0	8.17	Clear water, dark mud
8/25/91	18.0	29.0	9.6	7.5	7.92	Enteromorpha less than 50%
9/22/91	17.5	30.0	12.9	4.0	9.03	Fairly clear water
10/30/91	14.2	Off scale	5.3	15.0	8.73	Enteromorpha 50%
11/11/91	14.8	31.2	7.8	6.0	7.83	Enteromorpha 50%
12/14/91	12.3	30.3	7.7	4.5	7.99	Enteromorpha 50%

\*NTV is Nephelometric Turbidity Units

qa5/quality.pk

1991

MORO COJO SLOUGH  
MONITORING FOR NITRATES, AMMONIA, PHOSPHATES  
STATION SOUTH OF MOSS LANDING ROAD

<u>DATE</u>	<u>NO2</u>	<u>NO3+NO2</u>	<u>NH3</u>	<u>PO4</u>
3/5/91	1.60	33.50	13.32	4.80
5/18/91	1.26	88.67	2.42	2.53
6/7/91	2.05	73.66	2.79	NA
7/13/91	1.10	36.90	4.12	1.23
8/25/91	1.66	35.46	6.04	NA
9/22/91	0.82	31.00	4.80	NA
10/30/91	0.14	3.17	6.95	NA
11/11/91	0.20	27.55	5.25	4.27
12/14/91	1.20	13.62	8.37	NA

All Concentrations in uM

qa5/monitor.pk/ce

1991

MORO COJO SLOUGH  
MONITORING FOR NITRATES, AMMONIA, PHOSPHATES  
STATION EAST OF HIGHWAY 1 BRIDGE

<u>DATE</u>	<u>NO2</u>	<u>NO3+NO2</u>	<u>NH3</u>	<u>PO4</u>
1/27/91	0.26	4.28	0.56	1.23
2/22/91	0.00	1.06	0.10	1.20
3/5/91	0.43	6.20	1.30	1.52
4/27/91	0.26	1.83	0.70	21.49
5/18/91	0.11	4.10	0.28	0.48
6/7/91	0.56	7.53	0.00	5.67
7/13/91	0.52	4.13	1.54	0.76
8/25/91	0.82	6.34	1.46	NA
9/22/91	0.60	9.60	2.37	NA
10/30/91	0.00	5.57	2.40	NA
11/11/91	0.37	8.43	3.54	3.59
12/14/91	0.51	3.71	2.62	NA

All Concentrations in uM

qa5/monitor.pk/ce

1992

MORO COJO SLOUGH WATER QUALITY MONITORING  
STATION EAST OF HIGHWAY 1 BRIDGE

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TEMP. IN C</u>	<u>SALINITY IN PPT</u>	<u>DO IN mg/l</u>	<u>TURBIDITY IN NTU</u>	<u>PH</u>	<u>OBSERVATIONS</u>
01/26/92	14.1	30.5	10.6	7.5	8.27	Calm, advcets
02/18/92	14.0	4.0	7.4	58.0	7.10	No enteromorpha
03/28/92	18.1	28.8	14.4	10.0	8.40	Small ripples on slough
04/30/92	22.0	31.0	9.15	8.0	8.31	Ulva from shore to 6' out in the slough
05/25/92	18.8	32.0	10.1	3.0	8.52	Enteromorpha on edge, 20% coverage
06/30/92	22.0	39.5	8.3	4.7	9.26	Enteromorpha 25%
07/20/92	24.0	29.0	15.9	3.2	8.98	Enteromorpha and ulva, 50% coverage
08/08/92	21.5	37.0	8.0	6.6	9.04	Enteromorpha 40%, ulva on bottom
09/29/92	18.2	32.5	4.2	3.5	8.39	Enteromorpha 60%, ulva on bottom
10/30/92	16.3	32.8	7.5	3.2	8.15	Enteromorpha 60%
11/16/92	15.6	33.2	8.0	2.5	8.61	Enteromorpha 50%
12/07/92	12.2	29.1	7.9	1.9	8.18	Enteromorpha 10%, ulva on bottom

\*NTU is Nephelometric Turbidity Units

qa2\3\quality.pk/tk

1992

MORO COJO SLOUGH WATER QUALITY MONITORING  
STATION SOUTH OF MOSS LANDING ROAD

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TEMP. IN C</u>	<u>SALINITY IN PPT</u>	<u>DO IN mg/l</u>	<u>TURBIDITY IN NTU</u>	<u>PH</u>	<u>OBSERVATIONS</u>
01/26/92	13.5	32.5	7.2	22.0	8.05	Enteromorpha 25%
02/18/92	14.8	9.0	6.3	33.0	7.51	No enteromorpha
03/28/92	18.5	30.0	8.7	4.5	8.56	Small ripples on slough
04/30/92	19.0	29.5	9.50	6.5	8.18	Ulva from shore to 3' out, enteromorpha 25%
05/25/92	21.0	29.8	13.2	10.0	8.58	Enteromorpha 50%
06/30/92	19.9	36.2	6.4	2.5	8.80	Enteromorpha 20%, ulva from shore to 2' out
07/20/92	19.5	31.0	14.7	45.0	8.43	Enteromorpha and ulva from shore to 10' out
08/08/92	19.1	31.2	12.0	2.3	8.55	Ulva on bottom, 50% coverage
09/29/92	16.2	28.0	6.7	2.0	7.96	Enteromorpha 40%, ulva from shore to 8' out
10/30/92	15.9	31.3	7.7	4.5	8.01	Enteromorpha 40%
11/16/92	15.0	31.8	5.7	4.0	8.40	Enteromorpha 30%
12/07/92	13.0	28.0	5.0	0.4	7.81	Enteromorpha 75%, ulva on bottom

\*NTU is Nephelometric Turbidity Units

qa2\3\quality.pk/tk

1992

MORO COJO SLOUGH  
MONITORING FOR NITRATES, AMMONIA, PHOSPHATES, CHLORIDES  
STATION SOUTH OF MOSS LANDING ROAD

<u>DATE</u>	<u>NO3+NO2</u>	<u>NH3</u>	<u>PO4</u>	<u>CHLORIDES</u>	<u>ELEC. CONDUCT.</u>
01/26/92	1.36	0.10	0.18	---	48,200
02/18/92	9.50	1.09	1.68	4,850	15,310
03/28/92	1.20	<0.05	0.24	17,250	49,500
04/30/92	19.50	0.13	0.09	18,200	49,650
05/25/92	1.70	<0.05	0.11	18,300	46,500
06/30/92	4.10	0.20	0.05	21,400	56,000
07/20/92	<0.05	<0.10	0.04	18,500	49,300
08/08/92	0.50	<0.10	0.05	18,300	50,000
09/29/92	1.70	0.10	0.05	16,000	42,100
10/30/92	5.40	0.20	0.07	27,300	45,800
11/16/92	4.30	<0.10	0.07	37,000	49,800
12/07/92	2.30	<0.10	0.07	17,100	43,500

Electrical Conductivity in umhos/cm

All other values in uM (ppm)

1992


MORO COJO SLOUGH  
MONITORING FOR NITRATES, AMMONIA, PHOSPHATES, CHLORIDES  
STATION EAST OF HIGHWAY 1 BRIDGE


<u>DATE</u>	<u>NO3+NO2</u>	<u>NH3</u>	<u>PO4</u>	<u>CHLORIDES</u>	<u>ELEC. CONDUCT.</u>
01/26/92	0.33	0.07	0.16	---	46,800
02/18/92	13.6	0.75	1.72	2,210	5,940
03/28/92	0.10	<0.05	0.29	17,450	46,500
04/30/92	0.30	0.08	0.25	18,950	43,600
05/25/92	0.30	<0.05	0.03	18,500	48,200
06/30/92	0.11	0.20	0.03	23,900	61,500
07/20/92	<0.05	<0.10	0.03	18,750	49,200
08/08/92	--	0.20	0.05	23,750	58,000
09/29/92	1.50	<0.10	0.05	27,800	53,700
10/30/92	4.00	0.20	0.10	26,600	50,000
11/16/92	1.10	<0.10	0.50	19,800	51,500
12/07/92	1.70	0.10	0.08	18,100	45,000

Electrical Conductivity in umhos/cm

All other values in uM (ppm)

**Appendix B**  
*Water Quality Measurements*  
*by*  
*California Regional Water Quality Control Board*





**FIGURE C-11 MONTEREY BAY DRAINAGE AREA STATIONS**



Date: 05/16/94

WATER BODY FACT SHEET

Region: 3

Water Body Name: MORO COJO SLOUGH

Hydrologic Unit No.: 309.10

Total Areal Extent: 345 AC

Type of Resource: Wetlands

Clean Water Strategy Rating

Resource Value: 5

Uniqueness: 4

Magnitude of Use: 4

Type of Problem/Need: Sedimentation  
Pesticides/herbicides  
Wildlife habitat impaired

Location: Connects to Moss Landing Harbor at Old Salinas River

Problem/Need(s) and Source Description: SMW samples exceed EDL B5 for DDT (3036 ppb), 1982, also EDL 95 for Endosulfan 1 and Toxaphene (4500 ppb). Extremely elevated levels of organic pesticides in test biota.

SUMMARY OF PROBLEM(S) OR CONCERN(S)

Concern 1

Concern 2

Concern 3

Specific Location:

National Refractories Area  
TOXAPHENE, TRA, ENDOSULFAN

: Upper Reaches  
: SED, PES

:

Method of Assessment:

Measured

: Best Professional Judgement

:

Water Quality Impaired or Threatened?:

Impaired - 3

: Threatened - 3

:

Major Beneficial Use Category Affected:

Aquatic

: Aquatic

:

Type of Source(s):

AGRI

: AGRI, LDEV, ONPS, URBA

Areal Extent:

50e AC

: 100e AC

:

Programs Affected:

MONITOR, MPS, 205(J), SPEC-INV

: MONITOR, MPS, SPEC-INV, MOC-PLAN

:

Specific Location:

Concern 4

Concern 5

Concern 6

Type of Pollutants/Parameters:

:

Method of Assessment:

:

Water Quality Impaired or Threatened?:

:

Major Beneficial Use Category Affected:

:

Type of Source(s):

:

Areal Extent:

:

Programs Affected:

:


e = areal extent of problem is estimated

Date Last Updated: 03/21/94



**Appendix C**

*Checklist of Vascular Plants  
Moro Cojo Slough Watershed*



**APPENDIX C**  
**CHECKLIST OF VASCULAR PLANTS**  
**MORO COJO SLOUGH WATERSHED**

This is a list of the plant species observed in the Moro Cojo slough watershed during reconnaissance-level field surveys, as well as species listed by the California Native Plant Society for Manzanita County Park (CNPS, 1988), and other similar references.

<u>SPECIES</u>	<u>COMMON NAME</u>
<b>DICOTS</b>	
<b>AIZOACEAE</b>	
<i>Carpobrotus chilensis</i>	Ice plant
<i>Carpobrotus edulis</i>	Hottentot fig
<i>Tetragonia tetragonioides</i>	New Zealand spinach
<b>ANACARDIACEAE</b>	
<i>Toxicodendron diversilobum</i>	Poison oak
<b>APIACEAE</b>	
<i>Conium maculatum</i>	Poison hemlock
<i>Lomatium dasycarpum</i>	Lace-parsnip
<i>Lomatium parvifolium</i>	Small-leaved lomatium
<i>Perideridia gairdneri</i> ssp. <i>gairdneri</i>	Gairdner's yampah
<i>Sanicula crassicaulis</i>	Snakeweed
<b>ASTERACEAE</b>	
<i>Achillea millefolium</i>	Yarrow
<i>Ambrosia chamissonis</i>	Beach-bur
<i>Ambrosia psilostachya</i>	Western ragweed
<i>Artemisia californica</i>	California sagebrush
<i>Artemisia douglasiana</i>	Mugwort
<i>Aster chilensis</i>	Common aster
<i>Baccharis douglasii</i>	Marsh baccharis
<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>	Coyote brush
<i>Centaurea melitensis</i>	Tocalote
<i>Cirsium occidentale</i>	Cobweb thistle
<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	Bull thistle
<i>Coryza canadensis</i>	Horseweed
<i>Cotula coronopifolia</i>	Brass buttons
<i>Ericameria ericoides</i>	Mock heather
<i>Ericameria fasciculata</i>	Eastwood's ericameria
<i>Eriophyllum confertiflorum</i> var. <i>confertiflorum</i>	Golden yarrow
<i>Euthamia occidentalis</i>	Western goldenrod
<i>Filago gallica</i>	Narrow-leaved filago
<i>Gnaphalium californicum</i>	Everlasting
<i>Gnaphalium purpureum</i>	Purple cudweed

<u>SPECIES</u>	<u>COMMON NAME</u>
<i>Grindelia latifolia</i>	Gum plant
<i>Hemizonia corymbosa</i>	Coast tarweed
<i>Heterotheca grandiflora</i>	Telegraph weed
<i>Hypochaeris radicata</i>	Rough cat's ear
<i>Jaumea carnosa</i>	Jaumea
<i>Lessingia</i> sp.	Corethrogyne
<i>Madia sativa</i>	Coast tarweed
<i>Picris echioides</i>	Bristly ox-tongue
<i>Psilocarphus tenellus</i>	Slender woollyheads
<i>Silybum marianum</i>	Milk thistle
<i>Solidago californica</i>	California goldenrod
<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>	Common sow thistle
<b>BORAGINACEAE</b>	
<i>Amsinckia menziesii</i>	Common fiddleneck
<i>Cryptantha leiocarpa</i>	Coast cryptantha
<i>Heliotropium curassavicum</i> var. <i>oculatum</i>	Seaside heliotrope
<b>BRASSICACEAE</b>	
<i>Brassica rapa</i>	Field mustard
<i>Brassica nigra</i>	Black mustard
<i>Cakile maritima</i>	Sea rocket
<i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i>	Shepherd's purse
<i>Cardamine oligosperma</i>	Bittercress
<i>Lobularia maritima</i>	Sweet alyssum
<i>Raphanus sativus</i>	Radish
<i>Rorippa nasturtium-aquaticum</i>	Water cress
<b>CAPRIFOLIACEAE</b>	
<i>Sambucus mexicana</i>	Blue elderberry
<b>CARYOPHYLLACEAE</b>	
<i>Cardionema ramosissimum</i>	Sand mat
<i>Spergularia marina</i>	Salt-marsh sand spurry
<i>Stellaria media</i>	Common chickweed
<b>CHENOPODIACEAE</b>	
<i>Atriplex triangularis</i>	Fat hen
<i>Atriplex semibaccata</i>	Australian saltbush
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	Lamb's quarters
<i>Chenopodium californicum</i>	California goosefoot
<i>Chenopodium macrospermum</i> var. <i>halophilum</i>	Coast goosefoot
<i>Chenopodium rubrum</i>	Red goosefoot
<i>Salicornia virginica</i>	Pickleweed
<b>CRASSULACEAE</b>	
<i>Dudleya</i> sp.	Dudleya
<i>Crassula connata</i>	Sand pigmyweed

<u>SPECIES</u>	<u>COMMON NAME</u>
<b>CUCURBITACEAE</b> <i>Marah fabaceus</i>	California man-root
<b>CUSCUTACEAE</b> <i>Cuscuta salina</i>	Salt marsh dodder
<b>ERICACEAE</b> <i>Arbutus menziesii</i> <i>Arctostaphylos hookeri</i> sp. <i>hookeri</i> <i>Arctostaphylos pajaroensis</i> <i>Arctostaphylos tomentosa</i>	Madrone Hooker's manzanita Pajaro manzanita Manzanita
<b>FABACEAE (LEGUMINOSAE)</b> <i>Genista monspessulana</i> <i>Lotus formosissimus</i> <i>Lotus scoparius</i> <i>Lupinus nanus</i> <i>Medicago polymorpha</i> <i>Melilotus</i> sp. <i>Trifolium</i>	French broom Coast trefoil Deer tongue lotus Sky lupine Bur clover Sweet clover Clover
<b>FAGACEAE</b> <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	Coast live oak
<b>FRANKENIACEAE</b> <i>Frankenia salina</i>	Alkali heath
<b>GARRYACEAE</b> <i>Garrya elliptica</i>	Coast silk-tassel
<b>GENTIANACEAE</b> <i>Centaurium davyi</i>	Davy's centaurium
<b>GERANIACEAE</b> <i>Erodium botrys</i> <i>Erodium cicutarium</i> <i>Geranium dissectum</i> <i>Geranium molle</i>	Long-beaked filaree Red-stemmed filaree Cut-leaved geranium Woolly geranium
<b>HYPERICACEAE</b> <i>Hypericum anagalloides</i>	Tinker's penny
<b>LAMIACEAE</b> <i>Mentha pulegium</i> <i>Prunella vulgaris</i> var. <i>lanceolata</i> <i>Salvia mellifera</i> <i>Satureja douglasii</i> <i>Scutellaria tuberosa</i> <i>Stachys bullata</i>	Pennyroyal Self-heal Black sage Yerba Buena Skull cap Hedge nettle

<u>SPECIES</u>	<u>COMMON NAME</u>
<b>LYTHRACEAE</b>	
<i>Lythrum hyssopifolium</i>	Loosestrife
<b>MALVACEAE</b>	
<i>Lavatera cretica</i>	Tree mallow
<i>Malva parviflora</i>	Mallow
<b>MYRTACEAE</b>	
<i>Eucalyptus globulus</i>	Blue gum
<b>ONAGRACEAE</b>	
<i>Camissonia contorta</i>	Contorted primrose
<i>Epilobium</i> sp.	Willow herb
<i>Epilobium brachycarpum</i>	Panicled willow herb
<b>OXALIDACEAE</b>	
<i>Oxalis albicans</i> ssp. <i>pilosa</i>	Hairy wood sorrel
<i>Oxalis pes-caprae</i>	Bermuda buttercup
<b>PAPAVERACEAE</b>	
<i>Dendromecon rigida</i>	Bush poppy
<i>Eschscholzia californica</i>	California poppy
<b>PLANTAGINACEAE</b>	
<i>Plantago coronopus</i>	Cut-leaf plantain
<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	English plantain
<b>POLEMONIACEAE</b>	
<i>Eriastrum virgatum</i>	Virgate eriastrum
<i>Navarretia squarrosa</i>	Skunkweed
<b>POLYGONACEAE</b>	
<i>Chorizanthe pungens</i> var. <i>pungens</i>	Monterey spineflower
<i>Eriogonum elongatum</i> var. <i>elongatum</i>	Long-stemmed buckwheat
<i>Eriogonum nudum</i>	Naked buckwheat
<i>Polygonum amphibium</i> var. <i>emersum</i>	Water smartweed
<i>Polygonum punctatum</i>	Smartweed
<i>Rumex acetosella</i>	Sheep sorrel
<i>Rumex crispus</i>	Curly dock
<i>Rumex pulcher</i>	Fiddle dock
<b>PORTULACACEAE</b>	
<i>Calandrinia ciliata</i>	Red maids
<i>Claytonia perfoliata</i> var. <i>perfoliata</i>	Miner's lettuce
<b>PRIMULACEAE</b>	
<i>Anagallis arvensis</i>	Scarlet pimpernel
<i>Dodecatheon clevelandii</i>	Shooting star
<b>RANUNCULACEAE</b>	
<i>Ranunculus californicus</i>	California buttercup

**SPECIES****COMMON NAME****RHAMNACEAE***Ceanothus cuneatus* var. *rigidus*

Monterey ceanothus

*Ceanothus dentatus*

Dwarf ceanothus

*Ceanothus papillosus*

Wartleaf ceanothus

*Ceanothus thyrsiflorus*

Blue blossom

*Rhamnus californica*

Coffeeberry

**ROSACEAE***Adenostoma fasciculatum*

Chamise

*Fragaria vesca*

Wild strawberry

*Heteromeles arbutifolia*

Toyon

*Potentilla anserina* ssp. *pacifica*

Pacific silverweed

*Rosa californica*

California rose

*Rubus discolor*

Himalayan blackberry

*Rubus ursinus*

California blackberry

**RUBIACEAE***Galium aparine*

Bedstraw

*Galium californicum*

California bedstraw

**SALICACEAE***Populus* sp.

Cottonwood

*Salix laevigata*

Red willow

*Salix lucida* var. *lasiandra*

Yellow willow

*Salix lasiolepis*

Arroyo willow

**SCROPHULARIACEAE***Castilleja affinis* ssp. *affinis*

Indian paintbrush

*Mimulus aurantiacus*

Sticky monkey flower

*Pedicularis densiflora*

Indian warrior

*Scrophularia californica* ssp. *californica*

Figwort

**SOLANACEAE***Solanum americanum*

Small-flowered nightshade

*Solanum umbelliferum*

Blue witch

**URTICACEAE***Urtica dioica* ssp. *holosericea*

Stinging nettle

**MONOCOTS****CYPERACEAE***Carex* sp.

Sedge

*Carex brevicaulis*

Short-stemmed sedge

*Cyperus eragrostis*

Tall cyperus

*Cyperus esculentus*

Nut grass

*Eleocharis macrostachya*

Spikerush

*Scirpus acutus* var. *occidentalis*

Acute tule

*Scirpus americanus*

Three-square

<u>SPECIES</u>	<u>COMMON NAME</u>
<i>Scirpus californicus</i>	California tule
<i>Scirpus robustus</i>	Alkali bulrush
<b>IRIDACEAE</b>	
<i>Iris douglasiana</i>	Douglas' iris
<i>Sisyrinchium bellum</i>	Blue-eyed grass
<b>JUNCACEAE</b>	
<i>Juncus bufonius</i>	Toad rush
<i>Juncus breweri</i>	Rush
<i>Juncus effusus</i> var. <i>brunneus</i>	Bog rush
<i>Juncus phaeocephalus</i>	Brown-headed rush
<b>LILIACEAE</b>	
<i>Calochortus</i> sp.	Mariposa lily
<i>Chlorogalum pomeridianum</i>	Soaproot
<i>Fritillaria affinis</i>	Checker lily
<b>POACEAE (GRAMINEAE)</b>	
<i>Avena barbata</i>	Wild oat
<i>Bromus diandrus</i>	Ripgut brome
<i>Bromus hordeaceus</i>	Soft chess
<i>Bromus madritensis</i> ssp. <i>rubens</i>	Red brome
<i>Cortaderia selloana</i>	Pampas grass
<i>Distichlis spicata</i>	Saltgrass
<i>Elymus glaucus</i>	Blue wild rye
<i>Holcus lanatus</i>	Velvet grass
<i>Hordeum brachyantherum</i>	Meadow barley
<i>Hordeum marinum</i> ssp. <i>gussoneanum</i>	Mediterranean barley
<i>Hordeum murinum</i> ssp. <i>leporinum</i>	Farmer's foxtail
<i>Leymus triticoides</i>	Creeping wild rye
<i>Lolium perenne</i>	Perennial rye grass
<i>Nassella pulchra</i>	Purple needlgrass
<i>Paspalum dilatatum</i>	Dallis grass
<i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i>	Kikuyu grass
<i>Poa annua</i>	Annual bluegrass
<i>Polypogon interruptus</i>	Beard grass
<i>Polypogon monspeliensis</i>	Rabbitsfoot grass
<i>Vulpia myuros</i>	Vulpia
<b>TYPHACEAE</b>	
<i>Sparganium eurycarpum</i> ssp. <i>eurycarpum</i>	Bur-reed
<i>Typha latifolia</i>	Broad-leaved cattail
<b><u>FERNS AND FERN-ALLIES</u></b>	
<b>DENNSTAEDTIACEAE</b>	
<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>	Bracken fern

**SPECIES**

**COMMON NAME**

**DRYOPTERIDACEAE**

*Dryopteris arguta*

Wood fern

**GYMNOSPERMS**

**CUPRESSACEAE**


*Cupressus macrocarpa*

Monterey cypress

**PINACEAE**

*Pinus radiata*

Monterey pine



**Appendix D**

*Wildlife Species Observed or Predicted to Occur  
in Moro Cojo Slough Watershed*



**APPENDIX D**  
**WILDLIFE SPECIES OBSERVED OR PREDICTED TO OCCUR**  
**IN THE MORO COJO SLOUGH WATERSHED**

**KEY:**

- O** - Wildlife species or their signs observed in the study area.
- P** - Wildlife species expected to occur in the study area.
- P?** - Wildlife species which may occur in the study area, but information on this species occurrence in the study region is incomplete or lacking.
- n** - Bird species known or suspected to nest in the study area.
- a** - Bird species known or expected to occur in the study area primarily as aerial transients.
- \*** - Bird species recorded only very rarely in the study area (i.e., fewer than five times in the last ten years).

