# Developing a Rapid Assessment Method: The California Experience

Lating the 2 de

Josh Collins San Francisco Estuary Institute

## Impetus

Political will to change land use *Public's interest in "ecological health" and "restoration"* 

Lack of accountability Public's need to know what it's gotten for its investments

Inability to show progress and sustain political will Lack of consistency among existing methods, unavailability of data, prohibitive cost of adequate coverage

USEPA incentives Wetlands "Elements Letter"

# Key Questions and Issues



Where are the wetlands and riparian areas? How are they doing? Are the policies and programs working? Is the project successful? What about climate change?

#### Funding 2002-2009: 2.75 million

Federal CWA 104b3 (USEPA), Coastal Services Program (NOAA), National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS), Point Reyes National Seashore (USNPS)

State Coastal NPS Program, Legacy Program, State 404 Program

NGO Riparian Habitat Joint Venture, Association of Bay Area Governments

Foundations Packard Foundation, SF Foundation, Rose Foundation

## In-Kind Services

Data and expertise are provided by:

Cities, counties, special districts, regional agencies, state and federal agencies, NGOs, academia, private engineering and environmental firms

Championship

Not a project but a process Not a product but a program It's not agencies but people

## Developmental Organization

Sponsors Statewide Steering Committee Place-based NGO Leadership Geographic Science Teams Environmental Regulatory, Management, and Scientific Communities

#### Part of a Developmental Framework for Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring

Level 1: Landscape assessment based on the distribution, abundance, shape, size-frequency, etc of wetlands (e.g., NWI, Ca Wetland Inventory).

Level 2: Rapid assessment using checklists or other semiquantitative devices to score wetland sites relative to a range of condition from least impacted to highly degraded (e.g. ORAM, CRAM).

Level 3: Evaluation of ecological services in their own regard (e.g., Unit Hydrograph, IBI's) and to validate Level 1 and Level 2 results

# Goals:

## Increase State Capacity to Address Key Questions and Issues

- Develop State Wetland and Riparian Inventories
- Help standardize project assessment in the context of ambient monitoring
- Help assess the performance of wetland and riparian policies and programs

#### All Types of California Wetlands

- Lakes and Lagoons
- Estuaries
- Steams and Riparian
  Playas
- Slope Wetlands

- Depressional Wetlands
- Vernal Pools
- Wet Meadows

#### Focus on Coastal Watersheds

## Development of Level 1 Inventory





#### Updates linked to Ca 401 Certification Program

#### Development of Level 3 Tools: Protocols for Assessing Ecological Service

Protocols vetted with local, state and federal agencies through broadly inclusive science teams

Examples from other projects and programs:

- Stream Macroinvertebrate IBI
- Tidal Datum Updates
- Sentinel Species for bioaccumulation

Development of Level 2 Tool: California Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands and Riparian Areas

- Establish PI Team, Regional and Statewide Teams
- Develop conceptual models of form and function
- Review other RAMs
- Verify and revise
  - BPJ in the field
- Validate
  - Explore correlation to Level 3 data
  - Test repeatability within and among teams

## What is "CRAM"

- Expert "walk and talk" diagnostic tool
- Standard metrics for each wetland type
- Internal reference (scores represent percent of best achievable)
- Less than 4 hrs field time
- Teams of 2-3 trained practitioners

## Conceptual Models Reveal Assumptions

#### Primary and Secondary Drivers of Condition



#### Stress, Buffer, and Habitat Condition

Stress and disturbance originate in the landscape outside the buffer

Condition is assessed in the wetland

Buffer exists between stressors and the wetland

#### CRAM Design Template

Wetlands Assessment Areas for CRAM

Attributes of Condition

Same for all Wetlands Classes

Metrics and Sub-metrics Scores Vary among Wetland Classes



- Four attributes of wetland function contribute to the overall wetland condition
- Scores are recorded for metrics for these attributes



## Uses of the Stressor Checklist

Identify possible causes for low CRAM scores
Identify possible corrective actions
Develop testable hypotheses relating scores to stressors



## Validation: CRAM Correlation to Level 3 Data





p = 0.001 $r^2 = .66$ 

#### Landscape Attribute



p = 0.001 $r^2 = .62$ 

# Validation: CRAM Correlation to Level 3 Data

CRAM Score	Level 3 Data	r <sup>2</sup>	p-value
Landscape	Diversity of non-riparian bird species	+.39	.01
Hydrology	Total bird species diversity	+.32	.04
Physical	Macroinvertebrate IBI	+.35	.01
Biotic	Macroinvertebrate IBI	+.40	.003
Overall	Macroinvertebrate IBI	+.62	.001

# Validation: Repeatability within and among Teams

Precision Test	Precision Targeted	Precision Achieved		
		Estuarine	Riverine	
Within Team	+/- 10%	11%	7%	
Among Teams	+/- 20%	8%	12%	







\*Statewide average is based on CRAM calibration data.



## Watershed Profiles

#### **Confined Riverine**

#### **Unconfined** Riverine







# CRAM Highlights

Applicable across policies, programs, projects
 Applicable across landscapes and wetland types
 Provides immediate and transparent results
 Separates likely stressors from condition
 Correlates to ecological services

#### Status of CRAM Development

CRAM Manual: Complete for all wetland types
CRAM IT: Complete for all wetland types
Verification: Complete for all wetland types
Validation: Complete for riverine and estuarine

## Current and Pending Applications

- Program Performance Assessment
  - State 404 Certification Program
  - State Stream Bed Alteration Permit Program
  - State Net-gain Policy
- Impacted and Mitigation Site Assessment
  - Sacramento and Los Angeles USCACE
  - State Water Resources Control Board
- Restoration Site Assessment
  - State Coastal Conservancy
  - State Coastal Commission
  - Some Tribes (Yurok, Washo)

## Current and Pending Applications

#### Parklands and Refuge Assessment

- Selected State Parks
- State Fish and Game Refuges and Preserves
- Wetland Mitigation Banks
- Selected National Parks and Seashores

#### Ambient Assessment

- 30+ CMAP wadeable steam sites 2007
- 120+ statewide estuarine survey sites in 2007
- 6-8 watershed assessments 2007-09
- Adapted to Gulf Coast and Northwest Coast 2007

## Next Steps for CRAM

#### Training and Certification

- "As needed" training through 2007
- Training and Certification through University Extension Services beginning 2007

#### Peer Review

- Rapid Assessment in California (Sutula et al. 2006)
- Mitigation Project Review (Ambrose et al. 2006)
- CRAM Validation (Stein et al. in preparation)

Numerous Investigators with Federal and State Oversight

PI Group

Josh Collins, Cristina Grosso, Letitia Grenier SFEI Martha Sutula, Eric Stein, Betty Fetscher SCCWRP Ross Clark Ca Coastal Commission Adam Wiskind MLML

Regional Teams (10-20 members each) South Coast, Central Coast, Bay Area, North Coast

Statewide Steering Committee USEPA, USACE, USNPS, NRCS, Resources Agency, State Water Board, CalTrans, CDFG, Coastal Commission, Coastal Conservancy

