

CHAPTER 3

STREAM HABITAT ASSESSMENT

Chapter 3: Stream Habitat Assessment.....	3-1
3.1 Role of Assessment	3-1
3.1.1 Watershed Assessment.....	3-2
3.1.2 Reach Assessment.....	3-2
3.1.3 Site Assessment	3-3
3.2 Conducting Assessments.....	3-4
3.2.1 Assessment Topics.....	3-4
3.2.2 Determining the Scale of Assessment.....	3-9
3.2.3 Special Case Assessments – Urban Streams.....	3-14
3.2.4 Limitations of Assessments	3-15
3.3 Assessment Methodologies	3-16
3.4 References	3-19
3.4.1 Additional Reading	3-19
3.4.2 Cited References	3-20

Chapter 3. Stream Habitat Assessment

Stream habitat is created and maintained by the dynamic interplay of multiple physical, chemical and biological processes that function at diverse spatial and temporal scales (Chapter 2 of this document). Historically, restoration efforts were primarily quick fix, in-channel engineering efforts that were implemented without adequate knowledge of watershed and ecosystem processes and characteristics. These restoration efforts were often conducted at inappropriate locations or at inappropriate spatial and temporal scales and ignored the processes that were limiting habitat quality or species survival. Hence, structural and functional failures were common. Appropriate habitat assessments could have prevented many of these failures.

The purpose of a habitat assessment is to characterize the present (and/or historic) state of habitat and the processes that create and maintain it so that problems and appropriate restoration options and obstacles can be identified and prioritized. It provides the technical basis for making decisions concerning land management as well as restoration and mitigation policy, planning, and project development. In light of the limited resources available for restoration, the risk of project failure, and the risk of unintended detrimental habitat and infrastructure impacts when watershed processes and conditions are poorly understood, some degree of assessment should be conducted for all projects in order to maximize the likelihood of their long-term success. Assessment costs should be an integral part of project implementation costs, and therefore, should be included in the project budget. It is invariably more cost effective to adequately assess watershed conditions before project implementation rather than after a project has failed to meet expectations, but especially if more than one project can benefit from the endeavor.

The objectives of this chapter are to:

- Describe types of information to be gained through expanding scales of assessment,
- Describe typical components of an assessment,
- Provide tips on selecting an appropriate scale of assessment,
- Identify references concerning various assessment methodologies, and
- Identify available resources to help in your assessment.

Because the goals of assessment and the depth and scale of analysis vary with the problem(s) being addressed, specific instructions on how to conduct an assessment are not addressed below.

3.1 Role of Assessment

Stream habitat assessments are typically conducted at three scales: 1) watershed, 2) reach, and 3) site, because the processes responsible for creating, maintaining, and connecting stream habitat operate on multiple spatial and temporal scales. For instance, sediment found at a particular site may be derived from adjacent bank erosion (site-scale process), upstream channel incision (reach-scale process), or mass-wasting events in the watershed (watershed-scale process). The other reason is that the impacts of activities within the watershed are cumulative and propagate downstream (e.g., water quality impairment), upstream (e.g., channel incision), and laterally (e.g., channel migration). Hence, what goes on elsewhere in the watershed may influence the effectiveness of a restoration project. Similarly, the effects of an individual or series of restoration project may extend beyond the project area.

3.1.1 Watershed Assessment

Watershed assessments provide the context for evaluating the spatial and temporal variability of watershed inputs (water, sediment, organic material, energy, and solutes), their effects on watershed -, reach-, and site -level habitat conditions and species populations, and their relationship with past, current, and future land management. Understanding this relationship is useful to evaluate cause and affect relationships and to differentiate between anthropogenic and natural shifts in habitat and population conditions. Identifying the root cause(s) of habitat degradation is necessary to successfully restore stream ecosystems. Projects that address only the symptom of a problem, rather than functional causes, will provide only short-term and localized benefits.

Reid¹ lists the following questions as examples of what watershed assessments can best address:

- “What areas are important for fish [and wildlife], and why?”
- Where has habitat been impaired?
- What aspects of the habitat have changed?
- What caused those changes?
- What is the relative importance of the various habitat changes to fish [and wildlife]?
- What is the present trend of changes in the system?
- Which changes are reversible?
- What is the expected effectiveness of the potential remedies?
- What are the effects of those remedies on other land uses, [infrastructure], and ecosystem components?
- What are the relative costs of the potential remedies over the long term?”

