

APPENDIX C

SEDIMENT DELIVERY CALCULATIONS

NAVARRO RIVER WATERSHED TECHNICAL SUPPORT DOCUMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

C.1	Road Analysis	1
C.2	Road-Related Gullyng	1
C.3	Vineyard Erosion	1
C.4	Road Mass Wasting	2
C.5	Road Surface Erosion	2
C.6	Management Related Mass Wasting.....	3
C.7	Stream Crossing Erosion.....	3

LIST OF TABLES

C-1	Road Mileage by Category	1
C-2	Erosion Rates and Factors used in Calculating Surface Erosion	2

**APPENDIX C
SEDIMENT DELIVERY CALCULATIONS**

This appendix briefly describes many of the calculations Regional Board staff made while computing human-caused sediment delivery in the Navarro Watershed.

C.1 Road Analysis

The length of roads in each use category, as identified in the aerial photo analysis, is presented in Table C-1.

Table C-1: Road Mileage by Category

New Primary	36.9mi
New Secondary	67.4mi
New Rarely Used	10.3mi
Primary	496.8mi
Secondary	973.7mi
Rarely Used	275.8mi
Total Miles	1860.9mi

C.2 Road-Related Gullying

Form: $[\text{Basin-Wide Average Stream Crossing Delivery per Mile of Road}] [\text{Miles of Road}] [\text{Miles of Watershed Area}]^{-1} = \text{Road Related Gully Delivery}$

Example: Indian Creek

$$(17.9 \text{ tons mile}^{-1} \text{ year}^{-1}) (166.2 \text{ miles}) (39 \text{ miles}^2)^{-1} = 90 \text{ tons mile}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$$

C.3 Vineyard Erosion

From: $[\text{Acres of Cultivated Vineyards}] [\text{Erosion Rate}] [\text{Delivery Rate}] [\text{Area of Watershed miles}^2]^{-1} = \text{Rate of Vineyard Related Sediment Yield}$

Example: Anderson Creek

$$(1088 \text{ acres}) (10 \text{ tons acre}^{-1} \text{ year}^{-1}) (0.5) (46 \text{ miles}^2)^{-1} = 118 \text{ tons mile}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$$

C.4 Road Mass Wasting

Form: [Landslide Delivery] [# Road Miles]⁻¹ [10 year RI]⁻¹ = Rate of Road Related Mass Wasting Yield

C.5 Road Surface Erosion

Form: [Basic Erosion Rate (tons acre⁻¹ year⁻¹)] [Traffic/Precipitation Factor (Cover Factor for Ditch/Cutbank) (dimensionless)] [Road Prism Contribution (dimensionless)] [Hydrologic Connectivity (dimensionless)] [Road Width (feet)] [Conversion Factor (acre foot⁻¹ mile⁻¹)] = Rate of Road Surface Erosion Yield (tons mile⁻¹ year⁻¹)

In all calculations, road prism and ditch/cutbank contribution was 0.4, hydrologic connectivity was 0.56, ditch/cutbank width was 6 feet, and road width was 21 feet. Other factors that varied are presented in Table C-2.

Example: Existing primary roads in areas receiving greater than 45" annual precipitation

Road Tread: (60 tons acre⁻¹ year⁻¹) (4) (0.4) (0.56) (21 ft) (0.1212 ac ft⁻¹ mi⁻¹) = 137 tons mile⁻¹ year⁻¹

Ditch and Cutbank: (60 tons acre⁻¹ year⁻¹) (0.37) (0.4) (0.56) (6 ft) (0.1212 ac ft⁻¹ mi⁻¹) = 3.6 tons mile⁻¹ year⁻¹

Total surface erosion yield: (137 + 3.6) tons mile⁻¹ year⁻¹ = 140.6 tons mile⁻¹ year⁻¹

Category	Basic Erosion Rate (tons/acre/year)	Traffic/Precip. Factor (cover factor for ditch and cutbank)
Primary Roads, <45" annual precip	60	2
Secondary Roads, <45" annual precip	60	1
Rarely Used Roads, >45" annual precip	60	.05
Primary Roads, >45" annual precip	60	4
Secondary Roads, >45" annual precip	60	1
Rarely Used Roads, >45" annual precip	60	.05
New Primary Roads, <45" annual precip	110	2
New Secondary Roads, <45" annual precip	110	1
New Rarely Used Roads, >45" annual precip	110	.05
New Primary Roads, >45" annual precip	110	4
New Secondary Roads, >45" annual precip	110	1
New Rarely Used Roads, >45" annual precip	110	.05
New Ditch and Cutbank	110	.37
Previously existing Ditch and Cutbank	60	.63

C.6 Management Related Mass Wasting

Form: [Rate of Natural Shallow Landslide (from Entrix 1998)] [Management to Natural Ratio]
= Management Related Rate

C.7 Stream Crossing Erosion

Navarro road data: 109 stream crossings, average fill volume per crossing = 422 tons.

Data from Furniss et al (1998):

69% (n=266) of stream crossings failed (overtopped culvert).

Of those that failed, 21% had no erosion, 44% eroded 1-25% of their fill, 12% eroded 26-50% of their fill, 10% eroded 51-75% of their fill, and 13% eroded 76-100% of their fill.

Applying data from Furniss et al (1998) to Navarro road data:

69% of 109 = 75 crossings expected to fail

Assume high end of range of fill erosion:

$$(75)(0.21)(0)(422 \text{ tons}) + (75)(0.44)(0.25)(422 \text{ tons}) + (75)(0.12)(0.50)(422 \text{ tons}) + (75)(0.10)(0.75)(422 \text{ tons}) + (75)(0.13)(1.0)(422 \text{ tons}) = 12,133 \text{ tons}$$

$$(\text{Mass of eroded stream crossing fill volume}) (\text{total number of stream crossings})^{-1} = (12,133 \text{ tons}) \dots \dots (109 \text{ crossings})^{-1} = 111 \text{ tons crossing}^{-1}$$

Assuming 10-year recurrence interval storms trigger 69% of stream crossings to fail:

$$(111 \text{ tons crossing}^{-1}) (10 \text{ years})^{-1} = 11.1 \text{ tons crossing}^{-1} \text{ year}^{-1}$$