#### National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop

Advancing State and Tribal Programs



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

Reference Site Selection: Overview and a Framework

**RFC 101** 

Presented by Phil Larsen, USEPA

### **Reference site selection is**

- An iterative screening process for selecting sites
  - That are minimally or least disturbed by human activities and resultant stressors
  - That are representative of the aquatic resource in the region of interest
- Guided by indicators of human disturbance/stress
  - In the atmosphere
  - In the landscape/watershed
  - In the riparian corridor or near the site
  - In the channel
  - In the water
  - In the biota
- Available at different spatial scales

### A simple conceptual model: Human activity > stressors > responses



### A more complex conceptual model

(from Bryce et al. 1999. J. Am. Wat. Resour. Assoc. 35:23-36)

_									
Human Activity	Urbanization Channelizatio Levees Roads/Culver Erosion MWTPs/CSO Septic systems Imperviousnes Fragmentation	on ts s s s n	Ag/CAFO/ Silviculture Grazing Harvest Dams Channelization Diversions Levees Roads/Culverts Erosion Fertilizer Pesticides Compaction	Mining/ Drilling Extraction Metals Liming Tailings Valley Fill Diversions Roads/Culverts Erosion Petroleum Pipelines Fragmentation	Industry/ Power Gen. Dams Stacks Liming Wastewater WTP/CSOs Roads/Culverts Channelization Revetments Imperviousness Fragmentation				
Stressors			Fragmentation						
(Habitat	Habitat Flow	Habitat Flow Sediment Nutrient Oxygen Temperature Toxics							
change)									
Biological Responses	,	Alt	ered Biological S	Structure/Function	n				

# The Five Major Factors that Determine the Integrity of Aquatic Resources (from OHIO EPA)



March 31 – April 4, 2003 National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop, RFC 101\_04

#### Increasing Disturbance

	Industrial Mines Dominant Urban Dominant	Extreme Flows Only Inter-basin Transfers	F
Irrigated Rowcrops CAFOs; Crop Processors	Suburban Mines Common	Regulated Flows Only Intra-basin Transfers	Е
Intense Riparian Grazing Irrigated Forage	Small Cities Industrial Mines Present	Dammed Local Transfers	D
Constant Grazing Dryland Agriculture	Large Lot Residential Small Metal/Aggregate Mines	Slightly Flashier	С
Light/Rotated Grazing	Rural Residential Hand Mines	Natural Flow	В
Natural Vegetation	Transients	Natural Flow	Α
<u>Agriculture</u>	Urbanization/Mining	<u>Flow</u>	<u>Tier</u>

March 31 – April 4, 2003 National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop, RFC 101\_04

### **Overview of process: Preliminary steps**

- Select Region/aquatic resource of interest
- Identify the important natural gradients in the region (size? elevation? slope? geology? Lake or channel type?...)
- Identify human activities/stressors likely to be encountered in the region (local effects? Regional effects?)
- Establish criteria by which to rank disturbances
- Identify/locate sources of information that will be used in the sorting process

#### **Hierarchical Screening Process**



### **Extensive data**

- Identify sources of complete coverages
  - GIS resources?
  - GeoReferenced databases?
- Sources of data
  - Landscape screens
    - Land use/cover (TM imagery; other satellite imagery)
    - Roads
    - Population density/points sources
    - Mines
    - Feedlots
    - ...

### **Office Data**

- Identify sources of candidate sites
  - Air photos, digital orthophoto quads, maps
- Sources of data
  - Terraserver
  - USGS topo maps/local maps
  - National High Altitude Photography (NHAP)
  - Satellite imagery

### **Recon sites**

- By air
- By ground site visit
- ID disturbances missed by the coarser filters

### **Site measurements**

- Apply routine field protocol
  - EMAP
  - USGS
  - STATE
- To identify disturbances missed by coarser screens:
  - Riparian habitat
  - Physical habitat
  - Water quality
  - Biota

Is the use of biological data circular? The case against:

• Circularity Problem



## Need an independent measure of what "undisturbed by humans" means.

Is the use of biological data circular? The case for:

- Lesions/anomalies?
- Alien species dominate?
- Expert knowledge about biology of systems under consideration?