Watershed assessments may also assist in:

- Identifying watershed-wide constraints and opportunities for habitat restoration, enhancement, and preservation (Habitat restoration is of little long-term value in a watershed incapable of supporting the processes that create and maintain habitat conditions),
- Integrating planning efforts to avoid the problems and inefficiencies that result from multiple actions within a basin performed in isolation of each other,
- Developing prioritized restoration strategies that target projects and drainages that offer the greatest potential for collectively achieving long-term restoration goals at the lowest cost,
- Determining the appropriate scale in which implementing restoration, rehabilitation, enhancement, and preservation efforts, is most effective, and
- Developing monitoring strategies and objectives to determine the individual or collective effectiveness of restoration measures conducted throughout the watershed. Such measures are necessary to monitor and adaptively manage the watershed’s overall restoration strategy.

3.1.2 Reach Assessment

A reach assessment characterizes conditions found within a specific length of stream. It may be limited to the stream channel itself, or it may extend laterally to adjacent contributing areas. Channel reaches are typically many channel widths in length and exhibit similar geomorphic

characteristics throughout, such as channel pattern, slope, confinement, flow, and sediment size.²

Reach assessments can be used to collect information essential to project planning, development, and implementation. Reach assessments identify, quantify, and evaluate the condition of species, and the abundance and quality of habitat contained within. They can describe the relationship between species inhabiting the area, existing habitat conditions, and the habitat-forming processes acting within that reach. They can identify constraints and opportunities for restoration within the reach. Reach assessments are useful in characterizing factors that constrain the abundance and diversity of species that spend their entire life cycle within a reach. However, the limited scope of a reach assessment may not be adequate to characterize the factors affecting migratory species, which spend part of their life cycle in multiple stream reaches. Thus, restoration treatments designed to address habitat degradation from reach-scale assessments may only partially address impacts or be limited to addressing the symptom of a problem rather than the cause. Because reach assessments, by definition, cover a larger area than site assessments, they are better able to predict the impacts a project might have on upstream, downstream, and adjacent habitat and infrastructure, but they are limited in characterizing cumulative watershed effects.

3.1.3 Site Assessment

Sound project design requires knowledge of the condition and layout of the project site. For instance, riparian planting projects require knowledge of soil type and condition; light and moisture availability; the extent, frequency, duration, and depth of flooding; land management; and wildlife use of the area, among other variables. Such knowledge enables the designer, to select appropriate plant species and site preparation and maintenance techniques. Besides being a necessary design tool, site assessments are capable of identifying, quantifying, and evaluating the condition of species and the abundance and quality of habitat at that particular site. They can explore the spatial relationship among various in-channel habitat components, such as the proximity of cover to spawning habitat, or the connectivity of off-channel and in-channel habitat. They can also identify site-based restoration constraints and opportunities.

But site assessments are inadequate for identifying limiting factors to species health and abundance unless the species spends its entire life cycle within that particular site (e.g., vegetation, certain macroinvertebrates). They are also incapable of identifying the cause of any problems that originate from outside the site. For instance, although plants are stationary, their health, species composition, distribution, and extent are influenced by the availability of light, water, and nutrients, patterns of sedimentation and inundation, and the type, magnitude and frequency of disturbance. Each of these factors may be controlled by site, reach and/or watershed-scale processes. Likewise, site-scale assessment may be inadequate to predict how an individual project may influence upstream, downstream, and adjacent habitat, infrastructure, and channel stability. Hence, well-intentioned projects implemented to enhance habitat may inadvertently damage or impair other habitat or biota, destabilize the channel bed or banks, or put nearby infrastructure at risk if factors in restoration planning are not considered at a broader scale.

3.2 Conducting Assessments

Humans can alter habitat and habitat availability within the stream corridor directly through channelization, bank armoring, stream cleaning, and levee construction activities, among others, or indirectly through landuse activities within the watershed. The cumulative impact of land use activities and natural disturbance events (e.g., floods, landslides, fire, or debris torrents) may cause a series of channel and watershed responses that destabilize the stream or degrade habitat conditions, water quality, or fish and wildlife productivity. Because cumulative impacts vary both within and between watersheds, every assessment is unique, even if the reasons for conducting the analysis are the same. Assessments must address specific objectives, and include land use and naturally influenced disturbances.

3.2.1 Assessment Topics

Stream habitat assessment includes the reconnaissance, measurement, and documentation of existing conditions, historic conditions, and predicted future conditions as they relate to fish and wildlife species population and distribution, and the processes that influence and determine stream habitat. The habitat of an organism is defined by its physical (e.g., velocity, depth, substrate), chemical (e.g., dissolved oxygen, nutrient, and contaminant levels), and biological (e.g., predator-prey, competitive, and symbiotic relationships) characteristics.³ Hence, an assessment of the value, distribution, abundance, and accessibility of stream habitat may include physical, chemical, and/or biological surveys. Which components are evaluated and to what extent depends on project and restoration objectives, site, reach, and watershed conditions, and the scale(s) of analysis. Collecting and analyzing historical data and applying it for restoration purposes is challenging, but it can provide a context for understanding the capacity of the site to produce quality habitat. The Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project⁴ (PSNERP) provides an applied example of how historical assessments can be useful in identifying restoration potential of marine shorelines.