**CLASS: AMPHIBIA**

**ORDER: CAUDATA (Salamanders)**

**FAMILY: AMBYSTOMATIDAE (Mole Salamanders and Relatives)**

California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma tigrinum californiense*) O

Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander (*Ambystoma macrodactylum croceum*) O

**FAMILY: SALAMANDRIDAE (Newts)**

California Newt (*Taricha torosa*) O

**FAMILY: PLETHODONITDAE (Lungless Salamanders)**

California Slender Salamander (*Batrachoseps attenuatus*) O

Arboreal Salamander (*Aneides lugubris*) P

**ORDER: SALIENTIA (Frogs and Toads)**

**FAMILY: BUFONIDAE (True Toads)**

Western Toad (*Bufo boreas*) P

**FAMILY: HYLIDAE (Treefrogs and Relatives)**

Pacific Treefrog (*Hyla regilla*) O

**FAMILY: RANIDAE (True Frogs)**

California Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*) O

Bullfrog (*Rana catesbeiana*) P

**CLASS: REPTILIA**

**ORDER: TESTUDINESS (Turtles)**

**FAMILY: EMYDIDAE (Pond and Marsh Turtles)**

Western Pond Turtle (*Clemmys marmorata*) P

**ORDER: SQUAMATA (Lizards and Snakes)**

**SUBORDER: SAURIA (Lizards)**

**FAMILY: IGUANIDAE (Iguanids)**

Western Fence Lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*) O

**FAMILY: SCINCIDAE (Skinks)**

Western Skink (*Eumeces skiltonianus*) P

<b>FAMILY: ANGUIDAE (Alligator Lizards and Relatives)</b>	
Southern Alligator Lizard ( <i>Gerrhonotus multicarinatus</i> )	P
Northern Alligator Lizard ( <i>Gerrhonotus coeruleus</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: ANNIELLIDAE (California Legless Lizards)</b>	
California Legless Lizard ( <i>Anniella pulchra</i> )	P
<b>SUBORDER: SERPENTES (Snakes)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: COLUBRIDAE (Colubrids)</b>	
Ringneck Snake ( <i>Diadophis punctatus</i> )	P
Sharp-tailed Snake ( <i>Contia tenuis</i> )	P
Racer ( <i>Coluber constrictor</i> )	P
Gopher Snake ( <i>Pituophis melanoleucus</i> )	O
Common Kingsnake ( <i>Lampropeltis getulus</i> )	P
Common Garter Snake ( <i>Thamnophis sirtalis</i> )	P
Western Terrestrial Garter Snake ( <i>Thamnophis elegans</i> )	O
Western Aquatic Garter Snake ( <i>Thamnophis couchi</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: VIPERIDAE (Vipers)</b>	
Western Rattlesnake ( <i>Crotalus viridis</i> )	P
<b>CLASS: AVES</b>	
<b>ORDER: GAVIIFORMES (Loons)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: GAVIIDAE (Loons)</b>	
Red-throated Loon ( <i>Gavia stellata</i> )	P
Pacific Loon ( <i>Gavia arctica</i> )	P
Common Loon ( <i>Gavia immer</i> )	P
<b>ORDER: PODICIPEDIFORMES (Grebes)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: PODICIPEDIDAE (Grebes)</b>	
Pied-billed Grebe ( <i>Podilymbus podiceps</i> )	P,n
Horned Grebe ( <i>Podiceps auritus</i> )	P
Eared Grebe ( <i>Podiceps nigricollis</i> )	P
Western Grebe ( <i>Aechmophorus occidentalis</i> )	P
Clark's Grebe ( <i>Aechmophorus clarkii</i> )	P
<b>ORDER: PELECANIFORMES (Tropicbirds, Pelicans, and Relatives)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: PELECANIDAE (Pelicans)</b>	
American White Pelican ( <i>Pelecanus erythrorhynchos</i> )	P
California Brown Pelican ( <i>P. o. californicus</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: PHALACROCORACIDAE (Cormorants)</b>	
Double-crested Cormorant ( <i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i> )	O
Brandt's Cormorant ( <i>Phalacrocorax penicillatus</i> )	P
Pelagic Cormorant ( <i>Phalacrocorax pelagicus</i> )	P
<b>ORDER: CICONIIFORMES (Herons, Storks, Ibises, and Relatives)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: ARDEIDAE (Herons and Bitterns)</b>	
American Bittern ( <i>Botaurus lentiginosus</i> )	P
Great Blue Heron ( <i>Ardea herodias</i> )	O
Great Egret ( <i>Casmerodius albus</i> )	O
Snowy Egret ( <i>Egretta thula</i> )	O
Cattle Egret ( <i>Bubulcus ibis</i> )	P
Green-backed Heron ( <i>Butorides striatus</i> )	O,n
Black-crowned Night-Heron ( <i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i> )	P

**FAMILY: THRESKIORNITHIDAE (Ibises and Spoonbills)**

White-faced Ibis (*Plegadis chihi*)

O

**ORDER: ANSERIFORMES (Screamers, Ducks, and Relatives)**

**FAMILY: ANATIDAE (Swans, Geese, and Ducks)**

Greater White-fronted Goose (*Anser albifrons*)

P

Snow Goose (*Chen caerulescens*)

P

Ross' Goose (*Chen rossii*)

P

Brant (*Branta bernicla*)

P

Canada Goose (*Branta canadensis*)

P

Green-winged Teal (*Anas crecca*)

O

Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*)

O

Northern Pintail (*Anas acuta*)

O

Blue-winged Teal (*Anas discors*)

P

Cinnamon Teal (*Anas cyanoptera*)

O

Northern Shoveler (*Anas clypeata*)

O

Gadwall (*Anas strepera*)

P,n

American Wigeon (*Anas americana*)

P

Canvasback (*Aythya valisineria*)

P

Ring-necked Duck (*Aythya collaris*)

P

Greater Scaup (*Aythya marila*)

P

Lesser Scaup (*Aythya affinis*)

P

King Eider (*Somateria spectabilis*)

P

Oldsquaw (*Clangula hyemalis*)

P

Black Scoter (*Melanitta nigra*)

P

Surf Scoter (*Melanitta perspicillata*)

P

White-winged Scoter (*Melanitta fusca*)

P

Common Goldeneye (*Bucephala clangula*)

P

Bufflehead (*Bucephala albeola*)

P

Common Merganser (*Mergus merganser*)

P

Ruddy Duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*)

O,n

**ORDER: FALCONIFORMES (Vultures, Hawks, and Falcons)**

**FAMILY: CATHARTIDAE (American Vultures)**

Turkey Vulture (*Cathartes aura*)

O

**FAMILY: ACCIPITRIDAE (Hawks, Old World Vultures, and Harriers)**

Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*)

O

Black-shouldered Kite (*Elanus caeruleus*)

O,n

Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)

P,a

Northern Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*)

O,n

Sharp-shinned Hawk (*Accipiter striatus*)

O

Cooper's Hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*)

O

Red-shouldered Hawk (*Buteo lineatus*)

O

Red-tailed Hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*)

O,n

\* Ferruginous Hawk (*Buteo regalis*)

P,a

Rough-legged Hawk (*Buteo lagopus*)

P

\* Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*)

P

**FAMILY: FALCONIDAE (Caracaras and Falcons)**

American Kestrel (*Falco sparverius*)

O,n

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)

O

	Peregrine Falcon ( <i>Falco peregrinus</i> )	O
*	Prairie Falcon ( <i>Falco mexicanus</i> )	P,a
<b>ORDER: GALLIFORMES (Megapodes, Currassows, Pheasants, and Relatives)</b>		
<b>FAMILY: PHASIANIDAE (Quails, Pheasants, and Relatives)</b>		
	Ring-necked Pheasant ( <i>Phasianus colchicus</i> )	P
	California Quail ( <i>Callipepla californica</i> )	O,n
<b>ORDER: GRUIFORMES (Cranes, Rails, and Relatives)</b>		
<b>FAMILY: RALLIDAE (Rails, Gallinules, and Coots)</b>		
*	California Clapper Rail ( <i>Rallus longirostris obsoletus</i> )	P
	Virginia Rail ( <i>Rallus limicola</i> )	P,n
	Sora ( <i>Porzana carolina</i> )	P,n
	Common Moorhen ( <i>Gallinula chloropus</i> )	P,n
	American Coot ( <i>Fulica americana</i> )	O,n
<b>FAMILY: GRUIDAE (Cranes)</b>		
*	Sandhill Crane ( <i>Grus canadensis</i> )	P
<b>ORDER: CHARADRIIFORMES (Shorebirds, Gulls, and Relatives)</b>		
<b>FAMILY: CHARADRIIDAE (Plovers and Relatives)</b>		
	Black-bellied Plover ( <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> )	O
	Lesser Golden Plover ( <i>Pluvialis dominica</i> )	P
	Semipalmated Plover ( <i>Charadrius semipalmatus</i> )	P
	Killdeer ( <i>Charadrius vociferus</i> )	O
	Mountain Plover ( <i>Charadrius montanus</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: RECURVIROSTRIDAE (Avocets and Stilts)</b>		
	Black-necked Stilt ( <i>Himantopus mexicanus</i> )	O
	American Avocet ( <i>Recurvirostra americana</i> )	O
<b>FAMILY: SCOLOPACIDAE (Sandpipers and Relatives)</b>		
	Greater Yellowlegs ( <i>Tringa melanoleuca</i> )	O
	Lesser Yellowlegs ( <i>Tringa flavipes</i> )	P
	Solitary Sandpiper ( <i>Tringa solitaria</i> )	P
	Willet ( <i>Catoptrophorus semipalmatus</i> )	O
	Spotted Sandpiper ( <i>Actitis macularia</i> )	P
	Whimbrel ( <i>Numenius phaeopus</i> )	P
	Long-billed Curlew ( <i>Numenius americanus</i> )	O
	Marbled Godwit ( <i>Limosa fedoa</i> )	O
	Sanderling ( <i>Calidris alba</i> )	P
	Semipalmated Sandpiper ( <i>Calidris pusilla</i> )	P
	Western Sandpiper ( <i>Calidris mauri</i> )	O
	Least Sandpiper ( <i>Calidris minutilla</i> )	P
	Baird's Sandpiper ( <i>Calidris bairdii</i> )	P
	Dunlin ( <i>Calidris alpina</i> )	O
	Short-billed Dowitcher ( <i>Limnodromus griseus</i> )	P
	Long-billed Dowitcher ( <i>Limnodromus scolopaceus</i> )	O
	Common Snipe ( <i>Gallinago gallinago</i> )	P
	Wilson's Phalarope ( <i>Phalaropus tricolor</i> )	P
	Red-necked Phalarope ( <i>Phalaropus lobatus</i> )	P
	Red Phalarope ( <i>Phalaropus fulicaria</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: LARIDAE (Gulls and Terns)</b>		
	Bonaparte's Gull ( <i>Larus philadelphia</i> )	P

Heermann's Gull ( <i>Larus heermanni</i> )	P
Mew Gull ( <i>Larus canus</i> )	P
Ring-billed Gull ( <i>Larus delawarensis</i> )	O
California Gull ( <i>Larus californicus</i> )	P
Herring Gull ( <i>Larus argentatus</i> )	P
Thayer's Gull ( <i>Larus thayeri</i> )	P
Western Gull ( <i>Larus occidentalis</i> )	O
Glaucous-winged Gull ( <i>Larus glaucescens</i> )	P
Glaucous Gull ( <i>Larus hyperboreus</i> )	P
Caspian Tern ( <i>Sterna caspia</i> )	O
Elegant Tern ( <i>Sterna elegans</i> )	P
Common Tern ( <i>Sterna hirundo</i> )	P
Forster's Tern ( <i>Sterna forsteri</i> )	O
California Least Tern ( <i>Sterna antillarum browni</i> )	P
<b>ORDER: COLUMBIFORMES (Pigeons and Doves)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: COLUMBIDAE (Pigeons and Doves)</b>	
Rock Dove ( <i>Columba livia</i> )	O
Band-tailed Pigeon ( <i>Columba fasciata</i> )	O
Mourning Dove ( <i>Zenaida macroura</i> )	O,n
<b>ORDER: STRIGIFORMES (Owls)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: TYTONIDAE (Barn Owls)</b>	
Barn-Owl ( <i>Tyto alba</i> )	P,n
<b>FAMILY: STRIGIDAE (Typical Owls)</b>	
Great Horned Owl ( <i>Bubo virginianus</i> )	O,n
Burrowing Owl ( <i>Athene cunicularia</i> )	P,n
Short-eared owl ( <i>Asio flammeus</i> )	P,n
<b>ORDER: APODIFORMES (Swifts and Hummingbirds)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: APODIDAE (Swifts)</b>	
Black Swift ( <i>Cypseloides niger</i> )	P,a
Vaux's Swift ( <i>Chaetura vauxi</i> )	P,a
White-throated Swift ( <i>Aeronautes saxatalis</i> )	P,a
<b>FAMILY: TROCHILIDAE (Hummingbirds)</b>	
Anna's Hummingbird ( <i>Calypte anna</i> )	O,n
Rufous Hummingbird ( <i>Selasphorus rufus</i> )	P
Allen's Hummingbird ( <i>Selasphorus sasin</i> )	O,n
<b>ORDER: CORACIIFORMES (Kingfishers and Relatives)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: ALCEDINIDAE (Kingfishers)</b>	
Belted Kingfisher ( <i>Ceryle alcyon</i> )	O
<b>ORDER: PICIFORMES (Woodpeckers and Relatives)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: PICIDAE (Woodpeckers and Wrynecks)</b>	
Acorn Woodpecker ( <i>Melanerpes formicivorous</i> )	O
Red-breasted Sapsucker ( <i>Sphyrapicus ruber</i> )	P
Downy Woodpecker ( <i>Picoides pubescens</i> )	O,n
Northern Flicker ( <i>Colaptes auratus</i> )	O,n
<b>ORDER: PASSERIFORMES (Perching Birds)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: TYRANNIDAE (Tyrant Flycatchers)</b>	
Olive-sided Flycatcher ( <i>Contopus borealis</i> )	P

Western Wood-Pewee ( <i>Contopus sordidulus</i> )	P
Willow Flycatcher ( <i>Empidonax traillii</i> )	P
Pacific-slope Flycatcher ( <i>Empidonax difficilis</i> )	P,n
Black Phoebe ( <i>Sayornis nigricans</i> )	O,n
Say's Phoebe ( <i>Sayornis saya</i> )	O,n
Ash-throated Flycatcher ( <i>Myiarchus cinerascens</i> )	P
Western Kingbird ( <i>Tyrannus verticalis</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: ALAUDIDAE (Larks)</b>	
Horned Lark ( <i>Eremophila alpestris</i> )	O
<b>FAMILY: HIRUNDINIDAE (Swallows)</b>	
Tree Swallow ( <i>Tachycineta bicolor</i> )	P,n
Violet-green Swallow ( <i>Tachycineta thalassina</i> )	O,n
Northern Rough-winged Swallow ( <i>Stelgidopteryx serripennis</i> )	O,n
Cliff Swallow ( <i>Hirundo pyrrhonota</i> )	O,n
Barn Swallow ( <i>Hirundo rustica</i> )	O,n
<b>FAMILY: CORVIDAE (Jays, Magpies, and Crows)</b>	
Scrub Jay ( <i>Aphelocoma coerulescens</i> )	O,n
American Crow ( <i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i> )	O
Common Raven ( <i>Corvus corax</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: PARIDAE (Titmice)</b>	
Chestnut-backed Chickadee ( <i>Parus rufescens</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: AEGITHALIDAE (Bushtit)</b>	
Bushtit ( <i>Psaltriparus minimus</i> )	O,n
<b>FAMILY: SITTIDAE (Nuthatches)</b>	
Red-breasted Nuthatch ( <i>Sitta canadensis</i> )	P
Pygmy Nuthatch ( <i>Sitta pygmaea</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: CERTHIDAE (Creepers)</b>	
Brown Creeper ( <i>Certhia americana</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: TROGLODYTIDAE (Wrens)</b>	
Bewick's Wren ( <i>Thryomanes bewickii</i> )	O,n
House Wren ( <i>Troglodytes aedon</i> )	O
Winter Wren ( <i>Troglodytes troglodytes</i> )	P
Marsh Wren ( <i>Cistothorus palustris</i> )	O,n
<b>FAMILY: MUSCICAPIDAE (Old World Warblers, Gnatcatchers, Kinglets, Thrushes, Bluebirds, and Wrentit)</b>	
Ruby-crowned Kinglet ( <i>Regulus calendula</i> )	P
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher ( <i>Polioptila caerulea</i> )	P
Swainson's Thrush ( <i>Catharus ustulatus</i> )	O,n
Hermit Thrush ( <i>Catharus guttatus</i> )	P
American Robin ( <i>Turdus migratorius</i> )	O,n
Wrentit ( <i>Chamaea fasciata</i> )	O,n
<b>FAMILY: MIMIDAE (Mockingbirds and Thrashers)</b>	
Northern Mockingbird ( <i>Mimus polyglottos</i> )	O,n
California Thrasher ( <i>Toxostoma redivivum</i> )	O,n
<b>FAMILY: MOTACILLIDAE (Wagtails and Pipits)</b>	
American Pipit ( <i>Anthus rubescens</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: BOMBYCILLIDAE (Waxwings)</b>	
Cedar Waxwing ( <i>Bombycilla cedrorum</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: LANIIDAE (Shrikes)</b>	
Loggerhead Shrike ( <i>Lanius ludovicianus</i> )	O,n

<b>FAMILY: STURNIDAE (Starlings)</b>		
European Starling ( <i>Sturnus vulgaris</i> )		O,n
<b>FAMILY: VIREONIDAE (Typical Vireos)</b>		
Solitary Vireo ( <i>Vireo solitarius</i> )		P
Hutton's Vireo ( <i>Vireo huttoni</i> )		P,n
Warbling Vireo ( <i>Vireo gilvus</i> )		P,n
<b>FAMILY: EMBERIZIDAE (Wood Warblers, Sparrows, Blackbirds, and Relatives)</b>		
Orange-crowned Warbler ( <i>Vermivora celata</i> )		P,n
Nashville Warbler ( <i>Vermivora ruficapilla</i> )		P
Yellow Warbler ( <i>Dendroica petechia</i> )		P,n
Yellow-rumped Warbler ( <i>Dendroica coronata</i> )		O
Black-throated Gray Warbler ( <i>Dendroica nigrescens</i> )		P
Townsend's Warbler ( <i>Dendroica townsendi</i> )		P
* Palm Warbler ( <i>Dendroica palmarum</i> )		P
Common Yellowthroat ( <i>Geothlypis trichas</i> )		O,n
Wilson's Warbler ( <i>Wilsonia pusilla</i> )		O,n
Western Tanager ( <i>Piranga ludoviciana</i> )		P
Black-headed Grosbeak ( <i>Pheucticus melanocephalus</i> )		P,n
Rufous-sided Towhee ( <i>Pipilo erythrophthalmus</i> )		O,n
California Towhee ( <i>Pipilo crissalis</i> )		O,n
* Lark Sparrow ( <i>Chondestes grammacus</i> )		P
Savannah Sparrow ( <i>Passerculus sandwichensis</i> )		O,n
Fox Sparrow ( <i>Passerella iliaca</i> )		P
Song Sparrow ( <i>Melospiza melodia</i> )		O,n
Lincoln's Sparrow ( <i>Melospiza lincolni</i> )		O
Swamp Sparrow ( <i>Melospiza georgiana</i> )		P
Golden-crowned Sparrow ( <i>Zonotrichia atricapilla</i> )		O
White-crowned Sparrow ( <i>Zonotrichia leucophrys</i> )		O,n
Dark-eyed Junco ( <i>Junco hyemalis</i> )		O
Red-winged Blackbird ( <i>Agelaius phoeniceus</i> )		O
Tricolored Blackbird ( <i>Agelaius tricolor</i> )		P,n
Western Meadowlark ( <i>Sturnella neglecta</i> )		O
Brewer's Blackbird ( <i>Euphagus cyanocephalus</i> )		O,n
Brown-headed Cowbird ( <i>Molothrus ater</i> )		O,n
Hooded Oriole ( <i>Icterus cucullatus</i> )		P,n
Northern Oriole ( <i>Icterus galbula</i> )		P
<b>FAMILY: FRINGILLIDAE (Finches)</b>		
Purple Finch ( <i>Carpodacus purpureus</i> )		P
House Finch ( <i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i> )		O,n
Pine Siskin ( <i>Carduelis pinus</i> )		P
Lesser Goldfinch ( <i>Carduelis psaltria</i> )		P,n
American Goldfinch ( <i>Carduelis tristis</i> )		O,n
<b>FAMILY: PASSERIDAE (Weaver Finches)</b>		
House Sparrow ( <i>Passer domesticus</i> )		O,n

**CLASS: MAMMALIA**

**ORDER: MARSUPIALIA (Opossums, Kangaroos, and Relatives)**

**FAMILY: DIDELPHIDAE (Opossums)**

Virginia Opossum ( <i>Didelphis virginiana</i> )	P
--	---


<b>ORDER: INSECTIVORA (Shrews and Moles)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: SORICIDAE (Shrews)</b>	
Vagrant Shrew ( <i>Sorex vagrans</i> )	P
Ornate Shrew ( <i>Sorex ornatus</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: TALPIDAE (Moles)</b>	
Broad-footed Mole ( <i>Scapanus latimanus</i> )	O
<b>ORDER: CHIROPTERA (Bats)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: VESPERTILIONIDAE (Vespertilionid Bats)</b>	
Little Brown Myotis ( <i>Myotis lucifugus</i> )	P
Long-eared Myotis ( <i>Myotis evotis</i> )	P
Fringed Myotis ( <i>Myotis thysanodes</i> )	P
Long-legged Myotis ( <i>Myotis volans</i> )	P
Western Pipistrelle ( <i>Pipistrellus hesperus</i> )	P
Big Brown Bat ( <i>Eptesicus fuscus</i> )	P
Red Bat ( <i>Lasiurus borealis</i> )	P
Pallid Bat ( <i>Antrozous pallidus</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: MOLOSSIDAE (Free-tailed Bat)</b>	
Brazilian Free-tailed Bat ( <i>Tadarida brasiliensis</i> )	P
<b>ORDER: LAGOMORPHA (Rabbits, Hares, and Pikas)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: LEPORTIDAE (Rabbits and Hares)</b>	
Brush Rabbit ( <i>Sylvilagus bachmani</i> )	O
Audubon's Cottontail ( <i>Sylvilagus audubonii</i> )	P
Black-tailed Hare ( <i>Lepus californicus</i> )	P
<b>ORDER: RODENTIA (Squirrels, Rats, Mice, and Relatives)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: SCIURIDAE (Squirrels, Chipmunks, and Marmots)</b>	
California Ground Squirrel ( <i>Spermophilus beecheyi</i> )	O
<b>FAMILY: GEOMYIDAE (Pocket Gophers)</b>	
Botta's Pocket Gopher ( <i>Thomomys bottae</i> )	O
<b>FAMILY: HETEROMYIDAE (Pocket Mice and Kangaroo Rats)</b>	
California Pocket Mouse ( <i>Perognathus californicus</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: CRICETIDAE (Deer Mice and Relatives)</b>	
Western Harvest Mouse ( <i>Reithrodontomys megalotis</i> )	P
Deer Mouse ( <i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i> )	O
Brush Mouse ( <i>Peromyscus boylii</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: ARVICOLIDAE (Voles and Allies)</b>	
California Vole ( <i>Microtus californicus</i> )	P
Muskrat ( <i>Ondatra zibethicus</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: MURIDAE (Old World Rats and Mice)</b>	
Black Rat ( <i>Rattus rattus</i> )	P
Norway Rat ( <i>Rattus norvegicus</i> )	O
House Mouse ( <i>Mus musculus</i> )	O
<b>ORDER: CARNIVORA (Carnivores)</b>	
<b>FAMILY: CANIDAE (Foxes, Wolves, and Relatives)</b>	
Coyote ( <i>Canis latrans</i> )	O
Red Fox ( <i>Vulpes vulpes</i> )	O
Gray Fox ( <i>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</i> )	O
<b>FAMILY: PROCYONIDAE (Raccoons and Relatives)</b>	
Raccoon ( <i>Procyon lotor</i> )	O

<b>FAMILY: MUSTELIDAE (Weasels, Badgers, and Relatives)</b>	
Long-tailed Weasel ( <i>Mustela frenata</i> )	O
Badger ( <i>Taxidea taxus</i> )	P
Striped Skunk ( <i>Mephitis mephitis</i> )	O
<b>FAMILY: FELIDAE (Cats)</b>	
Bobcat ( <i>Lynx rufus</i> )	O
<b>ORDER: ARTIODACTYLA</b>	
<b>FAMILY: SUIDAE (Pigs)</b>	
Wild Pig ( <i>Sus scrofa</i> )	P
<b>FAMILY: CERVIDAE (Deer, Elk, and Relatives)</b>	
Black-tailed Deer ( <i>Odocoileus hemionus</i> )	O



**Appendix E**

*Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species  
and Species of Special Concern*



**APPENDIX E**  
**THREATENED AND ENDANGERED WILDLIFE SPECIES**  
**AND SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN**

**Common Loon**

The common loon is a State species of special concern (breeding population). Common loons occur in Monterey County primarily in inshore ocean waters, and on deep water lakes and reservoirs.

