National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop

Advancing State and Tribal Programs



Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 31 March – 4 April, 2003

Development of a Reference Site Screening Approach

RFC 201

Part 2

Presented by Peter Lattin, Dynamac Corporation

Also contributed Paul Ringold, USEPA

Project objectives - REVIEW

- Develop a 'top-down' reference stream reach screening approach for states/regions
- Identify <u>'least disturbed'</u> reference sites within any biophysical stratum
- Keys: practical, based on readily available data, reproducible, regionally flexible

Fine Screen Goals

- Reasonably objective process
- Reasonably reproducible
- Based on explicit criteria
- Screen <u>out</u> sites with increasing detailed information

Conceptual Approach



Fine Screening

Operational Definition: Evaluation of a set of the *least disturbed* Coarse Screened reaches using available online digital orthophotos and topographic maps, to create a ranked list by estimated level of stressors in the network, stratified by ecoregion and stream order.

Representing Disturbances

- During Coarse Screening buffer zones around disturbances <u>crudely</u> depicted potential impact on stream networks
- During Fine Screening:
 - Estimates made for the reach and the upstream contributing areas
 - ✓ Standardized severity scoring minimizes variability
 - ✓ Type and severity of disturbance are recorded
 - Photointerpreted judgment used to assess local conditions (e.g., soils, slope, etc.) affecting severity score

Standardized Disturbance Criteria Development

- Identify characteristic disturbances that can be interpreted from the orthophoto imagery
 - 🗸 Туре
 - Severity
- Scoring criteria should reflect both intensity and extent of potential disturbance impacts
- Ideally the final tally should <u>crudely</u> represent relative impacts

Example Scoring Criteria

NOT DETECTED	(0)	= not detected in imagery
LOW	(1)	= present, impact unlikely due
		to distance or riparian buffer; or
		light and localized impact
	(5)	= low impact probable
MODERATE	(10)	= low impact obvious for most
		of stream; or high but
		concentrated impact
HIGH	(20)	= moderate impact for most of
		stream; or very high but
		concentrated impact
SEVERE	(40)	= high impact for most of stream;
		or severe concentrated impact

What Might This Look Like?



Example Ranges on Scores

Urban/Residential Development	=	1 - 40
Commercial/Industrial	=	1 - 40
Roads	=	1 - 40
OHV trails	=	1 - 20
Pack trails	=	1 – 5
Railroads / Powerlines	=	1 - 10
Agriculture	=	1 - 40
Grazing	=	1 - 40
Confined animal feeding operations	=	10 - 40
Logging	=	1 - 40
Irrigation withdrawals	=	5 - 40
Water diversions	=	10 - 40
Impoundments	=	1 - 40
Rock / gravel extraction	=	1 - 40
Mineral/oil extraction	=	10 - 40

March 31 – April 4, 2003 National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop, RFC201_08

Atypical Disturbances ...



Useful Data Sources

- Digital orthophoto quads (e.g., TerraServer)
- Digital topographic maps (e.g., TerraServer, TopoZone)
- Air Photos
- BPJ recommendations
- Aerial and ground reconnaissance







Rapid Visual Screen to Identify the Least Disturbed Reach in the Network



March 31 – April 4, 2003 National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop, RFC201_08

Example Screening Form

REACH-ID	NETWORK-ID#				
% Disturbed	% Date: Screener				
Strahler Order 1 2 3	4 5 Ecoregion				
	6				

Fine-Level Screening Form

Access Issues:

< 2km to reach? Yes / No If no, estimate distance:_____ Is topography dangerous? Yes / No Is there public access to the reach? Yes / No

 Exclusionary Criteria:
 No impediments _____

 Major Mine(s) present _____
 Major upstream dam present _____

 Reach is artificial channel ______

Disturbance type	Severity	L	ocation	Row Total	
		Down	Reach	Upstrm	
Column Totals:					
				Grand	d Total:



Header Information





Rapid Exclusionary Criteria



Detailed Disturbance Type and Severity Information



Fine Screen Site Ranking

- Rank by ascending total score
- Best 3- 4 candidates (lowest scores) from each stratum are selected for BPJ review
 - ✓ Attempt to avoid spatial autocorrelation
 - ✓ Certain selection criteria may need to be relaxed to get sufficient samples
- Weighting issues, upstream vs. reach (*under consideration*)
 - ✓ Example: 1st order vs. 5th order catchments

Why Do Coarse and Fine Scores Differ?

