The West Virginia Save Our Streams Program

Developing a Tiered Approach to Volunteer Monitoring

Timothy Craddock, Citizen's Monitoring Coordinator

WHAT IS THE WV SAVE OUR STREAMS PROGRAM?



WV Save Our Streams is a volunteer stream monitoring program designed to teach its participants various techniques for making an assessment of their wadeable streams and rivers.

WV Save Our Streams provides hands-on training in the biological, physical and chemical survey methods commonly used for rockybottom stream monitoring and assessment.

Certification of the volunteer monitor's and **stream adoption** is an important component of the program.

HISTORY

The Save Our Streams (SOS) program had its beginnings in 1969, through a Maryland Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America (IWLA). The IWLA was the first to initiate this type of volunteer stream monitoring program, and through avenues such as the Virginia Environmental Endowment Grant program, helped to start SOS programs all across the United States. West Virginia's Save Our Streams program began initially in 1989 coordinator for two years by the Water Resources Section of the WV Division of Natural Resources.

The program began again in 1994 by way of a grant from Section 319 of the Clean Water Act, and has now found a permanent home with WV Department of Environmental Protection's (WV DEP) Division of Water Resources. Volunteer stream monitors are encouraged to use the IWLA to purchase additional supplies and equipment to help support IWLA's Save Our Streams program.

INITIAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Like many volunteer monitoring programs across the country, a major goal of the WV Save Our Streams Program is to encourage the use of volunteer data.

The idea is to gain credibility by providing a program that is not only accepted by the volunteers but will also be a mechanism for the collection of stream information that will be accepted and used by federal and state water quality agencies.

THE STAKEHOLDER PROCESS

A series of stakeholder (roundtable style) meetings were held over an eight month period in order collect ideas from all interested participants. The stakeholders provided guidance for future program development. There was overwhelming agreement regarding the development of the program from both the volunteer and professional communities...

- To develop a program that would provide enhanced training opportunities but would still be understood by those with little experience using stream monitoring and assessment techniques.
- A secondary goal is to develop field methods (possibly incorporating lab methods in the future) that would provide credible and reliable stream information.

THE FIRST MEETING

IWLA – Mountaineer Chapter House

THE STAKEHOLDERS

- 1. West Virginia Save Our Streams
- 2. WV DEP Watershed Assessment Section
- 3. WV DEP Nonpoint Source Program
- 4. WV DEP Division of Mining and Reclamation
- 5. WV Conservation Agency
- 6. WV Department of Natural Resources
- 7. Office of Surface Mining
- 8. Salem International University
- 9. Marshall University

- 10. Southern WV Community College
- 11. Shepherd University
- 12. Izaak Walton League of American
- 13. Blue Heron Environmental Network
- 14. Kelly's Creek Community Association
- 15. Heizer-Manila Watershed Organization
- 16. Jefferson County Watershed Coalition
- 17. Guardians of the West Fork
- 18. Cacapon Institute

PROGRAM STRUCTURE – THE WORKSHOPS

Tier One - Beginning Stream Monitoring Workshop

Introduces the concepts of chemical, physical and biological stream monitoring and provides basic equipment, manuals and other resource materials. The workshops are approximately 4-6 hours in length with both in-class and hands-on demonstrations along a stream.

Tier Two - Intermediate Stream Monitoring Workshop

Expands upon the concepts by using more thorough techniques, thus beginning to quantify the information collected. Basic equipment, manuals and other resources are provided. The workshops last a full day, with both in-class and hands-on demonstrations along a stream.

PROGRAM STRUCTURE – THE WORKSHOPS

Tier 3 - Advanced Stream Monitoring Workshop

The training is very similar to a professional type of stream assessment called, rapid bioassessment protocols (RBP's). Enhanced equipment, manuals and additional resources are provided. The advanced workshop is a two-day commitment. The first day is mostly in-class with some hands-on streamside demonstrations in the afternoon. The second day is spent entirely on a stream. By the end of the second day the group will have completed an advanced assessment of the entire stream reach.