Although no recorded sightings of this species have been reported in the study area, small numbers of common loons are regularly observed in the Elkhorn Slough, to the north, and the Salinas River Lagoon, to the south during migration and in winter. The mouth of Moro Cojo Slough offers suitable foraging habitat for this species.

**American White Pelican**

The American white pelican is a State species of special concern (breeding population). It occurs rarely along the coast in Monterey County, occurring primarily during the fall and winter (Roberson, Santa Clara County Breeding Bird Atlas, unpubl. data; Santa Cruz Bird Club, unpubl. data). This species also frequents some large reservoirs, such as San Antonio Reservoir in southern Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*).

The freshwater ponded habitat of the study area, as well as the salt water and brackish habitat in the lower reaches of the slough offers suitable foraging and roosting habitat for this species. In recent years, a flock of white pelicans has occurred regularly at the Salinas River Lagoon and the Elkhorn Slough during the non-breeding season (July - March).

**California Brown Pelican**

The California Brown Pelican is a Federal endangered and State endangered species. It occurs in estuarine, marine subtidal, and marine pelagic waters along the entire California coast. The nearest extant breeding colonies to the central California coast occur on the Channel Islands off Southern California, although this species nested at Point Lobos in Monterey County until 1966 (Baldrige 1973). This species occurs in central California primarily from March to November, although some may be seen year-round at favored sites (McCaskie *et al.*, 1979). Peak numbers are present along the central coast from August to October. Large number of pelicans gather at traditional roosts, such as Año Nuevo Island, the Moss Landing Salt Ponds, and Point Lobos. Smaller groups of pelicans gather at day roosts at a variety of sites along the coast. The Moss Landing area supports the largest night-roost north of Point Conception. Major factors contributing to this species' decline include the eggshell thinning caused by DDE and DDT, over-fishing by man of its primary prey species, Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) and northern anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*), shooting, and human disturbance at its breeding colonies.

This species occurs as a year-round visitor at the Salinas River mouth and the Elkhorn Slough, but is significantly more numerous from April to October than during the late fall and winter. The study area's slough habitat is primarily used for resting, preening, and bathing. Small numbers forage in the estuary, but most forage in the inshore waters of Monterey Bay.

### **Double-crested Cormorant**

The double-crested cormorant is a State species of special concern (rookery sites). It frequents freshwater lakes, rivers, and large ponds, as well as the inshore coastal waters. This species occurs in Monterey County as a fairly common year-round non-breeding visitor to inland lakes, local ponds, and estuaries, and as a rare breeding species at one location along the Big Sur coast (Roberson *ibid.*). Important inland roost localities include Lake San Antonio and upper Elkhorn Slough. Reasons for this species' population decline in California include habitat destruction, human disturbance at rookeries, DDE contamination, and over-fishing of the sardine fishery (Remsen 1978).

The aquatic and riparian habitats of the study area offers suitable foraging, bathing, and resting opportunities for this species. Double-crested cormorants have been observed roosting in eucalyptus trees toward the mouth of the slough, probably dispersing to the Elkhorn Slough or other parts of the study area for the day (C. Striplen, pers. obs.).

### **White-faced Ibis**

The white-faced ibis is a State species of special concern (rookery sites), and a Federal Candidate 2 species for listing. It frequents marshes, pond edges, and estuarine shorelines. This species is a rare spring and fall migrant in coastal central California, and an occasional winter visitor (McCaskie *ibid.*). In Monterey County, the white-faced ibis occurs as a rare fall migrant and winter visitor. It has been recorded on several occasions at the Salinas River mouth (Roberson *ibid.*), at the Elkhorn Slough, and in Moro Cojo Slough, west of the railroad tracks, during recent field investigations (C. Striplen, pers. obs.).

### **Bufflehead**

The bufflehead is a State species of special concern (breeding population). In California, this species is known to breed only in the Cascade Range (McCaskie, *et al.*, *ibid.*). Elsewhere, it occurs mainly during spring and fall migration and in winter. In Monterey County, the bufflehead is locally fairly common, occurring on reservoirs, lakes, sloughs, and river mouths (Roberson *ibid.*).

Buffleheads are fairly common in the vicinity of the study area, found at both the Elkhorn Slough and the Salinas River Lagoon during the non-breeding season. The slough offers suitable open-water foraging habitat for this species.

### **Osprey**

The osprey is a State species of special concern (breeding population). It is a rare spring and fall migrant and winter visitor in the San Francisco and Monterey Bay areas (McCaskie *et al.*, *ibid.*). The osprey occurs in Monterey County as an uncommon migrant and winter resident, and a very rare summer resident. Migrants occur from March to early June and August to November. Wintering individuals occur regularly at Lake San Antonio and the vicinity of Elkhorn Slough. This species forages in the region's lakes, reservoirs, and major waterways.

Moro Cojo Slough offers suitable foraging habitat for this species. Ospreys are regular visitors to the Elkhorn Slough and the Salinas River mouth during spring and fall migrations, and rare during winter.

### **Black-shouldered Kite**

The black-shouldered kite is designated a "fully protected" species by the CDF&G. It is a locally fairly common resident in grasslands, marshes, and agricultural areas in Monterey County. Nesting black-shouldered kites are most frequent in the grassland and agricultural habitats. Large roosts are occasionally recorded during the fall and winter at such localities as the Carmel River mouth and Salinas River mouth. Thirty-one individuals were recorded roosting at the latter site on October 11, 1975 (Roberson *ibid.*). This species' population was greatly reduced by shooting prior to 1960, but has since increased significantly.

The black-shouldered kite occurs as a common year-round resident in the study area. They are most numerous during winter when migrant populations arrive.

### **Southern Bald Eagle**

The southern bald eagle is a Federal and State endangered species. In Monterey County it is a very rare migrant and winter resident (Roberson *ibid.*). The southern bald eagle formerly nested along the Big Sur coast; however, today this species occurs regularly only at Lake San Antonio as a winter resident. Occasional sightings have been made at the Salinas River mouth and at the Elkhorn Slough (Roberson *ibid.*), where it is expected to occur primarily in the fall, winter, and early spring. The freshwater ponded habitat and the lower reaches of the of the study area may offer suitable foraging habitat for this species.

### **Northern Harrier**

The northern harrier is a State species of special concern (breeding population). It occurs as a rare breeding species in the lower Salinas Valley, and an uncommon migrant and winter resident elsewhere in Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). Northern harriers nest in grassland and marsh habitats, constructing their nests on the ground. Breeding in Monterey County is sporadic, depending on local conditions (Roberson *ibid.*). This species is threatened by destruction of marsh habitats, the spread of urban and agricultural development, and grazing of livestock in grassland habitats (Remsen *ibid.*).

The study area's grassland and marsh habitats offer suitable nesting and foraging sites for this species. The northern harrier is present year-round in the study area, but is most numerous in fall and winter when migrants arrive. One or more pairs probably nest on or adjacent to the study area (C. Striplen, pers. obs.).

### **Sharp-shinned Hawk**

The sharp-shinned hawk is a State species of special concern (breeding population). It is probably a locally distributed rare breeding species in the forested mountainous regions of Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). Elsewhere in the county, this species occurs as a fairly common migrant and uncommon winter visitor. Migrant and wintering individuals frequent a variety of habitats, but appear to favor wooded areas.

This species occurs at the study area as an uncommon visitor from October to April. Sharp-shinned hawks are expected to forage in the willow riparian habitat of the upper study area. The maritime chaparral and some thick riparian habitat within the study area may offer suitable breeding habitat for this species.

### **Cooper's Hawk**

The Cooper's hawk is a State species of special concern (breeding population). Its status and pattern of distribution and occurrence is similar to that of the sharp-shinned hawk, but is probably more widespread during the breeding season in the wooded and forested regions throughout Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). Migrant and wintering individuals occur in a variety of habitats, including oak woodland, conifer and mixed broadleaf forests, grasslands, residential areas, riparian woodland, and marshes.

The willow riparian habitat and other upland habitats of the study area offer suitable foraging sites for this species. Cooper's hawks are expected to occur in the study area as an uncommon visitor, primarily during migration and in winter. The maritime chaparral and some thick riparian habitat within the study area may offer suitable breeding habitat for this species.

### **Golden Eagle**

The golden eagle is a State species of special concern (breeding and wintering), and a "sensitive species" by the U.S. Forest Service. It is an uncommon resident throughout Monterey County in open country, but is generally rare along Monterey County's north coast. Golden eagles are regularly sighted along the foothills of eastern Salinas Valley, Elkhorn Slough, around Lake San Antonio, and in the Ventana Wilderness of the Los Padres National Forest. They require large areas of territory for feeding and nesting. Open terrain is needed for hunting, with nests usually placed on cliffs, in large trees, or in transmission towers.

A nesting pair occurs in the vicinity of the study area at Elkhorn Slough. Golden eagles may occur regularly at the study area as a rare migrant, and may make significant use of the habitats that occur there.

### **American Peregrine Falcon**

The American peregrine falcon (*F.p. anatum*) is a Federal and State endangered species. It is a very rare breeding bird along the coast and wilderness areas in Monterey County, and rare migrant and winterer (Roberson *ibid.*). They use a variety of habitats, but are most frequently encountered along the coast and in the vicinity of wetlands habitats where prey (i.e., ducks and shorebirds) is abundant. Formerly more numerous in the county, this species population declined drastically throughout California due to eggshell thinning caused by DDT and DDE, and falconry practices (Remsen *ibid.*).

Peregrine falcons are regular, but rare visitors to the study area, primarily from August to March. Peregrines forage in the slough, wetland, and grassland habitats of the study area.

### **Prairie Falcon**

The prairie falcon is a State species of special concern (breeding population). It frequents interior areas, and requires open country for foraging and sheltered cliffs for nesting. They are most frequently encountered in dry areas with extensive grassland or scrub habitat. Prairie falcons are vulnerable to DDE-induced eggshell thinning, and suffer nesting predation from mammalian predators, great horned owls, and golden eagles (Remsen *ibid.*). Prairie falcons are rare year-round residents in Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*), mostly occurring along the eastern Salinas Valley foothills around Pinnacles National Monument, and Peachtree and Cholame Valleys. They are occasionally seen along the coast, such as in the vicinity of Elkhorn Slough.

Prairie falcons are expected to occur uncommonly in the study area as occasional visitors, probably using the study area's grassland habitats for foraging.

### **Merlin**

The merlin is a State species of special concern (wintering population). This species apparently does not breed in California; however, severe declines in the number of wintering individuals have occurred within the last two decades (Remsen *ibid.*). During migration, merlins can be found throughout the state. Migrant and wintering individuals, however, are more common along the coast. It occurs as a rare migrant and winterer in Monterey County, favoring areas along the coast where it hunts shorebirds. Pesticide contamination (DDE) has been attributed to this species' decline in California.

Merlins occur as rare but regular fall and winter visitors in the study area. The slough, mudflats, wetlands and grassland habitats are used for foraging habitat by this species.

### **California Clapper Rail**

The California clapper rail is a State and Federal endangered species. Formerly a fairly common resident in upper Elkhorn Slough, it is now believed to be extirpated as a breeding species in Monterey County (CDF&G 1979). The last published sighting at Elkhorn Slough was on November 22, 1980 (Roberson *ibid.*). Although no observations naming Moro Cojo Slough have been recorded, Gill (1979) quoted researchers such as Silliman (1915) and Grinnell (1918) as stating rails were observed inhabiting "Elkhorn and Tembladero Sloughs, and other nearby marsh tributaries to the Monterey Bay". The study area's pickleweed marsh provides suitable breeding habitat for this species; however, due to the presence of efficient predators such as the red fox, it is unlikely that Moro Cojo Slough supports a breeding population of clapper rails.

### **Greater Sandhill Crane**

The greater sandhill crane is a State threatened species. Up until 1920, it was a regular winter visitor to the upper Salinas Valley, but the most recent sighting dates back to 1970 (Roberson *ibid.*). This species was probably always a rare spring and fall migrant along the Monterey County coastline. There have been limited recent recorded sightings of this species in the vicinity of the study area; sandhill cranes were observed along Castroville Blvd. north of the high school in 1991 (M. Silberstein, pers. comm.).

### **Long-billed Curlew**

The long-billed curlew is a State species of special concern (breeding population). In California, this species is known to breed only on the Modoc Plateau of the northern Great Basin (McCaskie, *et al.*, *ibid.*). Elsewhere, it occurs mainly during spring and fall migration, and in winter. In Monterey County, the long-billed curlew is locally fairly common, occurring in Elkhorn Slough and the wetlands and open fields of the lower Salinas Valley (Roberson *ibid.*).

Long-billed curlews are expected to be fairly common in the study area, occurring primarily in the mudflats and adjacent wetlands. The slough and mudflats offer suitable shallow-water foraging habitat for this species.

## **California Gull**

The California gull is a State species of special concern (nesting colony). In Monterey County, it is common year-round, although significantly more numerous during winter. The only breeding site in central coastal California occurs at Alviso in Santa Clara County. Wintering and non-breeding California gulls use marine habitats, beaches, estuaries, developed areas, and agricultural fields.

The California gull is a common to abundant year-round visitor at the study area, particularly during the fall and winter. Large numbers (thousands) occur at the Salinas River Lagoon and the Elkhorn Slough, where they roost, feed, and bathe. The Salinas River is used as a major flight corridor by this species, with thousands of individuals flying to and from foraging areas in the lower Salinas Valley.

## **Caspian Tern**

The Caspian tern is a State "sensitive" species (nesting colony). In Monterey County it is an uncommon migrant and summer visitor present from late March to October (Roberson *ibid.*). Nesting and nesting attempts have been made by this species at the Moss Landing salt ponds since 1970. A few pairs attempted to nest, although unsuccessfully, at the Salinas River mouth in 1983 (J. and R. Warriner, pers. comm.). They forage in inshore ocean waters, lagoons, and estuaries, and use beaches associated with estuaries for roosting, bathing, and resting. Caspian terns are nesting within the Elkhorn Slough Reserve; the colony was established in 1990 with one to a few nesting pairs. There are now over 100 nesting pairs on an island in the north marsh of the Reserve (M. Silberstein, pers. comm.).

The slough and freshwater ponded habitats within the study area provide suitable foraging, roosting, and bathing habitat for this species. Caspian terns most likely occur in the study area in spring, summer, and fall, being most numerous during spring migration and early summer.

## **Elegant Tern**

The elegant tern is a State species of special concern and a Candidate 2 species for listing as Federally threatened or endangered. This species is a common summer visitor along the coast in Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). Most individuals occurring in Central California are post-breeding visitors from their breeding colonies in Southern California and Mexico. Elegant terns are most numerous from July to early October.

The Salinas River Lagoon and the Elkhorn Slough are used extensively for feeding, bathing, and as a day roost. Adjacent to the study area, the Moss Landing area ranks high in importance for this species.

## **California Least Tern**

The California least tern is a Federal and State endangered species. Central California breeding colonies are restricted to a few locations within the San Francisco Bay area. The California least tern is a very rare spring and fall migrant along the coast of Monterey County, averaging 5-7 birds per year. This species regularly nested along the beaches from Moss Landing to the Pajaro River mouth through the mid-1950's, but is now extirpated as a breeding species from the region. It has

suffered significant population declines in California due to human disturbance and urban development.

A California least tern breeding colony formerly existed at the Salinas River Lagoon (20 pairs; Roberson *ibid.*) and at Moss Landing. It is likely to occur in the study area as an occasional spring migrant between May and July.

### **Forster's Tern**

The Forster's tern is a State "sensitive" species (nesting colony). It is a common migrant, very rare winter resident, and an irregularly locally nesting species along the coast in Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). Forster's Terns have nested at the salt ponds at Moss Landing in the past, with colonies ranging in size from 50-300 individuals.

The slough and freshwater ponded habitats within the study area provide suitable foraging, roosting, and bathing habitat for this species. Forster's terns are common at the study area in spring, summer, and fall.

### **Black Skimmer**

The black skimmer is a State species of special concern (nesting colony). This species is a year-round resident only in Southern California where it breeds at the Salton Sea and near San Diego. Recently, very small numbers have apparently nested successfully in south San Francisco Bay (Roberson *ibid.*). Skimmers are very rare spring and fall migrants along the coast of Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). It has been observed annually at Elkhorn Slough since 1978.

The black skimmer likely occurs at the study area as an occasional visitor. The open waters of the slough area provide suitable foraging habitat for this species.

### **Short-eared Owl**

The short-eared owl is a State species of special concern (breeding population). It frequents extensive grasslands near marsh habitats. Short-eared owls are rare in central California, where they occur primarily during the non-breeding season (McCaskie *et al.*, *ibid.*). In Monterey County, they are very rare summer residents at the Salinas River mouth, and slightly more numerous in winter in the Elkhorn Slough/Salinas River mouth area as northern migrants contribute to the local population (Roberson *ibid.*).

The study area offers suitable nesting and foraging habitat for this species. Nesting was documented at the Salinas River mouth in five years from 1974-1981 (Roberson *ibid.*). No nesting has been confirmed in the county since 1981. Migrants and wintering owls still occur, and breeding is still a possibility for the future.

### **Burrowing Owl**

The burrowing owl is a State species of special concern (breeding population). Burrowing owls use open grassland habitats with low-growing vegetation. They prefer areas interspersed with bare ground, and raised areas used as rest/perch sites. Abandoned burrows, especially of ground squirrels, are used as roost and nest sites. In Monterey County, the burrowing owl is a rare resident, primarily in the northwestern portion of the county from the mouth of the Salinas Valley inland to

the Salinas airport, and north to Elkhorn Slough (Roberson *ibid.*). Agricultural, industrial, and urban development have resulted in a significant decline of this species throughout California (Remsen *ibid.*).

The study area offers suitable wintering and breeding habitat for this species. Due to the abundance of ground squirrel burrows in the grassland habitats in the study area, it is possible that a small breeding population exists.

The red fox, a non-native species present within the Moro Cojo Slough watershed, has been reported to prey upon burrowing owls; red fox predation may be a factor in the distribution and abundance of burrowing owls within the watershed.

### **Black Swift**

The black swift is a State species of special concern (breeding population). It is a rare migrant and locally-distributed breeding species along the Big Sur coast and the Los Padres National Forest in Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). They are expected to be very rare spring and fall transients over the study area during migration, foraging in the aerial habitat. No suitable breeding habitat occurs within the study area.

### **Willow Flycatcher**

The willow flycatcher is a State threatened species and considered sensitive by the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management (breeding population). This species formerly nested in Monterey County in willow thickets along the Salinas and Carmel Rivers. Currently, it is thought to be extirpated as a breeding species as the last nesting record was in 1974 near Salinas. Riparian habitat destruction and nest parasitism by the brown-headed cowbird (*Moluthrus ater*) have contributed to this species decline in California (Remsen *ibid.*).

The willow flycatcher is expected to occur at the study area as a rare spring and fall migrant. The willow riparian habitat in the upper study area offer suitable foraging habitat for migrant birds.

### **Purple Martin**

The purple martin is a State species of special concern (breeding population). It is an uncommon migrant and local summer resident, in Monterey County, where it regularly breeds in the Los Padres National Forest (Big Sur area), and has occasionally nested under the Highway 1 bridge at Torre Canyon (Roberson *ibid.*).

Purple martins are expected to occur occasionally as transients over the study region from late April to May, and from August to September. The study area does not offer suitable breeding habitat for this species.

### **Bank Swallow**

The bank swallow is listed as a State threatened species. Bank swallows nest in burrows in sandy vertical banks and bluffs. They are absent in many parts of the state, and can be readily found only in the vicinity of breeding colonies, or at favored migratory stopover points (CDF&G 1989). In Monterey County, this species occurs as a rare migrant and very locally-distributed breeding species. Extant nesting colonies occur at Metz Road (King City), and along Cholame Creek (Roberson *ibid.*).

This species also nested at the Pajaro River mouth through the early 1980's. Many breeding colonies have become extirpated by flood control measures (e.g., rip-rapping of stream channels), urban development, and human disturbance (Remsen *ibid.*).

This species is expected to occur at the study area only as a very rare migrant from April to August. Seven to ten post-breeding dispersants were seen at the Salinas River mouth on July 7, 1990. The study area does not offer suitable nesting sites for this species, and no suitable nesting sites are known in the vicinity.

### **Yellow Warbler**

The yellow warbler is a State species of special concern (breeding population). Yellow warblers are common spring and fall migrants, uncommon during the breeding season, and very rare in winter in Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). Breeding pairs are closely associated with open canopy riparian habitat along major streams and lakes; cottonwood/willow habitats seem to be favored. During migration, this species occurs in a variety of habitats, but is often most numerous in riparian habitats. Yellow warblers are threatened by loss of riparian habitat and nest parasitism by the brown-headed cowbird (Remsen *ibid.*).

Yellow warblers are likely to nest in the willow riparian habitat of the upper study area as they are known to nest in similar habitat in the vicinity. The Monterey County breeding population is present from April to early August. Migrants are uncommon in the region in spring and common during fall.

### **Yellow-breasted Chat**

The yellow-breasted chat is a State species of special concern (breeding population). This species formerly nested along many of the creeks and rivers in Monterey County which supported dense riparian vegetation (Roberson *ibid.*). Presently, the chat has a very limited breeding distribution, occurring primarily along the upper Salinas River. During the non-breeding season, yellow-breasted chats are rare spring migrants, and rarer fall migrants in Monterey County (Roberson *ibid.*). Habitat destruction and cowbird parasitism have contributed to this species decline in California (Remsen *ibid.*).

Yellow-breasted chats probably occur as very rare spring and fall migrants in the willow riparian habitat of the upper study area. The study area does not appear to offer suitable breeding habitat for this species, and no breeding population is known in the vicinity.

### **Tricolored Blackbird**

The tricolored blackbird is a State species of special concern and a Federal Candidate 2 species for listing. It is a colonial-nesting species, restricted in distribution primarily to California. They are locally-distributed during the breeding season, occurring at ponds, lakes or marshes with dense growths of tules or cattails. They are more widespread during the non-breeding season, when large flocks gather in agricultural fields and pastures. Tricolored blackbirds are locally common residents of cattail and tule ponds in Monterey County. Numbers significantly increase during fall and winter when migrants from Central California supplement the existing population.

Suitable nesting habitat for the tricolored blackbird in the freshwater marsh areas in the upper study area. It is expected to occur at the study area as an occasional non-breeding season visitor and possible nester.

### **Salinas Ornate Shrew**


The Salinas ornate shrew is State species of special concern and a Federal Candidate 2 species for listing. This subspecies appears to be restricted in distribution to the river valleys in the vicinity of the Monterey Bay (Owen and Hoffman 1983). It prefers brackish or saline marshes near sea level. The study area is within its known distributional range (Williams 1986), and offers potentially suitable habitat for this subspecies.

### **Salinas Harvest Mouse**

The Salinas harvest mouse is a State "sensitive" species. This subspecies is distributed in the Monterey Bay region. Fresh- and brackish-water wetlands appear to be its favored habitats (Williams *ibid.*). The Salinas harvest mouse has been recorded in the Moss Landing and Marina areas (CNDDDB 1990). The marsh habitats of the study area offer potentially suitable habitat for this subspecies.