Landuse throughout the watershed directly and indirectly influences habitat conditions, and it may disturb (e.g., noise, artificial light), limit migration (e.g., dams, culverts, levees, tide gates), or create dangerous situations (e.g., roads) for fish and wildlife. Thus, habitat assessments are often conducted in conjunction with landuse, land management, landowner, and infrastructure assessments. Importantly, it can be difficult to establish clear causality between cumulative land use activities,¹ especially with regards to biological response (establishing a link between watershed activities and physical channel response may be more clear). Lag time between action and response can be years or decades, and the greater the lag time, the more opportunity for additional influences to come into play. For example, it may take decades for sediment inputs associated with logging to accumulate in downstream sites⁵.

3.2.1.1 Physical Habitat Assessment

A physical habitat assessment describes the structure and composition of a landscape. Physical habitat assessment is basal to assessing stream habitat restoration efforts because it evaluates the structure being restored directly, it is necessary to support biological assessments, and it is an intrinsic element of setting environmental flows using instream flow methods, which may also be used for physical habitat assessment.⁶ Physical habitat assessment may consist of:

- Documenting physical characteristics of the land and stream such as topography, feature dimensions, soils, stream bed and bank characteristics, channel characteristics

(entrenchment, sinuosity, channel migration zone), vegetation, and drainage basin boundaries, size, and shape.

- Evaluating channel stability. Is the channel actively aggrading or incising?
- Evaluating the abundance, distribution, proximity, condition, and accessibility of various types of habitat. Is there potentially productive habitat that is currently inaccessible because it lies behind levees or upstream of impassible culverts, tide gates, dams, or other stream or floodplain obstructions?
- Documenting landuse, land cover, and infrastructure, including those that place constraints on the channel, floodplain, or habitat-forming processes.
- Documenting the extent, type, and location of direct stream and floodplain modifications (e.g., channel straightening, dredging, diking, armoring, or cleaning; dams; floodplain fill) that have occurred.
- Identifying barriers and constraints to fish and wildlife passage between critical habitats (e.g., culverts, roads, levees, high flow velocities, low flow depths). Are they temporary, partial, or complete barriers?
- Determining physical habitat deficiencies that constrain fish, wildlife, and plant productivity within the stream corridor.

Consider current conditions as well as how each of these characteristics has been altered from historic conditions and how they will change over time if current landuse activities, regulations, and trends continue. Many characteristics vary over time and space in response to variations in climate, geology, vegetation, the frequency, magnitude, type, and proximity of disturbance, and site-, reach-, and watershed-scale processes. Therefore, evaluation of the processes that determine the physical characteristics of an area is an integral component of physical habitat assessment. Principal processes that influence channel morphology and physical habitat conditions include the delivery and routing of:^{7,8,9}

Sediment: Evaluation may include identifying, locating and determining the relative dominance of current sediment sources to the stream (e.g., mass-wasting events, channel incision, bank erosion, surface erosion), predicting where future erosion is likely to occur, evaluating whether individual sources are temporary or long-term, sediment size distribution, suspended sediment concentrations, or the rate of sediment transport to and from the site, reach, or watershed (sediment budget). Consider also how these have been altered from historic conditions and how they will change over time. What are the natural and human causes of changes between historic and current conditions? How is the supply of sediment affected by other controls and processes (e.g., surface runoff, vegetation, stream discharge)? How does the supply of sediment affect other processes (e.g., wood recruitment) and channel stability? Assessments concerning sediment supply and erosion may include inventories of landslides, roads that present a landslide hazard, and surface erosion hazards (e.g., unvegetated or disturbed soil areas),⁷ calculations of road density,⁸ or identification of dams, reservoirs, and instream detention basins that prevent downstream sediment transport. Refer to Chapter 4.6.1, *Sediment Supply*, of this document for information on the function and value of sediment in a stream, potential human impacts to sediment supply and transport, and potential techniques to address those impacts. Refer to the *Sediment Transport* Appendix for further information on evaluating sediment transport.^{7,10}