THE VOLUNTEER STREAM CONDITION INDEX

| WV Save Our Steams "Stream Condition Index" | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|--|--|
| Invertebrate Groups | Tot | al # | # Of Kinds | Tolerance | HBI Value | | |
| Stoneflies | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | |
| Mayflies | 34 | | 2 | 3 | 102 | | |
| Most Caddisflies | | | | 3 | 0 | | |
| Fishflies & Hellgrammites | 2 | | 1 | 5 | 10 | | |
| Water Penny | 3 | | 1 | 4 | 12 | | |
| Riffle Beetles | | | | 4 | 0 | | |
| Watersnipe | | | | 4 | 0 | | |
| Craneflies | (| 6 | 1 | 5 | 30 | | |
| Common Netspinner | 40 | | 1 | 5 | 200 | | |
| Dragonflies | | | | 5 | 0 | | |
| Damselflies | | | | 7 | 0 | | |
| Alderflies | | | | 6 | 0 | | |
| Other Beetle Larva | | | | 5 | 0 | | |
| Mussels | | | | 5 | 0 | | |
| Clams | 2 | | 1 | 6 | 12 | | |
| Gilled Snails | | | | 5 | 0 | | |
| Crayfish | 3 | | 1 | 6 | 18 | | |
| Scuds "Sideswimmer" | 34 | | 1 | 5 | 170 | | |
| Aquatic Sowbugs | 101 | | 1 | 7 | 707 | | |
| Pouch Snails | | | | 8 | 0 | | |
| Blackfly Larva | 3 | | 1 | 8 | 24 | | |
| Midge Larva | 9 | | 1 | 8 | 72 | | |
| Other Fly Larva | | | 8 0 | | 0 | | |
| Flatworms | | | 8 0 | | 0 | | |
| Leeches | | | 10 0 | | 0 | | |
| Aquatic Worms | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 100 | | |
| Total # of Macroinverteb | brates | 248 | Total | HBI | 1459 | | |
| Total # of Kinds | | 14 | Reference Formulas | | | | |
| Metrics | Score | Points | | | | | |
| % Dominance | 40.7 | 65.9 | = 100 × [(100 – Value) ÷ 90] | | | | |
| % EPT | 30.2 | 35.6 | = 100 × (Value ÷ 85) | | | | |
| EPT Richness | 4 | 33.3 | = 100 × (Value ÷ 12) | | | | |
| % Tolerant | 8.9 | 95.9 | = 100 × [(100 – Value) ÷ 95] | | | | |
| Hilsenhoff Biotic Index (HBI) | 5.9 | 63.3 | $= 100 \times [(10 - \text{Value}) \div 6.5]$ | | | | |
| Taxa Richness | 14 | 70.0 | = 100 × (Value ÷ 20) | | | | |
| Biological Integrity | | | | | | | |
| Stream Condition Index | 60 7 | Excellent | Good | Marginal | Poor | | |
| Circain Condition index | 00.7 | > 90 | 90 - 70 | 69.9 - 50 | < 50 | | |

HOW DOES VOLUNTEER DATA COMPARE TO PROFESSIONAL LEVEL DATA?

LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT SOME OF THE COMPARISONS.



161 Stream sites were compared within most of West Virginia's major hydrologic basins.



Potomac Direct and Shenandoah Drainage Basins

| Stream | Watershed | WVSOS | WVSCI | Correlation |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------------|
| Middle Fork/Indian Creek | Potomac Direct Drain | 85.9 | 76.4 | |
| Back Creek | Potomac Direct Drain | 82.7 | 84.2 | |
| Tilis Branch | Potomac Direct Drain | 63.6 | 66.6 | |
| Indian Run | Potomac Direct Drain | 92.5 | 83.7 | |
| Middle Fork/Sleepy Creek | Potomac Direct Drain | 79.8 | 72.5 | |
| Meadow Branch | Potomac Direct Drain | 65.3 | 67.1 | |
| Little Burch Creek | Potomac Direct Drain | 87.7 | 82.5 | 0.898 |
| Hog Run | Shenandoah | 50.6 | 59.2 | |
| North Fork/Bullskin Run | Shenandoah | 40.1 | 34.0 | |
| Bullskin Run | Shenandoah | 39.0 | 48.0 | |
| Flowing Springs Run | Shenandoah | 74.8 | 63.0 | |
| Shenandoah River | Shenandoah | 70.8 | 71.3 | |
| Evitt's Run | Shenandoah | 57.8 | 54.3 | |
| Evitt's Run | Shenandoah | 44.2 | 52.6 | 0.820 |

Potomac Direct and Shenandoah Drainage Basins



Correlation – 0.86

Cheat and Youghiogheny Drainage Basins

| Stream | Watershed | WVSOS | WSCI | Correlation |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| Yodkim Run | Cheat River | 59.8 | 63.0 | |
| Hyle Run | Cheat River | 89.1 | 91.9 | |
| Little Sandy Creek | Cheat River | 77.4 | 68.0 | |
| Wolf Run/Shavers Fork | Cheat River | 98.3 | 89.5 | |
| Roaring Run | Cheat River | 98.3 | 91.6 | |
| UNT/Buffalo Run | Cheat River | 46.0 | 51.3 | |
| Roaring Creek | Cheat River | 71.4 | 73.6 | 0.959 |
| Little Laurel Run | Youghiogeny | 68.3 | 60.3 | |
| Pine Swamp | Youghiogeny | 36.9 | 29.5 | |
| Tanklin Run | Youghiogeny | 82.3 | 77.6 | |
| South Branch | Youghiogeny | 90.6 | 81.6 | |
| Wardwell Run | Youghiogeny | 51.2 | 54.0 | |
| North Branch | Youghiogeny | 73.1 | 72.2 | |
| Snowy Creek | Youghiogeny | 52.3 | 55.5 | 0.963 |

Cheat and Youghiogheny Drainage Basins



Correlation – 0.96

Comments and Suggestions

Send your comments to:

Timothy Craddock West Virginia Save Our Streams 414 Summers Street, 2nd Floor Charleston, WV 25301

E-mail - tcraddock@wvdep.org