**Appendix F**

*UCSC Science Library  
Air Photo Coverage for  
Moro Cojo Slough Watershed*




UCSC Science Library air photo coverage for Moro Cojo Slough area,  
Monterey County, CA., 8/13/92.

YEAR	MONTH	SCALE	COLOR	SOURCE	COVERAGE
1987	6-7	1:40K	BW	ASCS?	Full no. 1/2 mont. co.
1989	10	1:6K	BW	Air Flight	Coast, mouth Elkh Sl.
1987	3	1:65K	C/TR	NASA	Mouth w. of Nashua
1987	4	1:12K	C/TR	Western AP	Castroville West to mouth
1986-87	3/86-3/87	1:12K	C	Air Flight	Coast E to Castroville
* 1985	4	1:31680	BW	WAC	FULL Monterey Co.
1984	4	1:12K	C	IK Curtis	Coastline
1983	5	1:24K	BW	Cartwright	Full exc. s. of Castroville.
1980	6-9	1:24K	BW	IK Curtis	Coastline
1980	4	1:12K	C/TR	Western AP	Full exc. s. to Salinas
1979	6	1:12K	C	Genge Aerial	North of Castroville
1978	5	1:12K	C	IK Curtis & Western Aerial Surv.	Coast west of Castroville
1976-77	10/76-7/77	1:12K	C	American Aerial Surv.	Coast west of Castroville
1974	10-12	1:24K	C/TR	ESCA Tech	S Cruz Co. w/lap Elk Sl.
1974	7-10	1:36K & 1:20K	C	Earthdata	Most of slough areas
1972-73	11/72-4/83	1:80K	BW	? for USGS	Full for orthophoto quad generation
1971	3	1:120K	C/TR	NASA	? Full ?
1971	5	1:20K	BW	WAC	Full Monterey Co.

1970	4,5,9	1:12K	BW	CDFG	Coast, mouth
1968	4,5,6	1:15K & 1:30K	BW	? For USGS	Full oversize (51cm <sup>2</sup> )
1967	2	1:12K	BW	CDFG	Coast W of Watsonville, E of Castroville
1966	5-8	1:20K	BW	Cartwright	No. Monterey Co. ?
1963	6-7	1:10K	BW	Cartwright	S Cruz Co. w/lap into No. Monterey Co. (46cm <sup>2</sup> )
1958	1	1:9600 & 1:36K	BW	Fairchild	Vicinity of Salinas & Santa Rita w. to Boronda & San Jon Rds.
1956	7-8	1:20K	BW	Aero Service	Full Monterey Co.
1956	8	1:10K	BW	Aero Service	S Cruz Co. w/lap No. Monterey Co.
1954	7	1:14400	BW	Fairchild	Salinas Vicinity E. of Castroville, N. to Santa Rita
1952	7	1:23600	BW	? For USGS	Quads: Moss Lndg, Prunedale, SJ Baut.
* 1949	7-8	1:20K	BW	Park Aerial	Full Monterey Co.
1948	4-5	1:10K	BW	USFS? For CDF	S Cruz Co. w/lap No. Monterey Co.
1940	1	1:31K	BW	USAF	Coastline/Mouth
1939	11	1:20K	BW	Fairchild	S Cruz Co. w/lap No. Monterey Co.
1937	10-12	1:20K	BW	Fairchild	Full coverage exc. 1 line missing over main So. fork of slough
1931	5	1:20K	BW	Fairchild	Partial, Salinas R.

**Appendix G**


*Best Management Practices  
for Water Resources*




**APPENDIX G**  
**BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**  
**FOR WATER RESOURCES**

The BMP's included in this appendix are those deemed suitable for implementation within the urban and rural residential portions of the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed. The BMP's include guidance for street cleaning (SC 70), stenciling of storm drains (SC 30), maintenance of detention devices and catch basins (SC 71 and 75) and private housekeeping practices (SC 10).

Based on a more comprehensive Non-point Source (NPS) Pollution program proposed for preparation for the Natividad/Gabilan Creek watershed (which includes the Moro Cojo Slough drainage), these BMP's are expected to be refined. Additional engineering and design work is necessary to provide site-specific recommendations, such as size of retention basins. Some actions, such as the establishment of a public education program (SC 0), can be initiated immediately. For information on recommended BMP's for agricultural sources, please see Appendix H.





Graphic: North Central  
Texas COG, 1993

- New Development
- Residential
- Commercial Activities
- Industrial Activities
- Municipal Facilities
- Illegal Discharges

### DESCRIPTION

Public education/participation, like an ordinance or a piece of equipment, is not so much a best management practice as it is a method by which to implement BMPs. This fact sheet highlights the importance of integrating elements of public education and participation into a municipality's overall plan for storm water quality management. Public education/participation are vital components of many of the individual source control BMPs that follow in this chapter.

A public education and participation plan provides the municipality with a strategy for educating its employees, the public, and businesses about the importance of protecting storm water from improperly used, stored, and disposed of pollutants. Municipal employees must be trained, especially those that work in departments not directly related to storm water but whose actions affect storm water. Residents must become aware that a variety of hazardous products are used in the home and that their improper use and disposal can pollute storm water. Increased public awareness also facilitates public scrutiny of industrial and municipal activities and will likely increase public reporting of incidents. Businesses, particularly smaller ones that may not be regulated by Federal, State, or local regulations, must be informed of ways to reduce their potential to pollute storm water.

The specific public education/participation aspects of each of the source controls are highlighted in the individual fact sheets. The focus of this fact sheet is more general, and includes the overall objectives and approaches for assuring public involvement in local storm water management programs. Accordingly, the organization of this fact sheet differs somewhat from the other fact sheets in this chapter.

### OBJECTIVES

The public education and participation plan should be based on four objectives:

- Promote a clear identification and understanding of the problem and the solutions,
- Identify responsible parties and efforts to date,
- Promote community ownership of the problems and the solutions, and
- Integrate public feedback into program implementation.

### APPROACH

- Pattern a new program after the many established programs from municipalities around the state and country. Whenever possible, integrate storm water public education/participation into existing programs from other departments at your municipality.



## BMP: PUBLIC EDUCATION/PARTICIPATION (CONTINUE)

- Implement public education/participation as a coordinated campaign in which each message is related to the last.
- Present a clear and consistent message and image to the public regarding how they contribute to storm water pollution and what they can do to reduce it.
- Expand definition of "public" to include small businesses and construction site operators who often possess the same limited levels of awareness of the problems, regulations, and solutions as the "general" public. As a result, small businesses need the same level of technical assistance (education) and participation in the process as the "general" public.
- Utilize multi-media to reach the full range of audiences.
- Translate messages into the foreign languages of the community to reach the full spectrum of your populace and to avoid misinterpretation of messages.
- Create an awareness and identification with the local watershed.
- Involve focus or advisory groups in the development of a public education/participation plan. This will create a much more effective plan as well as promote ownership of the plan by those involved.
- Use everyday language in all public pieces. Use outside reviewers to highlight and reduce the use of technical terminology, acronyms, and jargon.
- Make sure all statements have a sound, up-to-date technical basis. Do not contribute to the spread of misinformation.
- Break up complicated subjects into smaller more simple concepts. Present these concepts to the public in a metered and organized way to avoid "overloading" and confusing the audience.

SC0



## Additional Information — Public Education/Participation

### Approach

Public education and participation are critical elements of many of these source control BMPs. As each municipality chooses source controls, and develops and implements its SWMP, it is very important that the public education and participation aspects of the chosen source controls be integrated into an overall plan. The presentation of a well coordinated and comprehensive campaign will be much more effective and efficient at reaching the target audiences than a series of separate actions whose relation to one another may not be evident.

### Target Audiences

To effectively achieve these objectives, the implementation of a public education and participation plan requires that the full range of target audiences be identified and provided with appropriate information and outreach. The following audiences should be included:

- Political - Elected officials and heads of departments, agencies, and commissions;
- Technical (Internal) - Municipal department and agency staffs;
- Technical (External) - State agencies (Cal-EPA, SWRCB, IWMB, ARB), regional agencies (e.g., ABAG, SCAG, AMBAG, water and transportation agencies), and neighboring governments;
- Business - Commercial and industrial, including trade associations;
- Construction - Developers and contractors;
- Community Groups - Fraternal, ethnic, hobby, horticultural, senior citizen, and service;
- Environmental Groups;
- General Public/Residential;
- Schools/Youth Groups;
- Media - Print and electronic, and
- Pollutant-defined - Groups of individuals defined by the specific pollutant(s) they discharge (e.g., used motor oil, pesticides).

### Strategic Activities

The public must have a clear understanding of the problem of storm water pollution in order to bring about the behavioral changes needed to reduce the discharge of pollutants. Part of this "clear understanding" involves increasing the public's realization of their "place" in the watershed. The public should be educated about the watershed, where they live in relation to it, and how their behavior affects the health of the whole watershed. Ultimately, municipal employees, citizens, and businesses must realize that they contribute to storm water pollution and that by modifying their behavior they can contribute to the solution. Implementation of the public education and participation plan is the mechanism by which this understanding is attained, and these behavioral changes are brought about.

It has been estimated that some individuals require exposure to the same message up to seven times, from a variety of media, before behavior modification occurs. Therefore, given limited resources, the key question is not what one activity (e.g., fair) or media (e.g., radio) is best, but what mixture of these elements is most effective for the target audience.

In light of this information, the public education and participation plan should include a variety of activities to reach and educate the target audiences. These activities may include:

- Program Planning and Tracking - Public surveys and database;
- Program Identity - Program message, logo, and tag line;
- Collateral Material - Newsletter, fact sheets, brochures, posters;
- Coordinating Committees;
- Media Campaign - Press releases, advertising, public service announcements;

SC0



## Additional Information — Public Education/Participation

- Residential Programs - Storm drain stenciling, home toxics checklists/alternatives, and specific neighborhood projects;
- Presentations - Environmental booth, speakers bureau, and special events;
- Business Programs - Workshops, publications, and green business projects;
- Construction Programs - Workshops, educational materials, and certification;
- Consumer Programs - Point of purchase displays and printed grocery bags; and
- School Education - Facility tours, contests, and curriculum.

### Elements of a Model Public Education/Participation Plan

The following elements of a model plan are based on plans developed in California and elsewhere. The list of elements is intended as a guideline or menu only. The list of activities is by no means exhaustive, and new activities are being developed by communities on an ongoing basis. The actual level, priority, and schedule of activities in your agency's public education/participation plan must be based on your community's needs and resources. Communities have typically developed 5-year plans to match the length of their NPDES permit. There are some activities that should occur before others. These activities are listed as a group first, followed by a general list of other activities.

### Start-Up Activities

- **Program Planning and Tracking (Public survey and database)** - A public survey is an important tool to assess the use of toxic materials, perceptions of health risk, disposal practices, support and willingness to pay for new programs, and overall environmental awareness. The survey results will educate you as to your community's needs and guide the development and implementation of your public education and participation plan. Surveys are equally important in establishing a baseline for evaluating the effectiveness of your program. As such, surveys should be conducted on a regular basis (e.g. biannual) to gauge your program's success. Strongly consider the use of a professional survey firm. Surveys conducted in an unscientific manner often provide poor information at best, and misinformation at worst.

A database is another important program assessment tool that should be initiated before the program begins. The database can maintain information on mailing lists, phone inquiries, material distributions, spill incident data, and levels of effort. As much as possible, the program's effort should be quantified to track its progress and to provide feedback to the public and to the regulatory agencies.

- **Program Identity (Message, logo, and tag line)** - The development of a consistent image which appears on all materials distributed by your program will promote an understanding of the program, its mission, and its interconnectedness with other issues and programs. The development of a program logo with such high public exposure should be performed by a professional graphics firm.
- **Coordinating committees** - The work of other agencies within your municipality and other groups outside of the municipality often touches on some part of the storm water quality issue as a byproduct of these groups' efforts. Committees should be established that coordinate the storm water public education/participation program with other environmental education efforts within the municipality and at the schools. Likewise, successful implementation of the storm water management program cuts across most municipal departments requiring that representatives from these departments meet regularly to coordinate their efforts.

SC0



## Additional Information — Public Education/Participation

### Other Activities

- **Media Campaign** (Press releases, advertising, and public service announcements) - The media (radio, television, and newspapers) offers both widespread coverage and the opportunity to repeat the same message. Cultivate media support and involvement by educating media staff on the purpose of the program. Press releases and public service announcements (PSAs) may be produced on a regular basis to inform the public about upcoming events, household hazardous waste collections, and sources of additional information. Billboards and municipal vehicle (buses, street sweepers) placards are another effective media for transmitting the program logo and tag line.
- **Collateral Material** (Newsletter, fact sheets, brochure, and posters) - Produce newsletters at regular intervals to inform program participants, the general public, and businesses about the program. Fact sheets may be used to inform the public about specific issues. Brochures provide an overall picture of the program and can be used to highlight the program's comprehensiveness and long term nature. Posters may be displayed at municipal offices for both public education and municipal staff training, and distributed to schools and businesses.
- **Residential Programs** (Storm drain stencilling, home toxics checklist/alternatives, and specific neighborhood projects) - Because of its short development time and low maintenance costs, storm drain stencilling is often one of the first activities implemented by communities. Likewise, a home toxics checklist/alternatives publication, developed initially to meet household hazardous waste regulations, may be integrated into the public education effort about storm water quality. Some larger communities are targeting specific neighborhoods for more concentrated and immediate education, because of their geographic position in a watershed.
- **Presentations** (Environmental booth, speakers bureau, and special events) - Direct contact between the municipal staff implementing the storm water management program and the public can be a highly effective way of educating target audiences. Environmental booths can be especially effective because they distribute the message in a three dimensional, sometimes interactive way. A special event can bring extra attention to the program by highlighting a milestone, particularly if reporters from the media cover the event.
- **Construction Programs** (workshops, educational materials and certification) - Contractors and developers often need education on sources, impacts, and control of pollutants from construction sites. Site operators often need assistance in developing erosion and sediment controls. A certification program may be appropriate for all construction site operators, plan reviewers and inspectors. The certification program would establish a minimum-competency level for those involved in preparing and implementing erosion and sediment control plans, and storm water pollution prevention plans.
- **Business Programs** (Workshops, publications, and "green" business project) - Some businesses are more likely than others to contribute to storm water pollution. Municipality's can take advantage of this by defining and focusing education efforts on priority businesses. Small businesses, in particular, need assistance with understanding the problems and being made aware of alternatives and solutions. The use of an educational, positive incentive-based program for small businesses is often much more effective than a traditional command-and-control approach.
- **Consumer Programs** (Point of purchase displays and printed grocery bags) - Point of purchase displays can be very effective because they convey the program's message directly to the consumer at the time and place the purchase decision is being made. Grocery bags printed with the program logo and tag line are a quick and effective way to give brief information to many people.

SCO



## Additional Information — Public Education/Participation

School Education (Facility tours, contests, and curriculum) - The most effective long term method to modify behavior is to educate people at an early age. Facility tours of the wastewater treatment plant, sewer system, household hazardous waste collection center, and other municipal facilities provides children with a first hand look at the processes involved with treating waste and reinforces the awareness that substances deposited to the storm drain are not treated. Contests to develop posters, calendars, etc. are a fun way to raise children's awareness and the accuracy of the resulting products can provide feedback as to effectiveness of other educational efforts. An environmental curriculum covering recycling, energy use, air and water pollution can be a highly effective but long term educational activity. Several groups have recently developed or are developing curricula (see below).

### Examples of Effective Programs

There are a number of communities with effective public education/participation programs. The most pro-active include Santa Clara County and the City of Palo Alto, Alameda County, the City and County of San Francisco, the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project, City of Los Angeles Clean Water Program, City of Santa Monica, the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro), and the Unified Sewerage Agency of Washington County, Oregon. In addition, large businesses, such as PG&E, have used inserts in their bill mailings to educate their customers. The California Coastal Commission and the Lindsay Museum are both developing a curriculum targeted at nonpoint source pollution, and the San Francisco Estuary Project has already developed such a curriculum for K-12.

### REFERENCES

The Global Cities Project, 1992. Offer Residents an Education Program About Water Protection, Building Sustainable Communities.

Nonpoint Source Pollution: You are the Key to the Cleanup, Water Environment Federation, 1992.

Pacific Gas and Electric, 1992. Let's Keep Our Creeks Clean, PG&E Spotlight.

Public Information/Participation Plan, 1992. Alameda County Urban Runoff Clean Water Program.

San Francisco Department of Public Works, 1992. Best Management Practices Public Education Plan.

Santa Clara Valley Nonpoint Source Control Program, 1990. Public Information/Participation Plan.

Schumacher, J.W. and R.F. Grimes, 1992. A Model Public Education Process for Stormwater Management, p. 55-58, Public Works for September, 1992.

SCO



# BMP: HOUSEKEEPING PRACTICES

Graphic: North  
Central Texas  
COG, 1993



## Program Elements

New Development

Residential

Commercial Activities

Industrial Activities

Municipal Facilities

Illegal Discharges

## DESCRIPTION

Promote efficient and safe housekeeping practices (storage, use, and cleanup) when handling potentially harmful materials such as fertilizers, pesticides, cleaning solutions, paint products, automotive products, and swimming pool chemicals. Related information is provided in BMPs SC11, Safer Alternative Products; SC31, Household Hazardous Waste Collection; SC32, Used Oil Recycling; and the Spill Prevention and Cleanup BMPs (SC40/SC41). For information on specific activities at municipal facilities, see Chapter 4, Industrial Handbook.

## APPROACH

- Pattern a new program after the many established programs from municipalities around the state and country. Integrate this best management practice as much as possible with existing programs at your municipality.
- This BMP has two key audiences, municipal employees and the general public.
- Implement this BMP in conjunction with SC11, Safer Alternative Products.
- For a quick reference on disposal alternatives for specific wastes, see Table 4.1, SC50, Illegal Dumping Control.

## REQUIREMENTS

- Cost Considerations
  - The primary cost is for staff time as noted below.
- Regulations
  - There are no regulatory requirements to this BMP. Existing regulations already require municipalities to properly store, use, and dispose of hazardous materials.
- Administrative / Staffing
  - Staff to train municipal employees and to coordinate public education efforts.
- Equipment
  - There are no major equipment requirements to this BMP.
- Training
  - Municipal employees who handle potentially harmful materials should be trained in good housekeeping practices. Personnel who use pesticides must be trained in their use. The California Department of Pesticide Regulation license pesticide dealers, certify pesticide applicators and conduct on-site inspections.

## PUBLIC EDUCATION / PARTICIPATION

- Public awareness is a key to this BMP.

## LIMITATIONS

- There are no major limitations to this best management practice.

## Targeted Constituents

- Sediment
  - Nutrients
  - Heavy Metals
  - Toxic Materials
  - Floatable Materials
  - Oxygen Demanding Substances
  - Oil & Grease
  - Bacteria & Viruses
- Likely to Have Significant Impact
  - Probable Low or Unknown Impact

## Implementation Requirements

- Capital Costs
- O&M Costs
- Regulatory
- Staffing
- Training
- Administrative

High  Low

# SC10



## Additional Information — Housekeeping Practices

Municipal facilities should follow the best management practices outlined in Chapter 4 of the Industrial Handbook, most of which include good housekeeping measures. Municipalities should develop controls on the application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers in public right-of-ways and at municipal facilities. Controls may include:

- List of approved pesticides and selected uses;
- Product and application information for users;
- Equipment use and maintenance procedures; and
- Record keeping and public notice procedures.

For the general public, municipalities should establish a public education program that provides information on such items as storm water pollution and the beneficial effects of proper disposal on water quality; reading product labels; safer alternative products; safe storage, handling, and disposal of hazardous products; list of local agencies; and emergency phone numbers. The programs listed below have provided this information through brochures or booklets that are available at a variety of places including municipal offices, household hazardous waste collection events or facilities, and public information fairs.

The following discussion provides some general information on good housekeeping that may be provided to the general public. More specific information on particular chemicals may be found in the references listed below.

- Always use caution when handling any hazardous household product. Many products contain toxic chemicals that can cause severe injury or death.
- Store household hazardous products securely and away from children, pets, and sources of heat, sparks, and flames.
- Store products in their original containers and keep them well labeled. Do not store chemicals in food containers.
- Read and follow use instructions.
- Avoid contact with eyes and skin. Wear gloves and eye protection when using hazardous substances. Do not wear contact lenses which can absorb hazardous vapors.
- Work in only well ventilated areas.
- Use up all of the product before disposing or give extra to friends, neighbors or community groups.
- Do not dispose of household hazardous waste:
  - in trash,
  - down storm drains or into creeks,
  - down sink or toilet,
  - onto the ground, or
  - by burning.
- Do dispose of hazardous wastes at household hazardous waste collection events or facilities.

The California Integrated Waste Management Board's Recycling Hotline, 1-800-553-2962, provides information on household hazardous waste collection programs and facilities.

### Examples of Effective Programs

There are a number of communities with effective programs. The most pro-active include Santa Clara County and the City of Palo Alto, the City and County of San Francisco, and the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro).

### REFERENCES

The Bay Begins at Your Door (Brochure), Santa Clara Valley Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program, (No date).

Guide to Hazardous Products Around the Home (Booklet), Household Hazardous Waste Project, 1989.

SC10



## Additional Information — Housekeeping Practices

Hazardous Household Products: A Guide to the Disposal of Hazardous Household Products and the Use of Non-Hazardous Alternatives, California Department of Toxic Substance Control.

Household Cleaners and Polishes, Chemical Hazards in the Home (Brochure), Golden Empire Health Planning Center, (No date).

Solvents, Chemical Hazards in the Home (Brochure), Golden Empire Health Planning Center, (No date).


Take Me Shopping: A Consumer Guide to Safe Alternatives for Household Hazardous Products (Booklet), Santa Clara County and City of Palo Alto, 1992.

Your Guide to Less Toxic Shopping: Safer Alternatives for Your Home and Life! (Booklet), San Francisco Household Hazardous Waste Program, 1992.

SC10



# BMP: STORM DRAIN SYSTEM SIGNS



- Program Elements**
- New Development
  - Residential
  - Commercial Activities
  - Industrial Activities
  - Municipal Facilities
  - Illegal Discharges

## DESCRIPTION

Stenciling of the storm drain system (inlets, catch basins, channels, and creeks) with prohibitive language/graphic icons discourages the illegal dumping of unwanted materials.

## APPROACH

- Create a volunteer work force to stencil storm drain inlets, and use municipal staff to erect signs near drainage channels and creeks.
- For a quick reference on disposal alternatives for specific wastes, see Table 4.1, SCS0, Illegal Dumping Control.

## REQUIREMENTS

- **Cost Considerations**
  - Volunteer work force serves to lower program cost.
  - Stenciling kits require procurement of durable/disposable items.
  - Need for storage/maintenance of stenciling kits requires planning.
  - Program can aid in the cataloging of the storm drain system.
- **Regulations**
  - Develop and enforce an ordinance that requires inlets, catch basins, channels, and creeks to be fitted with anti-dumping, pollution prevention signs.
- **Administrative/Staffing**
  - Primary staff demand is for program setup to provide marketing and training.
  - Ongoing/follow-up staff time is minimal because of volunteer services.
  - Minimum 2 persons are required for high traffic areas, commercial and industrial zones.
  - Staff requirement at program headquarters for emergencies, questions, etc.
- **Equipment**
  - Storm drain stenciling kits.
- **Training**
  - Training sessions of approximately 10-15 minutes will cover stenciling procedures, including how to stencil, record keeping, problem drain notation, etc.
  - Proper health and safety protocol (buddy system, traffic, health concerns, etc.).

## PUBLIC EDUCATION/PARTICIPATION

- Promote volunteer services (individual and business) through radio/television and mail-out campaigns.
- Public reporting of improper waste disposal by a HOTLINE number stenciled onto the storm drain inlet.

## Targeted Constituents

- Sediment
  - Nutrients
  - Heavy Metals
  - Toxic Materials
  - Floatable Materials
  - Oxygen Demanding Substances
  - Oil & Grease
  - Bacteria & Viruses
- Likely to Have Significant Impact
  - Probable Low or Unknown Impact

## Implementation Requirements

- Capital Costs
  - O&M Costs
  - Regulatory
  - Staffing
  - Training
  - Administrative
- High  Low

**SC30**



## BMP: STORM DRAIN SYSTEM SIGNS (Continue)


### LIMITATIONS

- Private property access limits stenciling to publicly-owned areas.
- Program is highly dependent on volunteer response.
- Storm drain inlets that are physically blocked will be missed or require follow-up.
- High traffic/commercial/industrial zones will be responsibility of city staff.
- Ongoing maintenance to maintain readable signs.