Water: Evaluation may include determining the rate and timing of discharge to and from (water withdrawals) the stream; the frequency, depth, duration, and extent of floodplain inundation; and the routing and storage of water within the watershed, determining peak flows, dominant flows, and minimum flows, and locating special hydrologic features such as springs and groundwater recharge areas. Is the flow comprised dominantly of surface water or groundwater? Is the watershed subject to rain-on-snow events? Consider also how these have been altered from historic conditions and how they will change over time. What are the natural and human causes of changes between historic and current conditions? How is discharge affected by other controls and processes (e.g., vegetation, fire, floodplain connectivity, channel roughness)? How does discharge affect other processes (e.g., species migration, channel migration, sediment delivery) and channel stability? Assessments concerning stream flow regime may include an evaluation of how the flow regime has been affected by dams, water withdrawals, stormwater drainage networks, wetland drainage and fill, floodplain drainage and fill, land cover changes, stream channel and floodplain modifications, and by increasing amounts of impervious surface in the watershed. Or it may include an assessment of the connectivity of stream channels, floodplains, wetlands, side channels, and other off-channel habitats. How much of the floodplain is no longer accessible to overbank flows? Refer to Chapter 4.6.2, *Flow Regime*, of this document for information on the function and value of water in a stream, potential human impacts to water supply and transport, and potential techniques to address those impacts. Refer to the *Hydrology* Appendix for more information on evaluating watershed hydrology.^{7,8,10}

Organic material (large wood and detritus): Evaluation may include the age, extent, species composition, and distribution of riparian and upland plant communities, or the distribution, abundance, species, and size of large wood in the stream. Consider also how these have been altered from historic conditions and how they will change over time. What are the natural and human causes of changes between historic and current conditions? How is the organic material supplied to the stream affected by other controls and processes (e.g., fire, wind throw, mass wasting, flooding, vegetation)? How does it affect other processes (e.g., sediment storage, scour, channel migration, primary productivity, disturbance, species migration) and channel roughness, gradient, and stability? Assessments concerning organic inputs to the stream may include riparian vegetation and in or near-stream large wood surveys, the history of fire, fire suppression, landslides, bank erosion, flooding, blow down, and other recruitment mechanisms for large wood, the history of stream cleaning, timber harvest, and land cover changes, and inventories of obstructions to large wood transport (e.g., culverts, bridges, dams). Refer to the *Large Wood and Log Jams* technique and the *Riparian Restoration and Management* technique for further information on instream wood and riparian habitat, respectively.^{7,8,10}

Energy (light and heat): Evaluation may include the degree of shade provided to the stream, or the turbidity (as turbidity increases, light penetration decreases), temperature, and flow of the stream, its tributaries, and other natural or artificial discharges to the stream. Consider also how these have been altered from historic conditions and how they will change over time. Is the dominant source of water

to the stream groundwater or surface water? What are the natural and human causes of changes between historic and current conditions? How is the energy supplied to the stream affected by other controls and processes (e.g., vegetation, discharge, hyporheic flow, sediment supply)? How does it affect other processes (e.g., biotic productivity, dissolved oxygen content)? Assessments concerning energy inputs to the stream may include inventories of the temperature, turbidity, and flow regime of the stream and natural and artificial discharges to the stream, the rate and timing of water withdrawals (shallow water heats up faster than deep water), the extent and nature of modified channels (over-wide and flat bottomed channels will have relatively shallow flow), direct measurements of shade or indirect measurements based on the height, extent, species composition, and canopy cover of nearby vegetation that provide shade to the stream. It may also include an inventory of natural and artificial impoundments that allow water to heat up. Does the water released from those impoundments come from the surface of the reservoir (where it will be warmest) or from lower down?

Physical habitat inventories may be conducted at a watershed-, reach-, or site scale. However, evaluation of the processes that create, maintain, and connect those habitats will likely need to occur on a watershed-scale.

3.2.1.2 Chemical Habitat Assessment

The concentration of solutes (substances capable of dissolving in water) in a stream is a major factor in determining the quality of habitat for aquatic organisms and for terrestrial and avian species that drink the water or prey on aquatic species. Some solutes may be beneficial or necessary to support life within a certain range of concentrations (e.g., dissolved oxygen, nutrients) while others have only detrimental impacts above a certain threshold concentration. Where water quality is impaired, restoration of physical habitat in the absence of water quality improvement measures will provide minimal benefit, if any.

Chemical habitat assessment may include:^{8,10}

- Monitoring water quality. Are the surface water quality standards described in WAC173-201A being met? If not, how often and under what conditions are they out of compliance?
- Identifying the source, fate, and transport pathways for solutes of interest. As solutes are derived from numerous natural and anthropogenic sources, evaluation of land use activities within the watershed may be a necessary component of chemical habitat assessment. How have changes in land cover, land use, hydromodification, stream and floodplain modifications, and legal and illegal effluent discharges to the stream altered the source, fate, and transport of pollutants? Documenting current and historic escapement levels of anadromous fish may be necessary in streams deficient in marine-derived nutrients supplied by anadromous fish carcasses.
- Monitoring streamflow, which directly influences the concentration of solutes in the stream.
- Defining any associations between water quality and the present condition of species in an area. Is water quality a limiting factor to fish, wildlife, and plant productivity within the stream corridor?