- Data resolution
- GIS operations vs. photo interpretation
- Different operational definitions of zones of potential impact (buffers vs. interpreter judgment)
- Entire network disturbance (Coarse Screening) vs. just disturbance above reach pour point (Fine Screening)



Simplified Split-Screen Work Environment



Arcedit:sel network4-id = 10148;me sel;sel reach-id = 144114;drawsel;draw

<u>Typical Screen Shot</u> TerraServer Orthophoto – Convenient Zoom (Reach-Level to Watershed-Level Disturbances)



Watershed-level perspective (showing multiple impoundments)

March 31 – April 4, 2003 National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop, RFC201_08

Advantages of Online Orthophotos

- More rapid than field reconnaissance
- Easy movement between sample areas and scales
- Saves hard disk space
- Free (online)
- Level of detail (1m resolution is useful for many stressors (e.g., road washouts, grazing impacts)

Fine Screen Output

- ~ 3 4 candidates from each stratum (e.g., stream order x ecoregion)
- Mapped locations of reaches
- List of local contacts for BPJ review of sites



The BPJ Process

- Local contacts established
- Contacts are provided with
 - Maps & site information (approximate catchment boundaries, reach)
 - ✓ Scoring instructions
 - ✓ Standardized scoring sheets
- The best BPJ sites (perennial and 'least disturbed') from each stratum are identified for field inspection

The BPJ Step

- Best Professional Judgment
 - Reach and catchment stressors are scored, comparable to the Fine Screen step
 - Detailed information not always available in GIS data or interpreted from orthophotos (e.g., historical perspective)
 - ✓ Confirmation of flow status
 - Confirmation that stream is representative of 'least disturbed'
 - ✓ Access information / contacts
 - ✓ Alternate potential reference candidates solicited

Field Reconnaissance

- Sites with the lowest scores from each stratum are field inspected via:
 - Aerial reconnaissance of the watershed
 - Videotaped for post season debriefing and review
 - ✓ Ground truthing of the reach
 - Trained field crews to reduce variability in scoring
 - Standardized scoring data sheet
 - Photographs for assessment of variability between crews
 - Confirmation of flow status

The Final Fine Screen Product:

 Recommended list of candidate reaches for future field sampling



Utah State Pilot (2001 – 2002)

Fine Screen Step:

- 400 perennial reaches screened (28 strata)
- 80 Evaluated by BPJ
- BPJ recommended 42 (19 strata)
- 35 inspected by air
- 18 sites were field inspected
- 78% of field scores were < or = the BPJ score

 20 reference candidates (19 strata) were identified for future field sampling

Example – Two Strata (Utah Pilot)



Least Disturbed Sites in Highly Disturbed Settings

 The quality of 'least disturbed' candidates will vary between strata, depending upon ambient disturbance level

 Recommendation: Assign a relative quality rating to each site (high quality/minimally disturbed, average, low quality)

 For regions where only low quality sites are available, consider alternate approaches for defining reference condition, as explored in RFC 202

Skills Needed

- General GIS skills
- Photo interpretation skills
- General understanding of stressors and their impacts on aquatic ecosystems

- Summary -

- Multi-stage, multi-scale process
- The best Coarse Screened reaches for <u>each stratum</u> are Fine Screened
- The best Fine Screened reaches from <u>each stratum</u> evaluated using structured BPJ
- BPJ scores, confirms flow and 'least disturbed' status
- Best BPJ sites from <u>each stratum</u> are ground truthed:
 ✓ Aerial inspection of the watershed
 - ✓ Field inspection of the reach
- A final list of candidate reference sites is prepared