SC30



## BMP: STREET CLEANING



### Program Elements

- New Development
- Residential
- Commercial Activities
- Industrial Activities
- Municipal Facilities
- Illegal Discharges

### DESCRIPTION

Reduce the discharges of pollutants to storm water from street surfaces by conducting street cleaning on a regular basis.

### APPROACH

- Prioritize cleaning to use the most sophisticated sweepers, at the highest frequency, and in areas with the highest pollutant loading.
- Restrict street parking prior to and during sweeping.
- Increase sweeping frequency just before the rainy season.
- Proper maintenance and operation of sweepers greatly increases their efficiency.
- Keep accurate operation logs to track program.
- Reduce the number of parked vehicles using regulation.

### REQUIREMENTS

- Cost Considerations
  - A street cleaning program requires a significant capital and O&M budget. Sweeper capital costs range from \$65,000 to \$120,000, with a useful life of about 4 years. A careful review of cleaning efficiency should be performed before increased cleaning is proposed.
- Regulations
  - Densely populated areas or heavily used streets may require parking regulations to clear streets for cleaning.
- Administrative / Staffing
  - Sweeper operators, maintenance, supervisory, and administrative personnel are required.
  - Traffic control officers may be required to enforce parking restrictions.
  - Skillful design of cleaning routes is required for program to be productive.
  - Arrangements must be made for disposal of collected wastes.
- Equipment
  - Mechanical broom sweepers, vacuum sweepers, combination sweepers, and street flushers.
- Training
  - Operators must be trained in proper sweeper operation.

### PUBLIC EDUCATION / PARTICIPATION

- The general public should be educated about the need to obey parking restrictions and use litter receptacles to reduce street litter.

### LIMITATIONS

- No currently available conventional sweeper is effective at removing oil and grease.
- Mechanical sweepers are not effective at removing finer sediments.

### Targeted Constituents

- Sediment
- Nutrients
- Heavy Metals
- Toxic Materials
- Floatable Materials
- Oxygen Demanding Substances
- Oil & Grease
- Bacteria & Viruses
- Likely to Have Significant Impact
- Probable Low or Unknown Impact

### Implementation Requirements

- Capital Costs
- O&M Costs
- Regulatory
- Staffing
- Training
- Administrative
- High  Low

SC70



Best Management Practices

## Additional Information — Street Cleaning

### Approach

- Parked cars are the major obstacle to effective mechanical sweeping.
- Effectiveness may also be limited by street condition, traffic congestion, presence of construction projects, climatic conditions, and condition of curbs.
- Sweepers effective at removing smaller particles may generate respirable particulate matter (less than 10 microns) (i.e., dust) that would lead to concerns over worker and public safety.
- **Number of passes and frequency:**
  - Increase the sweeping frequency for streets with high pollutant loadings, especially in high traffic and industrial areas.
  - Increase the sweeping frequency just before the wet season to remove sediments accumulated during the summer.
  - Increase the sweeping frequency for streets in special problem areas such as special events, high litter or erosion zones.
  - To achieve 30% removal of street dirt, the sweeping interval must be no more than 2 times the average interval between storms. To reach 50% removal, sweeping must occur 1/2 to 1 times the average interval between storms.
  - Sweeping appears most effective in areas with distinct wet and dry seasons (e.g. California).
- **Equipment type and operation:**
  - Vacuum or regenerative air sweepers are more effective at removing the finer sediments which often bind a higher proportion of heavy metals.
  - Sweeper operation is critical to performance. Speeds of 6-8 mph are optimal. In addition, brush adjustment, rotation rate, and sweeping pattern also affect removal efficiencies.
- **Source reduction:**
  - Enforce construction erosion controls in urban areas.
  - Improve street conditions to increase sweeping effectiveness.
  - Enlist the help of citizens to keep yard waste, used oil, and other wastes out of the gutter.
  - Require construction contractors to implement storm water pollution prevention plans (see Construction Handbook).
- **Maintenance:**
  - Replace worn parts as necessary.
  - Install main and gutter brooms of the appropriate weight.
- **Record Keeping/Tracking:**
  - Keep accurate logs of the number of curb-miles swept.
  - Record the amount of waste collected.
  - Consider implementing employee deputization and spill tracking measures in ID1, Illegal Dumping Control, in conjunction with this BMP to facilitate control of illegal dumping.

### Equipment Selection

There are advantages and disadvantages to the two common types of sweepers. The best choice depends on your specific conditions. Many communities find it useful to have a compliment of both types in their fleet.

**Mechanical Broom Sweepers** - More effective at picking up large debris and cleaning wet streets. Less costly to purchase and operate. Create more airborne dust.

**Vacuum Sweepers** - More effective at removing fine particles and associated heavy metals. Ineffective at cleaning wet streets. Noisier than mechanical broom sweepers which may restrict areas or times of operation. May require an advance vehicle to remove large debris.

SC70



## Additional Information — Street Cleaning

A third piece of equipment used by some municipalities also has its advantages and disadvantages:

**Street Flushers** - Not affected by biggest interference to cleaning, parked cars. May remove finer sediments, moving them toward the gutter and storm water inlets. For this reason, flushing fell out of favor and is now used primarily after sweeping. Flushing may be effective for combined sewer systems. Presently street flushing is not allowed under most NPDES permits.

### Cross-Media Transfer of Pollutants

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) has established state ambient air quality standards including a standard for respirable particulate matter (less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter, symbolized as  $PM_{10}$ ). In the effort to sweep up finer sediments to remove attached heavy metals, municipalities should be aware that fine dust, that cannot be captured by the sweeping equipment and becomes airborne, could lead to issues of worker and public safety.

### Examples of Effective Programs

In the City and County of San Francisco, ninety percent of the streets are swept at least once per week, and some sections are swept two to three times per week. San Francisco is also converting as much of its fleet as possible to vacuum sweepers.

### REFERENCES

Best Management Practices for Street Cleaning (Draft), Maintenance Subcommittee, Alameda County Urban Runoff Clean Water Program, 1992.

Best Management Practices Program for Pollution Prevention, City and County of San Francisco, 1990.

Characterizing and Controlling Urban Runoff Through Street and Sewerage Cleaning, EPA/600/2-85/038, PB85-186500, USEPA, 1985.

Demonstration of Nonpoint Pollution Abatement Through Improved Street Cleaning Practices, EPA-600/2-79-161, PB80-108988, USEPA, 1979.

Guide to Nonpoint Source Pollution Control, USEPA, 1987.

Mustard, M.H., Ellis, S.R. and Gibbs, J.W., "Runoff and Washoff Loads from Rainfall - Simulation Experiments on a Street Surface and a Native Pasture in the Denver Metropolitan Area, Colorado, USGS, Open-File Report 84-820, 1985.

Protecting Water Quality in Urban Areas: Best Management Practices for Minnesota, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 1989.

Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin (The Technical Manual): Volume IV - Urban Land Use BMPs, Washington State Department of Ecology, 1992.


Street Cleaning Practice, American Public Works Association, 1978.

Street Sweeping as a Water Pollution Control Measure: Lessons Learned Over the Past Ten Years, The Science of the Total Environment, (33): 171-183, J.D. Sartor and D.R. Gaboury, 1984.

SC70



# BMP: CATCH BASIN CLEANING



## Program Elements

- New Development*
- Residential*
- Commercial Activities*
- Industrial Activities*
- Municipal Facilities*
- Illegal Discharges*

## DESCRIPTION

Maintain catch basins and storm water inlets on a regular basis to remove pollutants, reduce high pollutant concentrations during the first flush of storms, prevent clogging of the downstream conveyance system, and restore the catch basins' sediment trapping capacity. A catch basin is distinguished from a storm water inlet by having at its base a sediment sump designed to catch and retain sediments below the overflow point. This fact sheet focuses on the cleaning of accumulated sediments from catch basins.

## APPROACH

- Aggressively enforce anti-littering and illegal dumping ordinances.
- Catch basins should be cleaned regularly to reduce the possibility of sediment and pollutant loading from the flushing effect of storm water inflow.
- Prioritize maintenance to clean catch basins and inlets in areas with the highest pollutant loading.
- Keep accurate operation logs to track program.

## REQUIREMENTS

- **Cost Considerations**
  - An aggressive catch basin cleaning program could require a significant capital and O&M budget. A careful study of cleaning effectiveness should be undertaken before increased cleaning is implemented.
- **Regulations**
  - There are no regulatory requirements for this BMP. Municipal codes should include sections prohibiting the disposal of soil, debris, refuse, hazardous waste, and other pollutants into the storm drain system, and prohibiting littering.
- **Administrative / Staffing**
  - Two-person teams may be required to clean catch basins with vector trucks.
  - Arrangements must be made for proper disposal of collected wastes.
- **Equipment**
  - Except for small communities with relatively few catch basins that may be cleaned manually, most municipalities will require mechanical cleaners such as eductors, vacuums, or bucket loaders.
- **Training**
  - Crews must be trained in proper maintenance, including record keeping and disposal.

## PUBLIC EDUCATION / PARTICIPATION

- Educate contractors (cement, masonry, painting) and utility employees (telephone, cable, gas and electric) about proper waste (solid and liquid) disposal.

## LIMITATIONS

- There are no major limitations to this best management practice.

## Targeted Constituents

- Sediment*
  - Nutrients*
  - Heavy Metals*
  - Toxic Materials*
  - Floatable Materials*
  - Oxygen Demanding Substances*
  - Oil & Grease*
  - Bacteria & Viruses*
- Likely to Have Significant Impact*
  - Probable Low or Unknown Impact*

## Implementation Requirements

- Capital Costs*
  - O&M Costs*
  - Regulatory*
  - Staffing*
  - Training*
  - Administrative*
- High*    *Low*

# SC71



## Additional Information — Catch Basin Cleaning

Regular maintenance of public and private catch basins and inlets is necessary to ensure their proper functioning. Clogged catch basins are not only useless but may act as a source of sediments and pollutants. In general, the keys to effective catch basins are:

- At least annual inspections. Municipal staff should inspect public and private facilities to ensure compliance with the following:
  - Immediate repair of any deterioration threatening structural integrity.
  - Cleaning before the sump is 40% full. Catch basins should be cleaned as frequently as needed to meet this standard.
  - Stenciling of catch basins and inlets (see SC30, Storm Drain System Signs).
- Clean catch basins in high pollutant load areas just before the wet season to remove sediments and debris accumulated during the summer.
- Keep accurate logs of the number of catch basins cleaned.
- Record the amount of waste collected.
- Consider implementing employee deputization and spill tracking measures in SC50, Illegal Dumping Control, in conjunction with this BMP to facilitate control of illegal dumping.

Public education should be implemented in conjunction with the public education effort in SC50, Illegal Dumping Control, to raise awareness of the problem. Information in the Construction Handbook regarding waste management (BMPs CA20-CA24) may be used to develop a program for contractors.

### REFERENCES

Best Management Practices for Storm Drainage Facilities (Draft), Maintenance Subcommittee, Alameda County Urban Runoff Clean Water Program, 1992.

Protecting Water Quality in Urban Areas: Best Management Practices for Minnesota, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 1989.

Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin (The Technical Manual): Volume IV - Urban Land Use BMPs, Washington State Department of Ecology, 1992.

Street Cleaning Practice, American Public Works Association, 1978.

SC71



# BMP: VEGETATION CONTROLS

Graphic: North Central Texas COG, 1993



## DESCRIPTION

Vegetation control typically involves a combination of chemical (herbicide) application and mechanical methods. Mechanical vegetation control methods are discussed herein, and chemical methods are addressed in BMP SC10 of this chapter. Mechanical vegetation control includes leaving existing vegetation, cutting less frequently, handcutting, planting low maintenance vegetation, collecting and properly disposing of clippings and cuttings, and educating employees and the public.

## APPROACH

- Areas of Concern
  - Steep slopes.
  - Vegetated drainage channels.
  - Creeks.
  - Areas adjacent to catch basins.
  - Detention/retention basins.
- Areas Exempt
  - Flat or relatively flat vegetated areas.
  - Areas not adjacent to drainage structures.
  - Areas screened from drainage structures by vegetation.

## REQUIREMENTS

- Cost Considerations
  - Possible minor cost impact of upgrading certain mowing equipment for bagging.
  - Possible cost impact for additional laborers involved in hand cutting and picking up clippings.
- Regulations
  - Local municipal anti-dumping ordinances.
- Administrative/Staffing
  - Possible need for additional labor to hand cut and pick up clippings from areas where mechanical cutting and collection is not practicable.
  - Train landscape contractors and municipal employees re. vegetation controls.

## PUBLIC EDUCATION/PARTICIPATION

- Promote volunteer services to create litter collection groups (such as Adopt-a-Stream).
- Educate public regarding anti-dumping practices (fold into existing household hazardous waste program), and impact of erosion from new construction.

## LIMITATIONS

- Does not address problems associated with herbicide use.

## Program Elements

New Development

Residential

Commercial Activities

Industrial Activities

Municipal Facilities

Illegal Discharges

## Targeted Constituents

- Sediment
- Nutrients
- Heavy Metals
- Toxic Materials
- Floatable Materials
- Oxygen Demanding Substances
- Oil & Grease
- Bacteria & Viruses

Likely to Have Significant Impact

Probable Low or Unknown Impact

## Implementation Requirements

- Capital Costs
- O&M Costs
- Regulatory
- Staffing
- Training
- Administrative

High  Low

**SC72**



## Additional Information — Vegetation Controls

Mechanical control of vegetation includes mowing, "bush-hogging", and hand cutting. Large scale mowing is typically done by tractor-type mowers similar to farm machinery. "Bush-hogging" usually refers to tractor mounted mowing equipment with hydraulically mounted cutting machinery. On smaller areas, lawn tractors or push mowers may be used. In areas that are inaccessible by machinery, such as steep grades and rocky terrain, hand cutting using gas powered weed trimmers and scythes may be used.

Clippings and cuttings are the primary waste produced by mowing and trimming. Clippings and cuttings are almost exclusively leaf and woody materials. In some cases, litter may be intermingled with the clippings along public right-of-ways. The objective of this BMP is to minimize transportation of clippings and cuttings into the storm water conveyance system.

Clippings/cuttings carried into the storm water system and receiving streams can degrade water quality in several ways. Suspended solids will increase causing turbidity problems. Since most of the constituents are organic, the biological oxygen demand will increase causing a lowering of the available oxygen to animal life. In areas where litter and other solid waste pollution exists, toxic materials may be released into receiving streams with a resulting degradation of water quality.

A related problem exists with the illegal dumping of clippings/cuttings in or near drainage facilities. Often, landscapers and private maintenance people will discover that clippings/cuttings can easily be disposed of by dumping them down a nearby ravine or on the slope of a creek or drainage channel. This practice introduces a large quantity of decaying organic matter into the storm water collection system that is subsequently carried to receiving streams during the next storm.

Measures to improve the disposition of clippings/cuttings are simple and inexpensive. For the most part, the solution to this problem involves behavior modification through education. Awareness of the problem is the first step toward the solution.

Firstly and for new developments in particular, the easiest and least expensive measure is to leave the existing vegetation in place. Native vegetation typically requires much less maintenance than introduced vegetation. Secondly, consider mowing or trimming vegetation, both native and introduced, less frequently, thereby generating less waste. Thirdly, if introduced vegetation is necessary, consider planting low maintenance grasses and shrubs. Another advantage to these strategies is considerable water savings.

Once this vegetative waste is generated the main concern is to avoid transport of clippings/cuttings to receiving water bodies. It is necessary to pick up and properly dispose of clippings/cuttings on the slopes and bottom of drainage facilities, including storm water detention/retention facilities. In addition, the presence of clippings/cuttings in and around catch basins should be avoided by either using bagging equipment or manually picking the material up. Clippings/cuttings on flat surfaces are generally not transported by storm water runoff unless the event is particularly intense. Therefore, it is not necessary to pick up or bag clippings/cuttings on flat or nearly flat surfaces. Municipal operators should be trained to use good judgement in determining whether clippings/cuttings should be collected or left in place.

Mowing should be performed at optimal times. Mowing should not be performed if significant rain events are predicted.

Mulching mowers may be recommended for certain areas. Mulching mowers should be encouraged for homeowners in flat areas. Mulching mowers have the added benefit of reducing the fertilizer demand through reuse of organic material. Other techniques may be employed to minimize mowing such as selective vegetative planting using low maintenance grasses and shrubs.

SC72



## Additional Information — Vegetation Controls

Municipal anti-dumping ordinances should be enacted or reinforced (if necessary) so that private dumping of vegetative debris is not allowed. It is important that these ordinances be clear and enforceable.

Education and public participation are important elements in control of this unacceptable practice. Information regarding this subject should be incorporated into other local environmental education programs such as the household hazardous waste education program and pesticide education efforts.

Composting is one of the better disposal alternatives if locally available. Most municipalities either have or are planning yard waste composting facilities as a means of reducing the amount of waste going to the landfill. Lawn clippings from municipal maintenance programs as well as private sources would probably be compatible with most composting facilities.

SCT2



# BMP: DETENTION/INFILTRATION DEVICE MAINTENANCE



## Program Elements

- .. New Development
- .. Residential
- .. Commercial Activities
- .. Industrial Activities
- **Municipal Facilities**
- .. Illegal Discharges

## DESCRIPTION

Proper maintenance and siltation removal is required on both a routine and corrective basis to promote effective storm water pollutant removal efficiencies for wet/dry detention pond and infiltration devices.

*INCLUDING LAKES*

## APPROACH

- Remove silt after sufficient accumulation.
- Periodically clean accumulated sediment and silt out of pre-treatment inlets.
- Infiltration device silt removal should occur when the infiltration rate drops below 1/2 inch per hour.
- Removal of accumulated paper, trash, and debris should occur every six (6) months or as needed to prevent clogging of control devices.
- Vegetation growth should not be allowed to exceed 18 inches in height.
- Mow the slopes periodically and check for clogging, erosion and tree growth on the embankment.
- Corrective maintenance may require more frequent attention (as required).

## REQUIREMENTS

- Cost Considerations
  - Frequent sediment removal can be labor intensive and costly. However, properly designed ponds allow for easy removal of accumulated sediments at relatively minor cost.
  - Cost of waste material for transport and disposal.
- Administrative/Staffing
  - Two-person teams may be needed for routine silt removal and excavation.
  - Program manager needed to track maintenance activities and provide field assistance.
  - Staff team needed for corrective maintenance activities.
- Regulations
  - Permits may be required by Corps or Engineers, Fish & Wildlife or State Fish & Game.
- Equipment
  - Vehicles, dump trucks, bulldozers, trackhoes, excavators, mowers, weed trimmers, sickles, machetes, shovels, rakes, and personal protective equipment (PPE), (goggles, dust masks, coveralls, boots, gloves).
- Training
  - Appropriate excavation and maintenance procedures.
  - Proper waste disposal procedures.

## Targeted Constituents

- Sediment
  - Nutrients
  - Heavy Metals
  - Toxic Materials
  - Floatable Materials
  - Oxygen Demanding Substances
  - Oil & Grease
  - Bacteria & Viruses
- Likely to Have Significant Impact
  - Probable Low or Unknown Impact

## Implementation Requirements

- Capital Costs
  - O&M Costs
  - Regulatory
  - Staffing
  - Training
  - Administrative
- High
  - Low

**SC75**



## BMP: DETENTION/INFILTRATION DEVICE MAINTENANCE (Continue)

### PUBLIC EDUCATION/PARTICIPATION

- Create a public education campaign to explain the function of wet/dry detention pond/infiltration devices and their operational requirements for proper effectiveness
- Encourage the public to report wet/dry detention pond/infiltration devices needing maintenance

### LIMITATIONS

- Wet detention pond dredging can produce slurred waste that often exceeds the requirements of many landfills
- Frequent sediment removal is labor and cost intensive

SC75



## Additional Information — Detention/Infiltration Device Maintenance

### Maintenance

Proper maintenance of detention pond and infiltration device systems is a source control procedure necessary to ensure effective storm water pollutant removal efficiency. Routine and corrective maintenance needs should be monitored after storms for proper function of wet ponds, extended detention basins, and infiltration device structures. Proper maintenance of these structures requires periodic silt/sediment and trash debris removal, as well as timely vegetation control. Detention basin silt removal should occur when the accumulated depth exceeds six (6) inches on average in basins without sediment traps. In basins with sediment traps, silt removal should occur when accumulation exceeds four (4) inches.

More frequent sediment removal is recommended, especially in areas where roadway drainage provides a significant runoff component. High accumulation rates of heavy metal contaminants (lead, zinc, copper) have been identified in these BMP structures adjacent to high traffic areas. In order to avoid situations of hazardous waste disposal, sediment dredging and excavation should be given frequent priority.

Maintenance crews may require access vehicles, dump trucks, bulldozers, and dredging/excavation equipment. Manual use equipment (such as rakes, shovels, sickles, machetes) may suffice for maintenance of dry detention ponds and infiltration device systems. Staffing will require a minimum of two (2) person crews for health and safety reasons and effective structural BMP maintenance. A program manager should oversee operations either in the field or be readily accessible for providing procedural advice or direction. For corrective maintenance activities, a contingent team of field staff should be ready to mobilize for remedial action.


A public awareness campaign for educating the community of the operational and maintenance requirements of these BMP structures for pollutant removal effectiveness would assist in the monitoring of these systems. A community phone number for the reporting of structures - public and private - in need of maintenance would help to provide corrective maintenance as required.

### REFERENCES


Florida Development Manual: A Guide to Sound Land and Water Management, Storm water and Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs for Developing Areas, Florida Department of Environmental Regulation, 1988.

Environmental Criteria Manual, Design Guidelines for Water Quality Control, City of Austin, Texas, 1989.

SC75



## BMP: STORM CHANNEL/CREEK MAINTENANCE



Graphics: North Central Texas CCG, 1993

### Program Elements

- New Development
- Residential
- Commercial Activities
- Industrial Activities
- Municipal Facilities
- Illegal Discharges

### DESCRIPTION

Reduce pollutant levels in storm water by regularly removing illegally-dumped items and material from storm drainage channels and creeks. Modify channel characteristics to enhance pollutant removal and/or hydraulic capacity.

### APPROACH

- Identification of illegal dumping hot spots; regular inspection and clean up of hot spots and other storm drainage areas where illegal dumping and disposal occurs.
- Posting "No Littering" signs with a phone number for reporting a dumping in-progress.
- Adoption and enforcement of substantial penalties for illegal dumping and disposal.
- Modification of storm channel characteristics to improve channel hydraulics, to increase pollutant removals, and to enhance channel/creek aesthetic and habitat value.
- Maintenance of accurate logs to evaluate materials removed and improvements made.

### REQUIREMENTS

- Cost Considerations
  - Purchase and installation of signs.
  - Cost of vehicle(s) to haul illegally-disposed items and material to landfills.
  - Rental of heavy equipment to remove larger items (e.g., car bodies) from channels.
  - Purchase of landfill space to dispose of illegally-dumped items and material.
  - Capital and maintenance costs for channel modifications.
- Regulations
  - Adoption of substantial penalties for illegal dumping and disposal.
- Administration/Staffing
  - Larger municipalities should commit at least one full-time staff person; smaller municipalities at least one part-time staff person. Additional staff as-needed.
- Equipment and Materials (see discussion above).
- Training
  - Channel maintenance and use of heavy equipment.
  - Identification and handling of hazardous materials/wastes.

### PUBLIC EDUCATION/PARTICIPATION

- Education on the need for proper disposal of refuse.
- Notification of penalties for illegal dumping/disposal.

### LIMITATIONS

- Clean-up activities may create a slight disturbance for local aquatic species.
- Access to items and material on private property may be limited.
- Trade-offs may exist between channel hydraulics and water quality/riparian habitat.
- Worker/public safety may be at risk in crime-ridden or homeless-populated areas.
- If storm channels or basins are recognized as wetlands, many activities, including maintenance, may be subject to regulation.