- Determining how water quality is affected by other controls and ecosystem processes (e.g., mass wasting, flooding, stream flow, shade, vegetation, soils).
- Identifying beneficial uses that are dependent on water quality (e.g., fish and wildlife species that dwell in or drink from the stream, near-shore, or marine environment; fish, wildlife, and people that consume fish and wildlife that dwell in or drink from the stream, near-shore, or marine environment; drinking water; irrigation water, swimming).

Consider current conditions as well as how each of these characteristics has been altered from historic conditions and how they will change over time if current landuse activities, regulations, and trends continue. Refer to Chapter 4.6.7, *Water Quality*, of this document for information on potential human impacts to water quality, and potential techniques to address those impacts.

Chemical assessment can be conducted at the watershed, reach, or site scale. Impairments to water quality can be expressed as a function of the catchment area above the sample site. Because water quality varies with flow and with processes that influence the supply, transport, and fate of solutes in a stream, the frequency and timing of measurement is one of the biggest determinants of the value of the data, no matter what scale of assessment is conducted.

3.2.1.3 Biological Habitat Assessment

Biological assessments should be conducted as an ecosystem assessment. Too frequently, biological assessments are focused on single species, single life history stages, or limited geographic distribution. To the extent possible, assessments should include multiple species, life histories, and spatial extents to achieve restoration project objectives while minimizing impacts to non-target species. Biological assessment may include:^{10,11}

- Determining the relative abundance and distribution of species present in, or dependent upon, the stream corridor, including identification of threatened or endangered species, native and non-native species, resident and migratory species.
- Identifying species that have been extirpated.
- Identifying biotic invaders that may impede or preclude recovery.¹
- Measuring the age, size, growth rate, and condition of species present. Condition may refer to physical ailments or abnormalities, the presence of parasites or pathogens, or to the genetic integrity of stocks. What factors are responsible for this condition?
- Documenting the life histories of species, including how and when they use different parts of a stream network (the needs of the individual species may vary from season to season and from year to year).
- Determining interactions among species present, including dependency (e.g., predator/prey, parasitic, or symbiotic relationships) and competition among species for available habitat or resources.
- Documenting current and historical hatchery and harvest management influences.

Consider current conditions as well as how each of these characteristics has been altered from historic conditions and how they will change over time if current landuse activities, regulations, and trends continue. Because people, pets, and livestock also make up part of the biological community, their proximity and role as predator, prey, and disturber of fish and wildlife, should be evaluated as part of a biological assessment.

Biological assessment can be conducted at the watershed-, reach-, or site-scale, depending on the assessment goals. Certain objectives require large-scale analysis. Such analysis may go beyond the watershed to encompass entire flyways (e.g., migratory birds) or marine and near-shore environments (e.g., anadromous fish).

3.2.2 *Determining the Scale of Assessment*

Information gleaned from an assessment varies with the scale of analysis. Information from multiple scales complements one another. Habitat assessment at a site or reach scale may reveal the effects of impacts to watershed-scale processes. Similarly, limitations to habitat potential at the site or reach scale may identify watershed assessment needs. For instance, a decrease in the abundance of pool and cover habitat within a particular stream reach may trigger a watershed assessment of instream wood, riparian vegetation, and sediment supply to determine the root cause of the change. Broader scales of analysis allow individual sites, issues, and concerns to be viewed in a larger context,¹⁰ increasing the likelihood of identifying and addressing core problems and fully assessing how a potential project will impact, respond to, and function within the landscape. Unless a problem, its cause, and its potential treatment impacts are clearly limited to a specific site (e.g., water quality degradation immediately downstream of an industrial discharge pipe), focus on restoration of individual sites is only appropriate after developing some understanding of how those sites fit within the broader landscape.⁸ A watershed analysis that identifies broader ecosystem problems is recommended prior to initiating isolated restoration activities, though such analyses do not necessarily need to be extremely detailed or costly.

Even watershed assessments can be conducted at multiple scales. A watershed-scale assessment extends from the mouth of the stream to the upstream reaches of its drainage basin. Because the watershed of a small tributary stream is nested within the watersheds of successive larger streams, watershed-scale assessments may mean different things to different people. Its focus may be limited to the tributary or it may encompass the entire river basin including the main-stem and all tributaries. The size of watershed included in an assessment varies with the study objectives, topics to be addressed, and the physical, biological, and social complexity of the system¹⁰. A site or reach-specific problem, such as water quality concerns or insufficient instream cover or pool habitat for resident aquatic species, requires an assessment only of the local watershed to determine the cause of the problem, though risks and benefits to habitat and infrastructure associated with proposed treatments should also be considered as the effects of individual projects may extend up- or down-stream. Other topics, such as fish and wildlife population studies, or limiting factors for the productivity of migratory fish and wildlife species (e.g., migratory waterfowl, anadromous fish species) require assessment at larger scales, and may include the marine and nearshore environments.