### **Criteria for Candidate Reference Sites** (Georgia, Alabama, S. Carolina)

#### **Stream Gradient**

		High	Low
1.	Natural vegetation, i.e., forest/grassland/wetland (% in catchment)	> 65%	> 50%
2.	Minimum overall habitat score (% of maximum)	> 70%	> 70%
3.	Minimum riparian zone width (m)	>15 m	>15 m
4.	<b>Riparian zone in catchment (% of stream length)</b>	> 60%	> 60%
5.	Agriculture (% in catchment)	< 20%	< 30%
6.	Urban land (% in catchment)	< 15%	< 15%
7.	Silviculture (active [within 5 years] in catchment)	none	none
8.	Road density (length/area of catchment)	?	?
9.	Point source discharges (% of flow at 7Q10)	< 5%	< 5%
10.	Channel alteration in catchment	none	none

March 31 – April 4, 2003 National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop, RFC 101\_04

### **Criteria for Alaska Reference Sites** (**Must meet all criteria**)

- no channelization
- > no upstream impoundments
- > no known point source dischargers
- > dissolved oxygen greater or equal to 5 ppm
- urban land use less than 15% in catchment
- mining and/or logging affecting less than 15% in catchment

➢ forest land use (or other natural wetland, grassland) greater than 70% in catchment

riparian buffer width greater or equal to 18 m

### **Sources of candidate reference sites**

- Digital maps of the aquatic resource
  - RF3/NHD
  - National Wetlands inventory
- BPJ supplied
- Available from existing surveys
  - Probability surveys
  - Other surveys
- In any case, the screening criteria should be applied to all sites in the candidate pool, however obtained

### Selecting Reference sites: Repeatable outcome?

• Two sets of criteria, independently applied should give us the same outcome

### Criteria set #1

- Drainage: entirely within subregion
- Land use: >80% forest; no ag/urban; no recent disturbance, e.g., construction; clearcutting
- Habitat: No cattle in w/s; no disturbances
- Channel: Characteristic of region
- Riparian veg: > 30m buffer for most of w/s
- Instream substrate: no significant siltation or embeddedness
- Water Quality: No point sources; no recent spills; pH>6.

### Criteria set # 2

"Filters": exclude all sites with:

- sulfate over 400 ueq/L (mine drainage)
- acid neutralizing capacity less than 50 ueq/L (acid rain)
- average RBP habitat score less than 16 (habitat)
- total phosphorus over 100 ug/L (nutrient enrichment)
- total nitrogen over 750 ug/L (nutrient enrichment)
- chloride over 100 ueq/L (general watershed disturbance
- total benthic count less than 100 individuals (inadequate sample)



### Are Reference Sites Representative?

- Reference sites should be representative of the natural gradients in the region of interest, e.g.,
  - Elevation
  - Latitude
  - Longitude
  - Stream gradient

March 31 – April 4, 2003 National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop, RFC 101\_04





### **Revisiting minimally and least** disturbed



March 31 – April 4, 2003 National Biological Assessment and Criteria Workshop, RFC 101\_04

### Minimally Disturbed Condition (MDC)

- Condition in absence of significant, or with minimal, human disturbance
- MDC changes little over time, due to natural processes
- Stable benchmark
- Derived from minimally disturbed reference sites

### Least Disturbed Condition (LDC)

- Best available given today's state of the landscape
- Can change over time as land use and management practices change
- Derived by characterizing least disturbed reference sites

### **Concluding remarks**

- Establish a framework for reference site screening
- Identify some key concepts to be kept in mind
- Illustrations of the process in subsequent "lectures" and in RFC201 and RFC202.
- Use framework as a guide in your evaluation/applicability of courses to follow with respect to your unique situation

### **Concluding remarks**

- After Break:
  - Ed Rankin (Tuesday morning) or
    Dave Courtemanch (Tuesday afternoon)
  - Mike Edmondson
  - Jeffrey Schuldt
  - Break/Questions