### Targeted Constituents

- Sediment
  - Nutrients
  - Heavy Metals
  - Toxic Materials
  - Floatable Materials
  - Oxygen Demanding Substances
  - Oil & Grease
  - Bacteria & Viruses
- Likely to Have Significant Impact
  - Probable Low or Unknown Impact

### Implementation Requirements

- Capital Costs
  - O&M Costs
  - Regulatory
  - Staffing
  - Training
  - Administrative
- High  Low

SC76



Best Management Practices

## Additional Information — Storm Channel/Creek Maintenance

### Clean-up Activities

Although illegally dumped items have not been quantified in terms of their contribution to storm water runoff pollution, the potential exists for significant reductions in runoff metals loadings as a result of comprehensive storm channel and creek maintenance. Potentially significant sources of toxic pollutants in storm channels and creeks may include the following:

- Car bodies and automotive scrap,
- Car batteries,
- Tires,
- Hazardous materials/waste,
- Various metallic items (shopping carts, furniture, appliances, etc.),
- Animal waste, and
- Wastes from homeless people encampments.

In addition to the obvious benefit of reducing pollutants in storm water runoff, an equally important benefit of channel/creek maintenance is the dramatic aesthetic improvement achieved by removing all illegally-dumped wastes from a given stretch of a storm channel or creek. Use of such areas for illegal dumping creates an eyesore and reflects poorly on a community that might otherwise be making a conscientious effort to improve the environment. Consequently, storm channel/creek maintenance efforts should not focus solely on removing those items known to pose a threat to water quality. Instead, the effort should be directed toward all illegally dumped materials, including common household trash, litter, and non-metallic and/or inert materials of all kinds. In this way, water quality improvement and significant aesthetic enhancement can both be achieved.

### Channel Modification/Improvement

Urbanization, particularly land clearing and construction, tends to disrupt stream equilibrium, by temporarily intensifying sediment yield to streams. In addition to the cleanup practices described above, implementation of the erosion and sediment control BMPs presented in the Construction Handbook can also significantly reduce the effects of urbanization on streams.

It should be noted that any person, government agency, or public utility proposing an activity that will change the natural (emphasis added) state of any river, stream, or lake in California, must enter into a stream or Lake Alteration Agreement with the Department of Fish and Game. The developer-applicant should also contact local governments (city, county, special districts), other state agencies (SWRCB, RWQCB, Department of Forestry, Department of Water Resources), and Federal Corps of Engineers and USFWS.

### Flow Management

Flow management has been one of the principal motivations for designing urban stream corridors in the past. Such needs may or may not be compatible with the storm water quality goals in the stream corridor.

Downstream flood peaks can be suppressed by reducing throughflow velocity. This can be accomplished by reducing gradient with grade control structures or increasing roughness with boulders, dense vegetation, or complex banks forms. Reducing velocity correspondingly increases flood height, so all such measures have a natural association with floodplain open space. Flood elevations laterally adjacent to the stream can be lowered by increasing throughflow velocity.

However, increasing velocity increases flooding downstream and inherently conflicts with channel stability and human safety. Where topography permits, another way to lower flood elevation is to lower the level of the floodway with drop structures into a large but subtly excavated bowl where flood flows are allowed to spread out.

SC76



## Additional Information — Storm Channel/Creek Maintenance

### Stream Corridor Planning

Urban streams receive and convey storm water flows from developed or developing watersheds. Planning of stream corridors thus interacts with urban storm water management programs. If local programs are intended to control or protect downstream environments by managing flows delivered to the channels, then it is logical that such programs should be supplemented by management of the materials, forms, and uses of the downstream riparian corridor. Any proposal for stream alteration or management should be investigated for its potential flow and stability effects on upstream, downstream, and laterally adjacent areas. The timing and rate of flow from various tributaries can combine in complex ways to alter flood hazards. Each section of channel is unique, influenced by its own distribution of roughness elements, management activities, and stream responses.

Flexibility to adapt to stream features and behaviors as they evolve must be included in stream reclamation planning. The amenity and ecology of streams may be enhanced through the landscape design options of 1) corridor reservation, 2) bank treatment, 3) geomorphic restoration, and 4) grade control.

Corridor reservation - Reserving stream corridors and valleys to accommodate natural stream meandering, aggradation, degradation, and overbank flows allows streams to find their own form and generate less ongoing erosion. In California, open stream corridors in recent urban developments have produced recreational open space, irrigation of streamside plantings, and the aesthetic amenity of flowing water.

Bank treatment - The use of armoring, vegetative cover, and flow deflection may be used to influence a channel's form, stability, and biotic habitat. To prevent bank erosion, armoring can be done with rigid construction materials, such as concrete, masonry, wood planks and logs, riprap, and gabions. Concrete linings have been criticized because of their lack of provision of biotic habitat. In contrast, riprap and gabions make relatively porous and flexible linings. Boulders, placed in the bed reduce velocity and erosive power.

Riparian vegetation can stabilize the banks of streams that are at or near a condition of equilibrium. Binding networks of roots increase bank shear strength. During flood flows, resilient vegetation is forced into erosion-inhibiting mats. The roughness of vegetation leads to lower velocity, further reducing erosive effects. Structural flow deflection can protect banks from erosion or alter fish habitat. By concentrating flow, a deflector causes a pool to be scoured in the bed.

Geomorphic restoration - Restoration refers to alteration of disturbed streams so their form and behavior emulate those of undisturbed streams. Natural meanders are retained, with grading to gentle slopes on the inside of curves to allow point bars and riffle-pool sequences to develop. Trees are retained to provide scenic quality, biotic productivity, and roots for bank stabilization, supplemented by plantings where necessary.

A restorative approach can be successful where the stream is already approaching equilibrium. However, if upstream urbanization continues, new flow regimes will be generated that could disrupt the equilibrium of the treated system.

Grade Control - A grade control structure is a level shelf of a permanent material, such as stone, masonry, or concrete, over which stream water flows. A grade control structure is called a sill, weir, or drop structure, depending on the relation of its invert elevation to upstream and downstream channels.

A sill is installed at the preexisting channel bed elevation to prevent upstream migration of nickpoints. It establishes a firm base level below which the upstream channel can not erode.

SC76



## Additional Information — Storm Channel/Creek Maintenance

A weir or check dam is installed with invert above the preexisting bed elevation. A weir raises the local base level of the stream and causes aggradation upstream. The gradient, velocity, and erosive potential of the stream channel are reduced. A drop structure lowers the downstream invert below its preexisting elevation, reducing downstream gradient and velocity. Weirs and drop structure control erosion by dissipating energy and reducing slope velocity.

When carefully applied, grade control structures can be highly versatile in establishing human and environmental benefits in stabilized channels. To be successful, application of grade control structures should be guided by analysis of the stream system both upstream and downstream from the area to be reclaimed.

### Examples of Effective Programs

The California Department of Water Resources began the Urban Stream Restoration Program in 1985. The program provides grant funds to municipalities and community groups to implement stream restoration projects. The projects reduce damages from streambank and watershed instability and floods while restoring streams' aesthetic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values.

In Buena Vista Park, upper floodway slopes are gentle and grassed to achieve continuity of usable park land across the channel of small boulders at the base of the slopes.

The San Diego River is a large, vegetatively lined channel, which was planted in a variety of species to support riparian wildlife while stabilizing the steep banks of the floodway.


### REFERENCES

Ferguson, B.K. 1991. *Urban Stream Reclamation*, p. 324-328, *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*.

SC76



# BMP: WET PONDS



## Considerations

- Soils
- Area Required
- Slope
- Water Availability
- Aesthetics
- Hydraulic Head
- Environmental Side Effects

### DESCRIPTION

A wet pond has a permanent water pool to treat incoming storm water. An enhanced wet pond includes a pretreatment sediment forebay.

### CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE

There are regional flood control basins in California that function like wet ponds or constructed wetlands (TC3).

### SELECTION CRITERIA

- Need to achieve high level of particulate and some dissolved contaminant removal.
- Ideal for large, regional tributary areas.
- Multiple benefits of passive recreation (e.g., bird watching, wildlife habitat).

### LIMITATIONS

- Concern for mosquitoes and maintaining oxygen in ponds.
- Cannot be placed on steep unstable slopes.
- Need base flow or supplemental water if water level is to be maintained.
- Infeasible in very dense urban areas.
- In California the wet season is coincident with minimal plant growth.
- Could be regulated as a wetlands or under Chapter 15, Title 23, California Code of Regulations regarding waste disposal to lands.
- Pending volume and depth, pond designs may require approval from State Division of Safety of Dams.

### DESIGN AND SIZING CONSIDERATIONS

- Wet pool volume determined by Figures 2B and C.
- Water depth of 3 to 9 feet.
- Wetland vegetation, occupying 25-50% of water surface area.
- Design to minimize short-circuiting.
- Bypass storms greater than two year storm.

### CONSTRUCTION/INSPECTION CONSIDERATIONS

- Be careful when installing wetland vegetation.

### MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

- Remove floatables and sediment build-up.
- Correct erosion spots in banks.
- Control mosquitoes.
- May require permits from various regulatory agencies, e.g. Corps of Engineers.

### COST CONSIDERATIONS

- Costs for providing supplemental water may be prohibitive.

### Targeted Constituents

- Sediment
- Nutrients
- Heavy Metals
- Toxic Materials
- Floatable Materials
- Oxygen Demanding Substances
- Oil & Grease
- Bacteria & Viruses
- Likely to Have Significant Impact
- Probable Low or Unknown Impact

### Implementation Requirements

- Capital Costs
- O&M Costs
- Maintenance
- Training

High    Low

TC2



## Additional Information — Wet Ponds

### General

The major features of a wet pond are shown in Figure 2A. It is essentially a small lake with rooted wetland vegetation along the perimeter. The permanent pool of water provides a quiescent volume for continued settling of particulate contaminants and uptake of dissolved contaminants by aquatic plants between storms. The wetland vegetation is present to improve the removal of dissolved contaminants and to reduce the formation of algal mats. However, given the need to minimize the impact on space, it may be cost-effective to use vertical concrete retaining walls which would not allow for emergent vegetation.

The average depth of the wet pool is generally 3 to 9 feet, although greater depths are possible with artificial mixing. The objective is to avoid thermal stratification that could result in odor problems. Gentle artificial mixing may be needed in small ponds because they are effectively sheltered from the wind.

The wet pond could be allowed to dry during the summer months. Allowing the wet pond to dry has not been tried elsewhere but seems feasible since the pond need not operate during the summer months. The major problem with this concept will likely be aesthetics rather than performance.

Wet ponds are of interest where the removal of the dissolved constituent fraction is of concern, particularly nutrients and metals. Dissolved contaminants are removed by a combination of processes: physical adsorption to bottom sediments and suspended fine sediments, natural chemical flocculation, and uptake by aquatic plants. A wet pond with concrete sides and floor would therefore not likely provide any advantage over the non-vegetative treatment control BMPs. The relative importance of each mechanism is not well understood. Very limited data prevents a definitive conclusion as to the effectiveness of wet ponds in removing dissolved contaminants. Reduction in the dissolved fraction of phosphorus and some metals have been observed but this does not necessarily mean it is removed in the pond. It may be incorporated into algae or absorbed onto fine particulate matter which exits the facility in the effluent. If the primary removal mechanism is biological, wet ponds may not be particularly effective in removing dissolved contaminants in California because most storms occur during winter when plant growth is minimal.

Wet pond may be preferred where the secondary objective of aesthetics or passive recreation is important. The rooted vegetation along the pond edges will provide some habitat for wetland animals. Wet ponds are generally not feasible in dense urban areas due to the unavailability of land unless a park or open space is available and the pond can be designed to achieve recreational or aesthetic objectives. Wet ponds may have several side effects that may be considered unacceptable in certain situations. Placed in residential developments, the wet pool may be considered a safety hazard for small children although the incidence of drowning is rare where these facilities are in place. Fencing the facility for protection can be aesthetically displeasing and diminishes the value of the pond for passive recreation.

Another concept is the extended detention wet pond in which the outlet of the facility is restricted so as to retain a treatment design storm on top of the wet pool for a specified time. It is believed this added measure improves performance. The effect of restricting the outflow is to reduce the overflow rate during the storm increasing the capture of settleable solids. However, the majority of settling occurs between rather than during the storms. The extended detention zone may therefore provide little incremental benefit. If vertical space is available the concept could be employed because the added cost may be nominal. See TC5 Extended Detention Basins on how to determine the extended detention volume.

### Design

Two methods have been proposed for the sizing of wet ponds: one predicated on the removal of particulate contaminants only (USEPA, 1986) and one predicated on the removal of phosphorus as well (Florida, 1988; Maryland, 1986). The first method relates the removal efficiency of suspended solids to pond volume. The second method provides a detention

TC2



## Additional Information — Wet Ponds

time of 14 days based on the wettest month to allow sufficient time for the uptake of dissolved phosphorus by algae and the settling of fine solids where the particulate phosphorus tends to be concentrated. The criterion of 14 days comes from Kast et al., 1983 who observed that in lakes at least 14 days is needed for significant algal growth during the growing season. In much of the United States including Maryland and Florida the growing season is coincident with significant rainfall. But this is not the situation in California where essentially all of the rainfall occurs from November through April. Consequently, the removal of phosphorus and fine solids will not be as high as the literature indicates.

### Sizing the Permanent Pool

Figure 2B shows the relationship between performance and the long-term removal efficiency for average conditions in California (USEPA (1986) as adapted in FHWA (1989)).  $V_p/V_r$  is the ratio of the volume of the wet pond to the volume of the runoff of the mean storm event from the tributary watershed. The depth of the mean storm for various areas of California is shown in Figure 2C. The recommended performance goal is 80%. The volume of the pond is therefore calculated as follows:

$$V_p = 3S_d A_i 43560/12 = 10890S_d A_i \quad (1)$$

where:  $V_p$  = pond volume ( $\text{ft}^3$ )  
 $S_d$  = mean storm depth (inches)  
 $A_i$  = impervious acres in the tributary watershed

For  $A_i$  the engineer may use total impervious acres in the watershed; directly connected impervious acres more correctly represents the area being treated and would allow a smaller facility. If the jurisdiction has the runoff coefficient for the watershed but not the impervious acreage, multiply the total acreage of the watershed times the runoff coefficient to obtain a value for  $A_i$ . Although these variations are not equivalent, they are reasonable given the uncertainty of the methodology and expected pond performance.

This volume should be compared with the 14 days detention time criterion and the more conservative volume (i.e., larger volume) should be used for sizing.

### Adding Detention Storage to the Permanent Pool

Some investigators believe that detention volume added above the permanent pool enhances pool performance. The State of Florida, for example, requires one basin inch of detention storage be added to the permanent pool and be bled down over a 60 hour period. This requirement, however, adds considerably to the size of the basin, and the literature does not indicate that water quality performance is improved. Therefore detention storage should be added only if the pond is to be used for drainage control in addition to water quality control. As with extended detention, consideration should be given to bypassing the facility for flows greater than the two year storm so that bed load is not trapped in the pond.

A perforated riser outlet recommended by the Denver Urban Drainage and Flood Control Districts is illustrated in Figures 2D and 2E. Other outlet concepts are illustrated in TC5, Extended Detention Basins, Figure 5B.

### Additional Considerations

- Place wetland vegetation around the pond perimeter and near the outlet.

Rooted vegetation around the pond perimeter serves several functions (Figure 2A). It enhances the removal of dissolved pollutants (see T3, Constructed Wetlands); it may reduce the formation of floating algal mats; it reduces the risk of people falling into the deeper areas of the pond; and, it provides some habitat for insects, aquatic life, and wetland

TC2



## Additional Information — Wet Ponds

wildlife. The "shelf" for the vegetation should be about 10 feet wide with a water depth of 1 to 2 feet. The total area of the "shelf" should be 25-50% of the water surface area. Vegetation near the exit will assist settling of solids. An alternative is a rock filter which is used in many wastewater oxidation ponds where loss of algae in the effluent is a common problem during the growth season (Rich, L., 1988).

If mosquitoes are of particular concern, it would be advisable to inhibit the growth of emergent wetland vegetation around the perimeter by using steep slopes, say, 2:1, and by minimizing the amount of pond area that has a depth less than 18". *Gambusia* (mosquito fish) can also be planted in larger ponds but the water level must be maintained to insure their survival during the dry season.

If placement of wetland vegetation along the perimeter is not feasible consider the use of devices that retain non-rooted wetland species (Limnion, undated; Zirschky, et al. 1980). Non-rooted vegetation is more effective than rooted vegetation in removing dissolved nutrients and metals (see TC3 Constructed Wetlands). The vegetation grows within the device which is periodically removed and cleaned thereby removing the contaminants from the facility. The system developed by Limnion is in use in several artificial lakes in California to control nutrients.

- Except for very small facilities, include a forebay to facilitate maintenance.
- Use side slopes of at least 3:1 or flatter unless vertical retaining walls are used.
- Except for very small facilities, provide access to the forebay (slope of 4:1 or less), to the outlet, and around the pond perimeter for cleaning.

About 10 to 25% of the surface area determined in the above procedure should be devoted to the forebay. The forebay can be distinguished from the remainder of the pond by one of several means: a lateral sill with rooted wetland vegetation, two ponds in series, differential pool depth, rock-filled gabions or retaining wall, or a horizontal rock filter placed laterally across the pond. If there are small watersheds of five acres or less draining directly into the wet pond, consider grass biofilters (TC4) or incorporate small fore bays at each inlet.

- Use energy dissipation at the inlet to avoid erosion, to promote settling in the forebay and to minimize short-circuiting.
- Use a length to width ratio of at least 3:1 to minimize short-circuiting.

Short circuiting must be minimized. This can be accomplished by using a generally rectangular configuration with a length to width ratio of at least 3:1 and by placing the inlet and outlet at opposite ends. The inlet and outlet can be placed at the same end if baffling is installed to direct the water to the opposite end before returning to the outlet. If topography or aesthetics requires the pond to have an irregular shape, the pond area and volume should be increased to compensate for the dead spaces.

Inlet design may affect a facility's hydraulic efficiency. The traditional approach of deadheading the inlet pipe directly into the pond is not satisfactory. Experience with wastewater treatment indicates that it is best to have multiple inlets spaced equal to the depth of the pond, with a perforated baffle located in front of the inlets at a distance from one to two times the pond depth (Kleinschmidt, 1961). However, this concept is not practical with storm water treatment systems. A possible compromise that should significantly reduce short-circuiting in which the flow is split by a T or Y (Kleinschmidt, 1961) with the horizontal rock filter serving as perforated baffle. A lateral bench with wetland vegetation as shown in Figure 2A should also work. The area between the inlet and the filter becomes the forebay. Placing large rocks at each inlet will dissipate the energy and spread the water more effectively across the forebay.

TC2



## Additional Information — Wet Ponds

- Minimize water loss by infiltration through the pond bottom.

To maintain the wet pool to the maximum extent possible excessive losses by infiltration through the bottom must be avoided. Depending on the soils, this can be accomplished by compaction, incorporating clay into the soil, or an artificial liner.

- Freeboard of 1 foot.
- With earthen walls, place an antiseep collar around the outlet pipe.
- The outlet should incorporate an antivortex device if the facility is large (A 100 year storm must safely pass through or around the device).

The settleable solids concentration of storm water is relatively low, obviating the need for adding depth to the facility for sediment storage. However, if a significant portion of the tributary area is prone to erosion, it may be appropriate to increase the size and/or depth of the fore bay for sediment storage.

The sides of an earthen wall should be vegetated to avoid erosion. Drought tolerant groundcover species should be used if irrigation can not occur during the summer. See TC4, Biofilters regarding recommended plant species.

### Maintenance

Check at least annually and after each extreme storm event. The facility should be cleaned of accumulated debris. The banks of surface ponds should be checked and areas of erosion repaired. Remove nuisance wetland species and take appropriate measures to control mosquitoes. Solids should be removed when 10 to 15% of the storage capacity has been lost.

Limited studies (Dewberry and Davis, 1990; Meiorin, 1991; Florida, 1991; Livingstone, pers. comm.) of the bottom sediments indicate that toxicity limits specified by final disposal regulations are not exceeded. Concentrations observed by Dewberry and Davis (1990) were less than 1/1000 of toxicity limits. If this problem is occurring it suggests that source control BMPs need to be improved or spills/illegal dumpings are occurring on a wide spread scale. Frequent cleaning of the fore bay will help.

Metal uptake by plants and fish has been examined (Meiorin, 1991) at the experimental facility in Fremont, California. Accumulation of zinc was found in fish liver and manganese in plant tissue. No accumulation was found with copper, lead, chromium, or nickel. These results may not be representative inasmuch as 94% of the watershed was open space, agriculture or low density residential.

Rock filters placed at the outlets of oxidation ponds have a short life due to clogging by algae (Rich, 1988). However, it can be expected that algal growth will be significantly less in wet ponds given the lower concentration of phosphorus in storm water, and therefore clogging should not be a problem. If algal blooms are excessive consider alum treatment or the use of devices that retain non-rooted vegetation as discussed above.

### REFERENCES

Dewberry and Davis Inc, 1990, "Investigation of Potential Sediment Toxicity from BMP Ponds", Northern Virginia Planning District Commission.

Florida (State of), 1988, "The Florida Development Manual", Department of Environmental Regulation.

Florida (State of), 1991, "Maintenance Guidelines for Accumulated Sediments in Retention/Detention Ponds Receiving Highway Runoff", Department of Transportation.

TC2




## Additional Information — Wet Ponds

- Kleinschmidt, S.R., 1961, "Hydraulic Design of Detention Tanks", J. Boston Society of Civil Engrs., 48, 4, 247.
- Limnion Corporation, undated, "Nutrient Removal Using a Submersed Macrophyte System", and "Metals Removal Using a Submersed Macrophyte System".
- Maryland (State of), 1986, "Feasibility and Design of Wet Ponds to Achieve Water Quality Control", Water Resources Administration.
- Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), March, 1992, "A Current Assessment of Urban Best Management Practices: Techniques for Reducing Nonpoint Source Pollution in the Coastal Zone".
- Rast, W., R. Anne Jones, G. Fred Lee, 1983, "Predictive Capability of U.S. OECD Phosphorus Loading-Eutrophication Response Models", J. Water Pollution Control Federation, 55, 7, 990.
- Rich, L., 1988, "A Critical Look at Rock Filters", J. of Envir. Engr, Amer. Society of Civil Engrs, 114, 219.
- Shepp, D., D. Cole, and F. Galli, 1992, "A Field Survey of the Performance of Oil/Grit Separators", Metropolitan Council of Governments.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency, 1986, "Methodology for Analysis of Detention Basins for Control of Urban Runoff Quality".
- Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, Denver Colorado, "Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual - Volume 3 - Best Management Practices - Stormwater Quality", September 1992.
- Walker, W., 1987, "Phosphorus Removal by Urban Runoff Detention Basins", in Lake and Reservoir Management, North American Society for Lake Management, 314.
- Zirschky, J., and S. Reed, 1988, "The Use of Duckweed for Wastewater Treatment", J. Water Pollution Control Federation, 60, 1253.
- Woodward-Clyde Consultants, 1989, "Analysis of Storm Event Characteristics for Selected Rainfall Gauges Through the United States", prepared for USEPA.


TC2






Source: FHWA (1989)


FIGURE 2B. TSS REMOVAL VERSUS  $V_B / V_R$  RATIO






Source: Woodward-Clyde, 1989

FIGURE 2C. AVERAGE STORM EVENT DEPTH (INCHES)






Notes: 1. Alternate designs are acceptable as long as the hydraulics provides the required emptying times.  
 2. Use trash skimmer screens of stiff green steel material to protect perforated riser. Must extend from the top of the riser to 2 ft. below the permanent pool level.

OUTLET WORKS  
 NOT TO SCALE


Notes: 1. Minimum number of holes = 8  
 2. Minimum hole diameter = 1/8" Dia.




(Used By Permission, UDFCO, 1992)

Riser Diameter (in.)	Maximum Number of Perforated Columns			
	Hole Diameter, inches			
	1/4"	1/2"	3/4"	1"
4	8	8	—	—
6	12	12	8	—
8	16	16	12	8
10	20	20	14	10
12	24	24	18	12
Hole Diameter (in.)	Area (in. 2)			
1/8	0.013			
1/4	0.049			
3/8	0.110			
1/2	0.196			
5/8	0.307			
3/4	0.442			
7/8	0.601			
1	0.785			

FIGURE 2D. WATER QUALITY OUTLET FOR A WET POND







Source: Douglas County Storm Drainage and Technical Criteria, 1986.