Reid¹ provides a comprehensive description and evaluation of a number of approaches and procedures for watershed assessment, ranging from “ad hoc” approaches that focus on specific issues in specific areas to broad watershed analyses that seek to understand watershed conditions and identify issues of concern. She describes two of the most widely accepted and implemented watershed assessment procedures that are applied in Washington State:

*Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale: Federal Guide for Watershed Analysis.*¹⁰ This guide was completed under the direction of the Regional Interagency Executive Committee and the Intergovernmental Advisory

Committee, representing multiple federal agencies. It describes a 6-step process that focuses on seven core analysis topics (erosion processes, hydrology, vegetation, stream channel, water quality, species and habitats, and human uses) as well as specific problems or concerns identified in the watershed. Analysis teams identify and describe ecological processes of greatest concern, establish how well or poorly those processes are functioning, and determine the conditions under which management activities, including restoration, should and should not take place. The analysis itself is not prescriptive, but it provides the objective background information from which later management decisions and environmental impact assessments can be based. This analysis has a broad scope, capable of providing information to evaluate a range of land use issues.

*Standard Methodology for Conducting Watershed Analysis Manual, Version 5.0.*¹² This method was developed by a multitude of state agencies, tribes, members of the forest products industry, small private landowners, and environmental groups who were participating or otherwise involved in the Timber, Fish, and Wildlife Agreement. The assessment method presented is stepped and iterative, consisting of two parts—resource assessment and management prescription. A series of key questions provides a framework to develop information and interpret the condition and sensitivity of public resources within the watershed, including fish habitat (salmonid emphasis), water quality, water supply, and public works. These findings then feed into a prescription process where local land managers and agencies develop a tailored forest management plan for the watershed that responds to the identified resource concerns. The manual also includes modules that describe how to evaluate mass wasting, surface erosion, hydrologic change, riparian function, fish habitat, water quality, and public capital improvements. The procedure currently focuses on impacts to aquatic habitat. Terrestrial habitat may be addressed at a later date.

Two watershed assessment methodologies developed in Washington State since Reid's publication¹³ include:

*State of Washington Guidance on Watershed Assessment for Salmon.*⁹ The Joint Natural Resources Cabinet, representing multiple state and tribal agencies and planning councils, developed this document. The guidance provided is oriented towards identifying problems and issues in salmon recovery for specific watersheds. It presents three stages of watershed assessment: 1) Habitat Conditions--what habitat conditions are limiting salmon production? 2) Causes of Conditions--what processes or land uses are causing the habitat conditions?, and 3) Salmon Response to Conditions--what linkages exist between salmon and habitat conditions? Successive stages of assessment build on one another and support increasingly complex issues and decisions with regards to habitat preservation and restoration. Though the focus of the document is on salmon habitat, products may have broader application. The guidance does not explain how to assess various parameters, however, it contains an appendix that lists the various types of assessment that may be necessary and their relation to existing statewide information sources.

*Enhancing Transportation Project Delivery Through Watershed Characterization: Methods and SR522 Case Study. Review Draft Report to the Transportation Permit Efficiency and Accountability Committee.*⁸ The Watershed-Based Mitigation Subcommittee, created by Washington's Environmental Permit Streamlining Act in 2001, developed this report. It summarizes a scientific framework and set of procedures being developed at multiple watershed scales to identify and prioritize sites having potential to mitigate for transportation impacts. The framework consists of three parts: 1) Project site assessment – understanding the transportation project's potential environmental impacts, 2) Watershed characterization and cumulative impact assessment – characterizing effects of land use on ecological processes and aquatic and terrestrial resources, and 3) Identify and assess potential sites – ranking potential mitigation sites and selecting the preferred mitigation site. Each part includes a series of generalized steps that form the scientific framework for watershed characterization. Recovery efforts focus on recovery of ecosystem processes that create and maintain habitat in order to maximize the environmental benefit and longevity of mitigation activities.

The following is not a watershed assessment. However, when applied at a watershed scale, it can be used to rapidly identify stream reaches that appear to be functioning well and are candidates for protection and preservation, and those that are functioning poorly and require further review and assessment to reveal the cause of impairment and identify potential remedies.