(Used By Permission, UDFCO, 1992)

**FIGURE 2E. WATER QUALITY OUTLET SIZING:  
WET POND WITH A 12-HOUR DRAIN  
TIME OF THE CAPTURE VOLUME**



**Appendix H**  
*Best Management Practices  
for Agriculture*



## APPENDIX H

### BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

#### Methodology

Agricultural lands have been studied in the Moro Cojo Slough Watershed. Consultations occurred with growers, landowners, government officials working in the area, and other consultants involved with the project. Direction was also received from the Elkhorn Slough Research Advisory Committee.

Management measures for agricultural sources of nonpoint source pollution, developed as part of Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 (CZARA) were also reviewed (EPA, 1993). For more information on these measures, please refer to Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs: Program and Development and Approval Guidance. U.S. EPA Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds and NOAA Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management. EPA-840-B-92-002, January 1993.

#### Goals and Objectives

The intent of these Best Management Practices is to limit the impact of current agricultural crops on the wetlands of the slough system. Agriculture is the major financial contributor in this area. These suggestions are felt to be economically feasible for the farmers while maintaining wildlife in the slough as best possible.

#### Artichokes

**Leases.** All artichokes in the Moro Cojo Slough area are grown by Sea Mist Farms, but all the land is actually rented. The landowners and lessees appear to have good working arrangements, with both parties being informed as to good management practices and trends in the industry. All leases are for long periods of time (i.e., 3-7 years), with renewals being common in

the past 15 years. No changes are recommended.

**Cultivation and Irrigation.** The operators of Sea Mist Farms do an excellent job of protecting their soil because they plan to use it for production for many years in the future. Planting occurs along soil contours to achieve optimum drainage during irrigation and heavy rainy seasons without losing plants or topsoil. Ground is not over-cultivated or cultivated wet to create unwanted hardpans of soil. Irrigations are done to soil capacity, and not usually allowing large runoff amounts. When new fields are planted, irrigations may be heavier to drive down salt content and protect newly forming roots. This area has heavy amounts of salt in irrigation wells; this is a situation being addressed by the Monterey County Water Board. Sea Mist Farms is trying to improve irrigation techniques by experimenting with drip irrigation systems which would mean even less of a chance for water runoff.

Questions have been raised as to proper width of the drainage ditch surrounding the field directly behind the City of Castroville. Due to tractor work, the drainage ditch may have become narrower from the constant movement of soil. The width of this ditch is also affected by the current housing developments found on the other side which have deposited soil and concrete immediate adjacent to, and within the slough. At the beginning of this project the ditch was roughly 2' at the bottom and 15' at the top. Recent development and other residential situations have resulted in a narrowing of the ditch. The size for this ditch needs to be evaluated as to its ability to handle the runoff occurring from both the agricultural and residential land uses. A preliminary recommended size would be 3' across the bottom and 15' across the top. This would be more than sufficient for the fields to be drained, even from heavy rains. Sea Mist

Farms has maintained the weed control and should continue to do so.

**Soil Fertility and Pest Control.** All artichoke fields are surrounded by an 18' drive road which acts as an excellent buffer to prevent chemicals necessary for production from entering the slough system. This 18' drive road gives sufficient room for a tractor to turn around, a couple of feet for misplaced fertilizer, room to compensate for drift from pesticide spraying, and space for overspray from irrigation. This buffer area also allows the workers to move around without having to walk on wetlands areas hurting protected species of plant life.

None of the pesticides used by artichoke growers are known to be chemicals that leach down to groundwater causing contamination. Also the fertilizers are not used in excessive amounts (less the 100 lbs./acre of actual Nitrogen) to cause problems to water tables with Nitrate poisoning.

### **Strawberries**

**Leases.** Over 2000 acres of strawberries surround the slough, with many different growers and landowners. The average farm ranges in size from 10-50 acres. Leases are renewed on a yearly basis, usually in November due to growing patterns. Communication was absent between landowners and lessees. Growers sometimes are actually just a sublessor, not even knowing who actually owns the property. This problem becomes complicated when discussing who is "in the wrong" when cultivation occurs into waterways.

Due to leases being renewed on a yearly basis, and with the turnover of growers being high, the suggestion is made to hold the landlord responsible for good soil conservation techniques to occur. The landlord can insure that the grower follows good cultivation practices by including a soil erosion clause in the lease agreements, or the landlord can do some of the work himself. It is also necessary for the landlords to explain to the tenants about the waterways and that cultivation can not occur in them. In conjunction

with establishment of conservation easements along the slough, the 10' contour needs to be mapped and maps given to all landlords and lessees. Field demarcation would be helpful. Enforcement from the County needs to occur.

**Cultivation and Irrigation.** Many strawberry growers, especially those off of Dolan Rd. and Castroville Blvd., farm into the waterways of the slough. This was able to occur over the last 7 years of drought, since water was absent in some arms of the slough. After 1992's heavy rainfall, planted strawberry rows were actually under water when the season was ready to begin. In December, proper ditching needs to occur, directing winter rains safely into the slough without taking large amounts of topsoil. All winter ditches should be lined in plastic and follow other guidelines from the Soil Conservation Service.

The reason tenants have not taken the time to do these soil conservation measures before is because they may only use that field for one or two years and are therefore unwilling to take the time, or spend the money, if they will not see any benefit. Because of this reasoning, the recommendation is to make the landlord responsible and establish conservation easements.

Besides the loss of topsoil from this runoff, contamination may be occurring from fertilizers being carried with the soil.

As has been done in the artichoke fields, buffer zones should exist between the slough habitat and cultivated fields. Eighteen-foot drive roads are suggested to allow room for over-spray from pesticides, fertilizers, and worker's activities in the fields. Strawberry fields have lots of workers and it is not meant for these drive roads to be used for parking lots or lunch areas. Other areas on the property need to be maintained for these purposes.

All strawberry fields are on drip irrigation which keeps irrigation runoff to a minimum.

**Soil Fertility and Pest Control.** Fertilization is done mostly through drip tape and, due to

proper placement, leaching is also very low. The pesticides used in the strawberries do not have heavy leaching potential. Strawberry fields are sprayed on a weekly basis, however, and care needs to be taken, by the insertion of the drive roads, to protect the slough from overspray of pesticides during application.

**Sanitation.** Strawberry farming is very labor-intensive; many people are working in the field at least 6 months of the year. An average count is 5 people working per acre. These people will drive in cars, eat meals, use outdoor bathrooms, and may bring children to the fields. It should be the growers' responsibility to make sure litter is not spread in the slough, that bathrooms are kept reasonably clean and serviced, and cars are not parked in the slough. The suggestion is made to landlords to insert a clause in the leases stating that State of California sanitation and workman's safety codes be adhered.

### **Vegetables**

**Leases.** Approximately 25% of the vegetable land is farmed by landowners. The remainder is leased, with good communication between growers and landowners.

**Cultivation and Irrigation.** No major problems were noted in these areas. These growers do an excellent job of maintaining good soil in the hopes of future use. Cover cropping every 2-3 years was done in all fields to keep up organic matter content and help improve nitrogen levels. No cultivation was noted immediately adjacent to the slough. All fields off of Highway 1 had well over 20' between fields and ditches leading to the slough.

Irrigation is mainly done by sprinklers. Sprinklers were well set and no over-usage of water was noted. Field runoff, known as tail water, was not excessive.

**Soil Fertility and Pest Control.** The use of nitrogen fertilizers is high in any vegetable operation. All of the growers were very honest about their use of fertilizers and no amounts were found to be above the normal amounts

recommended by University of California research. No pesticides used by these vegetable growers had a high potential for leaching.

**Transplant Nursery.** Greenhouses for production of vegetable transplants are located off of Highway 1 at Washington St. Directly behind these houses is a drainage ditch feeding directly into the slough system. Irrigation water will run directly through a small amount of soil into a PVC pipe and discharged into the ditch. Since most fertilizers and pesticides are put in this irrigation water, direct contamination can occur. The important point to realize is only a small amount of soil is used which means a greater chance for chemicals to leach out. The suggestion is made to divert this water first to a retention pond. This retention pond should be lined with plastic to prevent leaching. Most agricultural chemicals will break down in direct sunlight, usually in a couple of weeks depending on the chemistry. After sufficient time, the irrigation water can then be discharged into the slough.

### **Cut Flowers**

**Cultivation.** The cut flower farms are located on the upper end of the slough system at the higher elevations. In past years, preparation ditching wasn't done for the rainy season. Large amounts of rain caused topsoil and uncontrolled water to drain off onto lower strawberry fields. In December of every year, drainage ditches need to be dug so water can be directed safely away without harming crops.

### **Cattle**

**Feedlots and Dairy.** Cattle operations surround the slough habitat. None of these cattle operations had large amounts of cattle in one area at one time. Usually, on the average, less than two animals per acre were noted to be grazing. The feedlot operation moves cattle throughout the watershed area during winter months. Currently cattle are allowed to graze into the slough system. Fencing needs to separate all the private land and the wetlands so the sensitive habitat is not ruined. The suggestion of the fencing

is placement at least 3' back from the grazing boundary since animals will put their heads through it when grazing.

Other livestock operations are found on the slough but under rural density zoning. Many times these animals (i.e., horses and sheep) are allowed to roam freely into the slough. These landowners should be held to the same guidelines as agricultural landowners and prohibited from allowing grazing in waterways.

#### **Public Access**

Farming involves large machinery and chemical use. Walkways that might hinder production would be discouraged. Also thefts of produce would occur if people were close to artichoke or strawberry fields. The public access, as proposed in the plan, is consistent with these concerns.

#### **Monitoring and Research**

Encouragement to implement these BMPs needs to occur from applicable State, County and Federal agencies. Once conservation easements are established, it would be the County's responsibility to make sure the slough is managed properly.

Research in agriculture is always on-going through the University of California system, Marketing Boards, and private researchers. Many of the growers in this area are involved. New chemicals are always being tested and introduced. Some of the Hispanic growers, due to cultural, language, or money considerations, may be the last in the agricultural industries to take advantage of new techniques. The intent of this report is to provide information and incentives to growers on the value of good agricultural practices. This will provide benefits to themselves as well as protecting the wetlands.

When funds become available, the main source of research should be in soil retention. Soil erosion is a major problem in every crop on the slough and has the greatest potential to harm any water habitat.

#### **Conclusions**

Agriculture is the largest revenue-generating activity in this region. Agriculture can co-exist with the natural resources of the Moro Cojo Slough so long as there is understanding on both sides. The most important aspect will need to be community involvement so all possible sides are taken into consideration. Most farmers on this project were comfortable discussing growing practices but resistance was found from the actual landowners. Community meetings are suggested with county officials, growers, landowners, agricultural workers and rural homeowners, in a comfortable environment. Above all, landowners must realize this plan is only to help maintain the slough area for the future.

**Appendix I**  
*Best Management Practices  
for Control of  
Selected Invasive Non-native Plant Species*



# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## BRISTLY OX-TONGUE (*Picris echioides*)

Aliases: Bugloss, Bugloss-Picris

Escaped from: Mediterranean region and Southwestern Asia

Identifying Characteristics: Member of the Sunflower Family (*Asteraceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Annual, biennial, or short-lived perennial. Mature plant is coarsely branched and 2-3' tall. Stems are angled and covered with barbed hairs that make the plant painful to the touch.


**Leaves:** Basal and lower leaves are 2-6" long, and  $\pm 1$ " wide, oblong in shape with shallowly scalloped margins. Upper leaves are smaller and clasp the stem. All leaves are rough to the touch due to barbed bristles that arise from blister-like swellings.

**Flowers:** Yellow dandelion-like flowers,  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$ " across. Flowers are borne in clusters, or singly, above 4-5 modified leaves (bracts).

**Blooming period:** April thru December

**Life History:** Reproduction is by one-seeded fruits (achenes). The achenes bear feathery bristles that facilitate wind dispersal.

**Invasiveness:** Bristly ox-tongue is a common invasive weed of disturbed habitats such as ditches, fallow fields, and roadsides. It also infests cultivated croplands, orchards, and vineyards. Bristly ox-tongue can overwhelm groundcovers in revegetation sites.



**REWARD**

FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION

**Control Measures:** 1) Pull or uproot when soil is moist; or 2) Hoe 2" below ground level, before flowering; or 3) Repeated mowing.

**Disposal:** Remove flower parts from site.

**Contact:** *The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.*

**CALL (408) 335-6800**

*You may also wish to subscribe to CalEPPC News, the newsletter for the California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 448 Bello Street, Pismo Beach, California 93449.*

\* Reward for development of an innovative means of easily eradicating this noxious weed. Reward is 1 year membership in either SERCAL, EPPC, CNPS, TNC, or an equal membership in another environmental organization.

# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## POISON HEMLOCK (*Conium maculatum*)

**Aliases:** Poison Parsley, Deadly Hemlock, Snakeweed

**Escaped from:** Eurasia and North Africa

**Identifying Characteristics:** Member of the Carrot Family (*Apiaceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Tall biennial with long white taproot. Stems are erect and branching. Stems are hollow and marked with purple dots. Mature plants are 3-10' tall.

**Leaves:** Leaves are arranged alternately along the stem and are pinnately compound with finely cut leaflets. The lower leaves have short stalks that are flattened at the base and partially envelop the stem.

**Flowers:** Numerous, small white flowers borne in large umbrella-shaped clusters.

**Blooming period:** April thru August

**Life History:** Poison hemlock reproduces by seed and is water dispersed.

**Invasiveness:** Poison hemlock is a very invasive weed, especially in disturbed areas such as pastures, creeks, roadsides, meadows and waste places. Poison hemlock makes revegetation site maintenance difficult due to its rapid growth and size. Dense stands can shade out smaller native plants.

**Warning:** All plant parts contain poisonous alkaloids. Usually avoided by livestock. Wear gloves when handling.



**REWARD**

FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION

**Control Measures:** 1) Pull or uproot when soil is moist; or 2) Hoe 2" below ground level, before flowering; or 3) Repeated mowing.

**Disposal:** Remove from site if mature or nearly mature seed is present.

**Contact:** The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.

**CALL (408) 335-6800**

You may also wish to subscribe to CalEPPC News, the newsletter for the California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 448 Bello Street, Pismo Beach, California 93449.

\* Reward for development of an innovative means of easily eradicating this noxious weed. Reward is 1 year membership in either SERCAL, EPPC, CNPS, TNC, or an equal membership in another environmental organization.

# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## TREE TOBACCO (*Nicotiana glauca*)

**Aliases:** Mexican Tobacco

**Escaped from:** South America (Paraguay, Argentina and Bolivia)

**Identifying Characteristics:** Member of the nightshade family (*Solanaceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Woody evergreen perennial shrub or small, slender, tree-like plant. Mature plant grows up to 26' with slender, loosely branching stems.

**Leaves:** Egg-shaped leaves are bluish-green in color, range from 2-6" in length, and have smooth or wavy margins. Leaves are hairless and covered with a whitish powder.

**Flowers:** Yellow flowers are tubular and appear in dangling clusters on the ends of long leafless stalks at the ends of the branches. The individual flowers are about 1 1/2" long.

**Blooming period:** Spring and summer

**Life History:** Tree tobacco reproduces by tiny seeds that develop inside a small oval pod. Seeds are dispersed by wind and water.

**Invasiveness:** Tree tobacco is moderately invasive, and widespread along streams, roadsides, cultivated areas, and in waste places. Dense stands can out-compete native vegetation.

**Warning:** Tree tobacco is poisonous to humans and animals.



**REWARD** FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION

**Control Measures:** 1) Pull or uproot when young, or use Weed Wrench for larger plants; or 2) Hoe 2" below ground level; or 3) Cut at ground level.

**Disposal:** Remove seed pods from site.

**Contact:** *The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.*

## CALL (408) 335-6800

*You may also wish to subscribe to CalEPPC News, the newsletter for the California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 448 Bello Street, Pismo Beach, California 93449.*

\* Reward for development of an innovative means of easily eradicating this noxious weed. Reward is 1 year membership in either SERCAL, EPPC, CNPS, TNC, or an equal membership in another environmental organization.

# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## COCKLEBUR (*Xanthium strumarium*)

**Aliases:** Clotbur, Buttonbur, Ditchbur, Sea Burdock, Hedgehog Burweed, Sheep Bur

**Escaped from:** Europe

**Identifying Characteristics:** Member of the Sunflower Family (*Asteraceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Fast growing annual herb with widely branching, stout stems. Mature plant is upright or bushy, from 2-5' in height, with red spots on its stems.

**Leaves:** The first true leaves are opposite on the stem. Later leaves alternate on the stems. Leaves are dull green on the upper surface; paler green on the under surface. They are long stalked and triangular, with margins that are lobed and coarsely toothed.


**Flowers:** Male and female flowers are small and greenish. Male flowers in clusters at top of plant; female flowers are burs in leaf axils along the stem. Burs are football-shaped and covered with hooked stiff spines.

**Blooming period:** June thru October

**Life History:** Reproduces by seeds in the spiny bur fruits. Spines are easily caught in fur and feathers of passing animals, which in turn disperse the seeds.

**Invasiveness:** Very invasive; infests pastures, irrigation ditches, and cultivated areas, especially where water has stood or accumulated in winter or early spring. Shades out smaller native plants.

**Warning:** Plants and seeds contain the poison xanthostrumarin.



**REWARD**

**FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION**

**Control Measures:** 1) Pull or uproot when plants are young and soil is moist; or 2) Hoe 2" below ground level, before seed set; or 3) Repeated mowing.

**Disposal:** Bag and remove plant parts that have formed burs.

**Contact:** *The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.*

**CALL (408) 335-6800**

*You may also wish to subscribe to CalEPPC News, the newsletter for the California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 448 Bello Street, Pismo Beach, California 93449.*

\* Reward for development of an innovative means of easily eradicating this noxious weed. Reward is 1 year membership in either SERCAL, EPPC, CNPS, TNC, or an equal membership in another environmental organization.

# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## PERIWINKLE (*Vinca major*)

**Aliases:** Myrtle, Vinca

**Escaped from:** Mediterranean region, Europe

**Identifying Characteristics:** Member of Dogbane Family (*Apocynaceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Non-native, perennial herb with erect flowering stems and trailing non-flowering stems. Stems have a milky latex. Plants can form extensive, low-growing patches.


**Leaves:** Dark green and oval, 1-2" long. Leaves arranged alternately along the stem.

**Flowers:** Periwinkle blue flowers are solitary in the leaf axils. The corolla is divided into 5 lobes about 1/4" long.

**Blooming period:** March thru July

**Life History:** Periwinkle spreads vegetatively by arching stolons that root at the tips. Frequently found as a garden escapee in moist or wooded areas. Not known to reproduce from seed as seeds rarely mature.

**Invasiveness:** Periwinkle is very invasive forming dense patches to the exclusion of other vegetation. Although susceptible to dry weather and frost, it quickly resprouts, especially in moist, shady areas. Its rapid spread can out-compete native flora, disrupting natural plant communities such as riparian areas.



**REWARD**

**FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION**

**Control Measures:** 1) Mow, then spray cut surfaces immediately with 5% glyphosate. Do not disc or till. Reseed large areas with appropriate native plants. *or* 2) Spray entire plant with 5% glyphosate using extra surfactant.

**Disposal:** Leave in place.

**Contact:** *The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.*

## CALL (408) 335-6800

*You may also wish to subscribe to CalEPPC News, the newsletter for the California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 448 Bello Street, Pismo Beach, California 93449.*

\* Reward for development of an innovative means of easily eradicating this noxious weed. Reward is 1 year membership in either SERCAL, EPPC, CNPS, TNC, or an equal membership in another environmental organization.

# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## BULL THISTLE (*Cirsium vulgare*)

**Aliases:** Spear Thistle, Common Thistle, Plume Thistle

**Escaped from:** Europe and Asia

**Identifying Characteristics:** Member of the Sunflower Family (*Asteraceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Biennial herb 3-4' tall, with stout branching stems. During the first year, the plant can have a rosette-like appearance.

**Leaves:** Leaves arranged alternately along stem, and are lance-shaped. Leaves are coarsely toothed or deeply lobed almost to mid-rib. Teeth or lobes bear long needle-pointed tips. Lower leaves are from 6"-1' long, and 2½-4" wide. Upper leaves are not stalked, but attach at the base of the blade.

**Flowers:** Flower heads are 1½-2" high, in clusters of 4 or 5 at tips of flowering stalks. Flowers are deep purple to rose in color.

**Blooming period:** June thru October

**Life History:** Reproduction is by one-seeded fruits (achenes). The achenes bear feathery bristles that facilitate wind dispersal.

**Invasiveness:** Bull thistle is an aggressive weed that has become common in disturbed habitats and waste places. Bull thistle makes revegetation site maintenance difficult, due to its size, spines, and rapid spread. Troublesome weed in pastures; not good fodder for livestock.



**REWARD**

FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION

**Control Measures:** 1) Uproot or pull while plant is a rosette. or 2) Hoe 2" below ground level before the plant flowers. or 3) Repeated mowing.

**Disposal:** Remove flowering plants from site. Immature flowers ripen and set seed after plant is cut.

**Contact:** *The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.*

**CALL (408) 335-6800**

*You may also wish to subscribe to CalEPPC News, the newsletter for the California Exotic Plant Council, 448 Bello Street, Pismo Beach, California 93449.*

\* Reward for development of an innovative means of easily eradicating this noxious weed. Reward is 1 year membership in either SERCAL, EPPC, CNPS, TNC, or an equal membership in another environmental organization.

# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## GIANT REED (*Arundo donax*)

**Aliases:** False Bamboo, Arundo

**Escaped from:** Mediterranean region and Europe

**Identifying Characteristics:** Member of the Grass Family (*Poaceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Non-native perennial grass, forming running clumps up to 20-25' tall. Looks like bamboo. Fast grower.

**Leaves:** Numerous long blades arranged alternately along the stem.

**Flowers:** Small in dense upright plume-like cluster (panicle) that is 3-5' long.

**Blooming period:** March thru September

**Life History:** Not known to reproduce from seed in California. Spreads vegetatively by rhizomes that can be dispersed by water.

**Invasiveness:** Very invasive in both disturbed and natural areas especially along stream courses. Capable of taking over large areas. This exotic weed has the ability to outcompete and completely suppress native riparian vegetation. Known to restrict water flow and cause sedimentation of creeks.



**REWARD**

FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION

**Control Measures:** 1) Cut near ground level; apply 50% solution of glyphosate when plants are actively growing (summer). or 2) Small plants may be dug out of ground.

**Disposal:** Cut stems may be left on site or removed. Uprooted rhizomes must be removed or exposed to the sun.

**Contact:** *The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.*

**CALL (408) 335-6800**

*You may also wish to subscribe to CalEPPC News, the newsletter for the California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 448 Bello Street, Pismo Beach, California 93449.*

\* Reward for development of an innovative means of easily eradicating this noxious weed. Reward is 1 year membership in either SERCAL, EPPC, CNPS, TNC, or an equal membership in another environmental organization.

# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## PAMPAS GRASS (*Cortaderia jubata*)

**Aliases:** Jubata Grass, Andean Grass

**Escaped from:** Andes Mountains of northern Argentina, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia

**Identifying Characteristics:** Member of the Grass Family (*Poaceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Non-native, perennial grass, forming large tussocks up to 8' tall. Fast grower.


**Leaves:** Numerous long, dark green blades arise at the base of the plant and have a drooping habit. Leaves are 1-2 cm wide with razor-like margins. This contrasts with another commonly planted pampas grass, *C. selloana*, which has narrower, blue-green leaves.

**Flowers:** Small flowers are borne in pinkish or purplish plume-like clusters (panicles) and later turn creamy white. Flower stems rise up to 3 times higher than the clump of foliage. All of the plants are female and seeds are formed asexually. Flower color contrasts that of *C. selloana*, which is white and glistening at maturity.

**Blooming period:** March thru September

**Life History:** Reproduction is mainly by seed and optimal germination occurs with high soil moisture and temperatures around 10°C. Seedlings can germinate and become established in a variety of soil types. There are populations of pampas grass that consist entirely of female plants that can form seed without pollination (apomixis); therefore millions of seeds can be produced per plant. The seeds are primarily dispersed by the wind.

**Invasiveness:** Pampas grass is a very invasive non-native plant, capable of taking over both disturbed and natural areas, especially in the coastal fog belt where freezing temperatures do not occur. Huge seed loads contribute to the plant's invasiveness. Pampas grass is highly competitive with native plants and is a substantial threat to native habitats, especially coastal sand dunes and inland sand hills that contain a number of rare and threatened plant species.