*Process for Assessing Proper Functioning Condition (PFC).*¹⁴ PFC, first developed by the Bureau of Land Management, was adopted by all other federal land management agencies. It is a qualitative assessment system used to evaluate how the stream is handling the energy flowing through it. Assessment is based on hydrology and geomorphology, riparian vegetation, and soils. It results in a classification of streams, reach by reach, as exhibiting “proper functioning condition”, “functional, but at risk”, “nonfunctional”, or “unknown”. Non-functional stream reaches are those that lack adequate vegetation, landform, or large wood to dissipate stream energy, indicative that the channel itself or the processes that create, maintain, and connect habitat within such reaches have likely been altered from historic conditions. The strength of PFC lies in its relatively rapid application.

Each of the watershed assessment methods described above was developed with specific objectives in mind. Despite their differences, they share a common philosophy that:¹

1. General patterns exhibited through a watershed are more important to consider than specific details.
2. Understanding of interactions among watershed components and processes is more important than understanding of the individual components.
3. Qualitative descriptions and order-of-magnitude estimates are often of greater value than precise numbers.

The choice of which watershed analysis to use depends on the problems being addressed and the objectives of the assessment.¹ Planners are encouraged to review the inherent assumptions, potential application, limitations, and required time, cost, and expertise of a procedure, as well as the utility prior to making a selection.

Conducting an assessment costs time and money, both of which increase with the number of parameters studied, the level of detail required to describe each parameter (e.g., quantitative vs. qualitative analysis), and the geographic extent of the study. Limited resources may limit the scope and scale of assessment. But the cost and time associated with assessment must be weighed against the amount and type of data necessary to provide meaningful results. The success of an assessment is measured by its utility to decision makers and resource specialists applying the results.¹⁰

Where available time and funding for watershed assessment is limited, it may be appropriate to limit its scope to that necessary to plan, design, and implement low risk restoration activities that offer a high likelihood of success. Roni et al.⁷ reviewed the effectiveness of various restoration methods for improving salmonid habitat. Results, summarized in **Table 3.1**, suggest the highest likelihood of success is associated with preserving high quality habitat; reconnecting isolated high quality instream, floodplain, and estuary habitats that are currently inaccessible as a result of barrier culverts, dams, levees, or other artificial structures; and restoring ecosystem processes and controls through projects such as road abandonment and improvement, and riparian restoration. With that in mind, if a full culvert assessment has not been done in a low gradient watershed, a culvert assessment might be a good place to start. In watersheds with a history of mass wasting and identified sedimentation concerns, consider conducting a mass wasting assessment. In an area subject to urban growth, identification and assessment of undeveloped riparian zones and floodplains that can be acquired represents important opportunities that may soon be lost. Information from similar watersheds, in conjunction with the help of professional scientists and resource managers with previous experience in the region can play an important role in prioritizing watershed assessment efforts, when prioritization is necessary. Areas with similar geology, geography, landuse, and climate often have similar needs for restoration.

Table 3.1. Typical response time, duration, variability in success, and probability of success of common restoration techniques. Adapted from Beechie et al.¹⁵ as modified from Roni et al.⁷

Restoration type ^a	Specific Action	Years to achieve response	Longevity of action (years)	Variability of success among projects	Probability of success
Reconnect Habitats	Culverts	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
	Off channel	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
	Estuarine	5-20	10-50+	Moderate	Moderate to High
	Instream Flows	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
Roads and land use	Road removal	5-20	Decades to centuries	Low	High
	Road alteration	5-20	Decades to centuries	Moderate	Moderate to high
	Change in land use	10+	Decades to centuries	Unknown	Unknown
Riparian restoration	Fencing	5-20	10-50+	Low	Moderate to high
	Riparian replanting	5-20	10-50+	Low	Moderate to high
	Rest-rotation or grazing strategy	5-20	10-50+	Moderate	Moderate
	Conifer conversion	10-100	Centuries	High	Low to moderate
Instream habitat restoration	Artificial log structures	1-5	5-20	High	Low to High ^b
	Natural LWD placement	1-5	5-20	High	Low to High ^b
	Artificial log jams	1-5	10-50+	Moderate	Low to High ^b
	Boulder placement	1-5	5-20	Moderate	Low to High ^b
	Gabions	1-5	10	Moderate	Low to High ^b
Nutrient enrichment	Carcass placement	1-5	Unknown	Low	Moderate to high
	Stream fertilization	1-5	Unknown	Moderate	Moderate to high
Habitat creation	Off channel	1-5	10-50+	High	Moderate
	Estuarine	5-10	10-50+	High	Low
	Instream	See various instream restoration techniques above			

Where sustained long-term funding is available, assessments may be incremental, with efforts focusing on new sub-basins within a watershed, or issues and effects not previously assessed. However, it is important to integrate incremental assessments with previous information to get a better handle on the cumulative effects and cause and effect relationships between physical, chemical, and biotic processes operating at a watershed scale.