**REWARD**

FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION

**Control Measures:** 1) Well-established plants should be removed first because they have the highest reproductive potential due to their prolific seed heads. If adequate manpower is available and the plants are not too large, pampas grass can be manually removed with a pick and shovel. It is important that all of the crown be removed so that crown sprouting is prevented. or 2) Established plants can be controlled chemically. The herbicide glyphosate has proved successful for large plants and seedlings.

**Disposal:** Regardless of the size of the plant removed, the plant remains should be cleared from the area, since pampas grass can send roots back into the ground and continue to grow.

**Contact:** The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.

CALL (408) 325 6800

# UNWANTED

\* ESCAPED INVASIVE WEED \*

## FRENCH BROOM (*Genista monspessulana*)

**Aliases:** Formerly known as *Cytisus monspessulanus*; often mistaken for its cousin, Scotch Broom

**Escaped from:** Canary Islands, Mediterranean, and the Azores

**Identifying Characteristics:** Member of the Pea Family (*Fabaceae*)

**Growth Habit:** Perennial shrub, 3-9' tall with villous branchlets. Some reach 15'.

**Leaves:** Three-parted (trifoliate) with petioles about ¼" long. Leaflets are obovate, entire, and ± ½" long; the undersides are covered with soft hairs.

**Flowers:** Light yellow flowers on short lateral branches, each flower stalk bearing 3-9 flowers. This contrasts with Scotch broom (*G. scoparius*), with single flowers borne in the axil (upper angle formed by a leaf or branch with the stem).

**Blooming period:** March thru May

**Life History:** Both French and Scotch broom reproduce primarily by seed, although vegetative reproduction and stump sprouting occur. Seeds are long-lived, and may remain viable for 80 years. The hard seed coats are distributed by birds and other animals, passing vehicles, and survive transport in river gravels. Seeds are borne in pods that often open explosively.

**Invasiveness:** Brooms are very aggressive, spread rapidly, and are becoming a common problem in pastures, forests, and disturbed areas such as roadsides and recently cleared land. The Calif. Dept. of Food and Agriculture has declared French and Scotch broom as Class C pest species. French broom is the most widespread and damaging of the weedy brooms; in some places it forms impenetrable thickets that displace native vegetation and lower the habitat value for wildlife. They render rangeland worthless, and increase the cost of maintenance of roads, ditches, and canals.

**Control Measures:** 1) Manual control methods: Remove plants before they set seed. Seedlings should be destroyed whenever they are found. A hand-tool, the Weed Wrench, was developed for controlling this species. Avoid disturbing soil, since bare soil fosters broom germination. Removal should be done during the rainy season, when soil is moist prior to seed set. or 2) Broadcast herbicide application is effective in dense thickets. Herbicides commonly used for broom are 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T; alone or with additives. Broom has been determined susceptible to picloram. Herbicides may be applied with spot chemical methods; stem injection; and cut stump treatment. or 3) Control with prescribed burning and/or prescribed grazing (goats and sheep) methods.

**Disposal:** Uprooted plants not supporting flowers or seed pods can be scattered thinly as a mulch. However, care should be taken to prevent vegetative reproduction from stems. All foliage with flowers and seeds should be removed from the site.

**Contact:** The Habitat Restoration Group, P.O. Box 4006, Felton, California 95018, for information on native plants which can be used to revegetate disturbed areas after eradicating this weed.



**REWARD**

FOR INFORMATION \*  
LEADING TO THIS  
WEED'S ERADICATION

CALL 1 800 225 6000

1000  
1000  
1000  
1000

## **Appendix J**

### *Guidelines for Development Activities Adjacent to Oak Trees*





# TREE NOTES

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

George Deukmejian  
Governor  
State of California

Richard A. Wilson  
Director

Gordon K. Van Vleck  
Secretary for Resources  
The Resources Agency



NUMBER: 7

JUNE 1990

## Keeping Native California Oaks Healthy

Bruce W. Hagen

Forest Pest Specialist, Forest Pest Management Program, P. O. Box 820, Santa Rosa, CA 95402-0820

Oak trees in the residential landscape are often seriously damaged or killed during the construction and/or landscaping phase of development. Decline and early death may also stem from inappropriate landscaping and irrigation practices. Damage often takes years to become evident, and by the time the tree shows signs of decline it is usually too late to help.

### *Oaks and Summer Water*

Once established, native oaks require little or no supplemental irrigation. In fact, they do best in non-irrigated soils. This is because oak roots, particularly those originating at the base of the trunk (root crown), are susceptible to root-disease fungi when exposed to prolonged moisture during the summer (Figure 1). These fungi are normally inactive in dry soil, but proliferate under the warm, moist conditions created when frequent summer water is applied. (Other species of trees are less susceptible to these fungi because they have evolved where summer soil moisture is high.) Oaks weakened by the loss of roots or root function are particularly susceptible to root pathogens and other pests. Frequent summer irrigation, particularly near the root crown, is likely to cause root decay which, over time, may destroy the roots, killing the tree or causing a hazardous situation. Therefore, irrigation for lawns, ground covers or other ornamental vegetation should be avoided or, at the very least, kept well away from the trunk. The common notion that younger oaks can adapt to frequent irrigation is incorrect. Young or newly planted oaks in irrigated situations often show signs of decline after 15 to 20 years.

### *Oak Roots*

The roots of mature oaks grow predominantly within the upper three feet of soil. Most of the roots responsible for the uptake of water and minerals are concentrated within 18 inches of the surface. Few roots grow deeper than three feet. Although the roots typically radiate well beyond the periphery of foliage (drip line), much of the active root system is within the drip line (Figure 1). Roots are sensitive to environmental change (soil compaction, grade change, increased moisture, paving). Oak roots like those of most trees, are associated with beneficial fungi that resist pathogens in the soil and aid

in the absorption of water and minerals. These fungi are easily killed by changes in soil conditions.

### *Common Problems That Occur During Construction and Landscaping*

Life-supporting roots are frequently severed during construction or damaged by other construction practices that change the existing soil environment. The frequent irrigation of lawns and ornamental vegetation commonly planted under oaks after construction, leads to decay and progressive root loss. The net effect is reduced water and mineral uptake. This typically causes die-back and decline over one to many years. Few people associate this decline with construction or landscaping because the symptoms often develop gradually. Most of these trees will die or fall prematurely unless prompt remedial action is taken.

### *Activities That Damage Roots and Disturb the Soil Environment*

**Grade change.** This involves either the addition or removal of soil within the drip line. Excavation can sever roots, while the addition of fill soil may suffocate them. Fill soils can also impede water infiltration and soil drainage, leading to drought conditions or waterlogging.

**Trenching.** Trenches dug for utility or irrigation lines within or across the drip line cut essential roots. This impairs the tree's ability to obtain water and essential elements, which may cause death, die-back, or gradual decline. It can also impede drainage and root development.

**Pavement.** Impermeable soil coverings such as asphalt or concrete restrict the amount of air, water, and minerals available to the roots. This impairs root growth and function, and can ultimately lead to their death.

**Soil compaction.** Frequent traffic, both human and livestock, and the operation and parking of heavy vehicles within the drip line, squeeze soil particles together, thus eliminating much of the natural air space. This reduces the infiltration and storage of water and air, inhibiting root growth and the uptake of water and minerals.

**Drainage changes.** Grade changes that cause water to collect around a tree, especially near the trunk, are harmful. Likewise, a grade change that diverts a source of water that the tree depends on may cause drought stress.

**Soil contamination.** Avoid storing and discarding harmful chemicals or materials such as, herbicides, petroleum products, building materials, or waste water near oaks.

**Herbicides.** It is best to avoid using systemic or soil

**Root Loss.** The degree to which oaks tolerate root loss depends on species, age, health, climate, soil depth, soil structure, and soil moisture. In general, the damage caused by a 15 to 30 percent loss of roots is negligible to moderate, respectively. A root loss in excess of 50% is considered to be harmful. A single three foot deep trench at the drip line along one side of a tree will remove approximately 15 percent of the roots. A similar trench made midway between the drip-line and the trunk will sever approximately 30 percent of the roots. Trenches made within 10' of large oaks are usually very damaging.




FIGURE 1.

active herbicides under landscape trees. If herbicides are to be used within the root zone follow label recommendations.

## Preventing Problems

Avoid injuring the roots or altering the soil where they grow, particularly within the drip line. Keep this area undisturbed and free of water-demanding ornamental vegetation such as lawns, ground covers, and shrubs like rhododendrons, azaleas, and camellias. Do not remove the leaf mulch unless there is a fire hazard. This organic material conserves water, provides nutrients as it decays, improves soil structure, decreases soil pH, and reduces soil temperature extremes. If turf is present beneath oaks, discontinue watering within the drip zone. If this is impractical, plug, alter or redirect sprinklers to prevent water from hitting the trunk or wetting the soil within 10 feet of the tree's trunk. Although not necessary, you may wish to remove the dying turf. In either case, cover the exposed soil surface or turf with 2 to 4 inches of organic mulch.

**Appropriate Landscaping.** If ornamental vegetation must be planted under old, established oaks, minimize its use. Keep the area within the drip zone relatively open. Use plants as accents rather than as ground covers. Extensive landscaping will disturb much of the root system and compete for available water and minerals. Select plants that tolerate shade and drought, and plant no closer than 10 feet to the trunk (Figure 1). Avoid all planting under declining oaks. Trees that have sustained construction damage will require several years to recover before landscaping.

**Watering.** As a general rule, native oaks should not be irrigated. One exception, however, is during drought years. If the winter is unusually dry, supplemental watering in the spring can complement natural rainfall. Water the soil from halfway between the trunk and the drip line to 10-15 feet beyond, allowing water to penetrate the soil to a depth of 18 to 24 inches. It may be necessary to water for 4 to 6 hours to get water to this depth. Keep water at least 10' away from the trunk. The length of time will vary based on the rate of water flow, method of irrigation (soaker hose, sprinkler, etc.), area covered, rate of water penetration, and topography. You

may have to experiment a little to get good water penetration. To check the depth of penetration, dig a small hole in the irrigated area several hours after watering. If the soil is moist at the desired level, the watering time is adequate. Insufficient watering is marked by dry soil, while excessive watering is indicated by standing water. Additional watering can be applied 1-2 times during especially dry summers. Another exception for the occasional watering of oaks is where extensive use of pavement causes natural precipitation to run off rather than penetrate the soil around the trees, causing drought stress. One further reason to irrigate native oaks, is to reduce water stress following moderate to severe root loss.

Plant drought tolerant landscape plants in the fall and winter to ensure their survival. If rain is lacking, water these plants twice a week for several weeks. Use a drip system or slow running hose to wet the root ball and 4-6 inches of surrounding soil. Thereafter, water twice a month until the rain starts. The following season, water 2-3 times during the summer. Wetting the soil to a depth and radius of 12 inches around the plant. By the third season, most of the plants should be well established, requiring no further watering. If turf is to be maintained under an oak, apply the least amount of water which will keep it reasonably green.

**Mulching.** Keep the soil surface beneath oaks mulched with 2-4 inches of natural leaf litter, wood chips, or gravel. Be careful not to place the mulch directly against the trunk. Organic mulch will improve soil structure and provide minerals upon decay. Avoid the use of impervious plastic tarping which reduces the availability of air and water to the roots.

**Fertilizing.** Healthy, mature oaks growing under natural conditions do not normally require added fertilizer. However, oaks in landscaped areas where the leaf litter is regularly removed, will benefit from nitrogen fertilization. Young oaks can be fertilized to encourage rapid growth. The ideal time to fertilize is in the spring. Fertilizer is best applied by broadcasting over the tree's root zone. If rain is lacking, lightly water the minerals into the soil, avoiding the area within 10' of the trunk. Use fertilizers high in nitrogen (N) such as calcium nitrate, ammonia sulfate, ammonia nitrate or urea. Complete fertilizers containing nitrogen (N), phosphorous (P) and potassium (K) are more expensive and generally unwarranted.

**Pruning.** NEVER TOP OAKS. DO NOT LEAVE STUBS. DO NOT MAKE FLUSH CUTS. PROTECT THE BRANCH COLLAR. Try to retain natural shape. Avoid excessive pruning, remove no more than 10-20% of the foliage in any one year. Except for the removal of weak, hazardous, diseased, damaged or dead branches, mature oaks normally require little pruning. Some trees can benefit from light thinning to open the foliage canopy to more sunlight or to lighten heavy branches. Avoid pruning in the spring and early fall. Pruning large trees is dangerous and difficult; it is best left to professionals. Consult an arborist, preferably someone

certified by the Western Chapter of the International Society of Arboriculture.

## Correcting Soil Problems

**Fills** - The flared bases (root crowns) and trunks of trees buried during construction should be exposed by careful excavation down to the original soil grade and out to several feet. Moist soil in contact with the bark of the trunk usually leads to decay. Slope the soil away from the tree so that water does not collect near the trunk and try to provide some drainage. A retaining wall may be needed to keep soil away from the root crown and trunk. You can tell that the soil level around your oak has been raised if the trunk does not flare out as it enters the soil.

**Compaction** - Soil compaction displaces much of the natural air space in the soil, reducing the amount of air (oxygen) available to the roots. Oxygen is critical for the uptake of the water and minerals necessary for tree growth and survival. Oaks growing in compacted soil may benefit from increasing the availability of oxygen to the roots. The best way to do this is to eliminate or curtail activities around the tree which cause compaction, followed by the addition of several inches of organic mulch to the drip zone. This will gradually improve soil structure and aeration, while helping to prevent further compaction. Avoid placing mulch directly against the trunk.

Several methods may be used to temporarily improve soil aeration. One method involves drilling holes 1-3 inches wide, 12 inches deep, and 1-3 feet apart around the tree out to the drip line. Holes may be filled with coarse sand or pea gravel or left open. It may be necessary to repeat every two to three years. Another method involves the injection of air under pressure into holes to fracture and lift the hardened soil, allowing air penetration. Holes can also be made by injecting water under high pressure via a hollow tube into the soil. The water jet loosens and expels soil particles as it is inserted into the ground.

**Pavement** - Where practical, remove asphalt and concrete pavement within the drip line and replace with permeable materials like organic mulch, gravel, brick, or stone set in sand.

## Inspecting Your Tree for Health and Hazard Potential

### Signs of Advanced Decline or Decay

- » Thin, sparse foliage
- » Poor growth
- » Yellow, undersized leaves
- » Dead branches and limbs in the upper canopy
- » Wilted, brown leaves during spring and summer
- » Many short shoots growing on trunk and branches
- » Mushrooms at tree base or on the roots in the fall or early winter
- » Conks - shelf-like mushrooms on trunk

- » Cavities in trunk
- » White, fan shaped mats of fungus under the bark at the soil line.
- » Soft, punky wood
- » Wet, oozing areas on the bark

Proper health and hazard inspection is difficult to do. It requires training, experience, and sometimes elaborate procedures to be reliable. A thorough tree inspection may involve exposing the large, supporting roots originating at the base of the trunk (root crown). This requires the careful removal of soil from a distance of 2 - 3 feet around the root crown to a depth of 12-18 inches or to the original grade if fill soil has been placed around the tree. Soil excavation and root-crown inspection are best done by a consulting arborist.

Oaks with extensively decayed roots should be removed for safety; those in the early stages of decay can be treated. Carefully expose infected roots and remove diseased portions. Cut the bark back until healthy wood is found. Dispose of all diseased roots and bark. Allow the exposed roots to dry for several months. You may wish to construct a retaining wall around the perimeter of the excavation to keep the soil away from the exposed roots. Try to provide drainage to keep rainwater from collecting in the well. The soil can be replaced before winter. Otherwise, the roots can be left exposed. Although this is not a cure, it will slow the progress of the disease-producing organisms, prolonging the life of the tree. For this treatment to be helpful, all further watering near the trunk must be stopped.

---

## Successful Development Around Oaks

Successful development around oaks depends on careful planning and construction. For this to happen, everyone involved in the development process must recognize that tree health suffers when roots are destroyed or soil conditions are altered.

When oaks die, property values drop and removal costs are incurred. Prudent development can ensure a more attractive and more valuable setting.

---

## Further Reading

- Bornstein, Carol. *Landscaping Under Established Native Oaks - Do and Don'ts*, Santa Barbara Botanic Gardens. Information Bulletin #5. (808) 682-4726.
- Caprile, Janet L. *Guidelines for Landscaping Around Old Oaks*. University of California Cooperative Extension, Contra Costa County. (415) 646-5250.
- Caprile, Janet L. *Guidelines for Development Around Old Oaks*. University of California Cooperative Extension, Contra Costa County. (415) 646-5250.
- Coate, Barrie D. 1983. *Planting Under Old Oaks*, Fremontia 11 (3):26 - 28, October.

Gross, Robert, and Robert H. Schmidt. 1989. *Irrigating Native California Oaks*. University of California Cooperative Extension, Oak Information Project Publication Number 1. U. C. Hopland Field Station, Hopland, California. (707) 744-1431.

Johnson, Sharon G. 1989. *Living Among the Oaks - A Management Guide for Landowners*. University of California Cooperative Extension. (415) 642-2360. Available from University of California Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program, 145 Mulford Hall, U. C. Berkely, CA 94720.

Hagen, Bruce W. 1989. *Tree Roots - Major Considerations for the Developer*. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Tree Notes, Number: 2, (707) 576-2360.

Hardesty, Nancy. 1983. *Oak Woodland Preservation and Land Planning*, 855 Oak Grove Avenue, Suite 205, Menlo Park, California, 94025, (415) 326-4268.

Harris, Richard W. 1983, *Arboriculture - Care of Trees, Shrubs, and Vines in the Landscaping*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Perry, Bob. 1981. *Trees and Shrubs for Dry California Landscapes*. Landscape Design Publication, Pomona, California.

Sanborn, Sherburn. 1989. *Protecting Trees From Construction Impacts*. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Tree Notes, Number: 1, (707) 576-2360.

.....1983. *Success List of Watering Conserving Plants*. Saratoga Horticultural Foundation, 15185 Murphy Avenue, San Martin, California, 95406. (408) 779-2022.

.....1986. *Water Conserving Plants and Landscapes for the Bay Area*. East Bay Municipal Utility District, P. O. Box 937, Alamo, California, 94507. (415) 820-2436.

.....*Care of Native Oaks*. 1989. California Oak Foundation. 909 12th Street, Suite 125, Sacramento, California, 95814.

## Other Resources:

Western Chapter International Society America, Certification Committee, P. O. Box 424, St. Helena, CA 94574. (707) 963-7578, for lists of Certified Arborists.

University of California Cooperative Extension, Natural Resources Program, 163 Mulford Hall, Berkeley, California, 94720. (415) 642-2360.

Sherby Sanborn: Editor, Layout and Design  
CDF Forest Pest Management (707) 576-2360  
Revised, 3/4/91

PG&E Advice 3156-E

Attachment 5



September 17, 2007

Wendy Sarsfield  
Pacific Gas & Electric Company  
356 E. Alisal St.  
Salinas, Ca 93901

Dear Wendy:

I wanted to follow-up on our conversation today regarding ESF's request for an easement over PG&E land in Moro Cojo Slough. The total acreage involved is .6 to .8 acre.

We have been working with several community organizations and agencies to bring water to the Moro Cojo Slough restoration project on the Sea Mist property owned by the Elkhorn Slough Foundation. This project is part of the larger Moro Cojo Slough Restoration and Management Plan, adopted by Monterey County as part of their Local Coastal Plan.

As we discussed, we are asking for an expedited review of our request. The reason is that we are facing a funding deadline, imposed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and if we fail to make progress on bringing the pipeline with Castroville Slough water to the restoration site, we will lose a substantial portion of the \$1.2 million grant.

I truly appreciate all the help you have given us in moving this work forward. I thank you in advance for any assistance you and your colleagues can provide in expediting our request for an easement.

Sincerely,

Mark Silberstein  
Executive Director

**Board of Directors**

**President**

Richard Nutter  
Aptos

**Vice President**

Jim Van Houten  
La Selva Beach

**Treasurer**

Richard Hammond  
Carmel

**Secretary**

Steve Webster  
Carmel Valley

Diane Cooley  
Watsonville

Steve Dennis  
Carmel

Terry Eckhardt  
Soquel

Bill Eggleston  
Carmel

Steve Green  
Royal Oaks

Candace Ingram  
Pacific Grove

Anne F. Olsen  
Salinas

Jerry Patrick  
Aptos

Lydia Villarreal  
Salinas

John Warriner  
Watsonville

**Executive Director**  
Mark Silberstein

**Office Address**  
1700 Elkhorn Road  
Watsonville,  
California 95076

**Mailing Address**  
P.O. Box 267  
Moss Landing,  
California 95039

Tel: (831) 728-5939  
Fax: (831) 728-7031

[www.elkhornslough.org](http://www.elkhornslough.org)

**PG&E Gas and Electric  
Advice Filing List  
General Order 96-B, Section IV**

ABAG Power Pool	Douglass & Liddell	PG&E National Energy Group
Accent Energy	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer	Pinnacle CNG Company
Aglet Consumer Alliance	Duke Energy	PITCO
Agnews Developmental Center	Duke Energy North America	Plurimi, Inc.
Ahmed, Ali	Duncan, Virgil E.	PPL EnergyPlus, LLC
Alcantar & Kahl	Dutcher, John	Praxair, Inc.
Ancillary Services Coalition	Dynergy Inc.	Price, Roy
Anderson Donovan & Poole P.C.	Ellison Schneider	Product Development Dept
Applied Power Technologies	Energy Law Group LLP	R. M. Hairston & Company
APS Energy Services Co Inc	Energy Management Services, LLC	R. W. Beck & Associates
Arter & Hadden LLP	Exelon Energy Ohio, Inc	Recon Research
Avista Corp	Exeter Associates	Regional Cogeneration Service
Barkovich & Yap, Inc.	Foster Farms	RMC Lonestar
BART	Foster, Wheeler, Martinez	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
Bartle Wells Associates	Franciscan Mobilehome	SCD Energy Solutions
Blue Ridge Gas	Future Resources Associates, Inc	Seattle City Light
Bohannon Development Co	G. A. Krause & Assoc	Sempra
BP Energy Company	Gas Transmission Northwest Corporation	Sempra Energy
Braun & Associates	GLJ Energy Publications	Sequoia Union HS Dist
C & H Sugar Co.	Goodin, MacBride, Squeri, Schlotz &	SESCO
CA Bldg Industry Association	Hanna & Morton	Sierra Pacific Power Company
CA Cotton Ginners & Growers Assoc.	Heeg, Peggy A.	Silicon Valley Power
CA League of Food Processors	Hitachi Global Storage Technologies	Smurfit Stone Container Corp
CA Water Service Group	Hogan Manufacturing, Inc	Southern California Edison
California Energy Commission	House, Lon	SPURR
California Farm Bureau Federation	Imperial Irrigation District	St. Paul Assoc
California Gas Acquisition Svcs	Integrated Utility Consulting Group	Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan
California ISO	International Power Technology	Tabors Caramanis & Associates
Calpine	Interstate Gas Services, Inc.	Tecogen, Inc
Calpine Corp	IUCG/Sunshine Design LLC	TFS Energy
Calpine Gilroy Cogen	J. R. Wood, Inc	Transcanada
Cambridge Energy Research Assoc	JTM, Inc	Turlock Irrigation District
Cameron McKenna	Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps	U S Borax, Inc
Cardinal Cogen	Manatt, Phelps & Phillips	United Cogen Inc.
Cellnet Data Systems	Marcus, David	URM Groups
Chevron Texaco	Matthew V. Brady & Associates	Utility Resource Network
Chevron USA Production Co.	Maynor, Donald H.	Wellhead Electric Company
City of Glendale	MBMC, Inc.	White & Case
City of Healdsburg	McKenzie & Assoc	WMA
City of Palo Alto	McKenzie & Associates	
City of Redding	Meek, Daniel W.	
CLECA Law Office	Mirant California, LLC	
Commerce Energy	Modesto Irrigation Dist	
Constellation New Energy	Morrison & Foerster	
CPUC	Morse Richard Weisenmiller & Assoc.	
Cross Border Inc	Navigant Consulting	
Crossborder Inc	New United Motor Mfg, Inc	
CSC Energy Services	Norris & Wong Associates	
Davis, Wright, Tremaine LLP	North Coast Solar Resources	
Defense Fuel Support Center	Northern California Power Agency	
Department of the Army	Office of Energy Assessments	
Department of Water & Power City	OnGrid Solar	
DGS Natural Gas Services	Palo Alto Muni Utilities	