The following considerations are recommended when determining the necessary scope and scale of assessment for restoration and project planning:

Restoration Planning:

- What are your assessment goals? Is there a particular issue you are trying to address (e.g., elevated nitrogen and low dissolved oxygen concentrations in the nearshore environment) or is your objective to identify and prioritize issues and restoration/management initiatives in the watershed? Is your objective restricted to project-specific reconnaissance?
-

- How much is already known about the stream, its watershed, and the fish and wildlife that it supports? Have other studies been conducted such that the proposed assessment is unnecessary or its scope can be limited to avoid redundancy of effort? Can the current assessment fill critical data gaps identified in previous analyses?
- Are other restoration projects likely to occur in the watershed that can benefit from the assessment? Encourage and pursue opportunities for coordinated and cooperative analysis efforts.¹⁰ Because watershed analysis promotes the long-term viability of an overall restoration strategy, it may be practical to pursue cost-sharing of assessment among numerous smaller projects.
- What is the spatial and temporal scale of the problem? Is it localized or system-wide?
- What is the spatial and temporal scale of the cause of the problem? Keep in mind that limitations to habitat potential at the site or reach scale may sometimes be explained only by assessing watershed-scale processes. The scale of assessment should match the scale of the underlying cause of the problem if it is to be correctly identified and addressed. For instance, sedimentation of spawning gravels resulting from watershed-wide land use impacts will require watershed assessment to identify dominant sources and prioritize potential remedies.
- What funds are available to conduct an assessment? Could the cost be shared among multiple projects and stakeholders? Could the scope or scale of assessment be modified to attract more funding?

Project Planning:

- What factors and conditions will influence the success or failure of the project?
- What are the nature and scale of impacts associated with the proposed project? What are the possible impacts (including unintentional impacts) to habitat, infrastructure, and fish, wildlife, and human life? How far reaching will those impacts be? What is the likelihood of their occurrence?
- What is the risk of, and associated with, project failure? What is the nature and scale of impacts to habitat, infrastructure, and fish, wildlife, and human life if the project should fail? What is the likelihood of project failure? Many projects have a high risk of failure when the watershed processes and conditions are not well understood. Higher risk projects warrant higher levels of assessment.
- What are the risks associated with a delay of project implementation during the time necessary to conduct an assessment (e.g., further habitat degradation or species extinction)? Studies may take years to accomplish effectively, during which time valuable resources may be lost.

3.2.3 Special Case Assessments – Urban Streams

Urban streams provide unique challenges to restoration and assessment efforts. Water chemistry, physical habitat characteristics, and riparian vegetation have been discussed in previous sections of this chapter as important considerations in stream habitat assessments. However, urban streams are uniquely influenced by the source, rate and timing of stream flow (Konrad and Booth 2005¹⁶). Impervious surfaces, including roads, can direct precipitation away from natural drainages and magnify the amount of water that reaches the channel by reducing or preventing soil infiltration rates. Resulting increased stream flows during storm events can cause down-

cutting of the channel bed and coarsening of stream substrates. During summer months, less ground water is available to the stream because ground water storage during winter months is retarded. Biotic responses to these changes can result in decreased fish and aquatic insect production. Additionally, urban streams more commonly have armored stream banks than non-urban streams, which can exacerbate stream flow effects on fish and fish habitat.

3.2.4 Limitations of Assessments

Assessment, on any scale, can provide valuable insight into the conditions and issues of concern in a watershed and the underlying cause of those conditions. However, the ability of an assessment to accurately and fully reveal an understanding of what's going on in the watershed, and to provide meaningful results can be limited by any number of constraints. Nevertheless, narrowing the number and significance of assessment uncertainties can improve restoration project performance. Some limitations of assessments include :

- Property ownership and access may limit the area of study. Contact with landowners early in the process with an outline of assessment objects can be helpful in accomplishing habitat assessments while meeting landowner needs. Also, assessments that feature partnerships with local restoration groups, such as Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups (RFEG's), tribes, Lead Entities, or County extension services may be helpful to some landowners.
- The type and resolution of data collected may be limited by time, money, or the limited objectives of those conducting the assessment. Although they may not match your assessment objectives, existing assessments conducted for a similar purpose or in a representative location or scale may supplement limited assessment capabilities.
- Most of our understanding of restoration project success (and failure) comes from case-study assessments. Due to large variations among restoration projects and their site conditions, aquatic habitat response to these actions is highly variable. Although among the least desirable monitoring tools, narrative discussions of project effectiveness at the site scale can be incorporated into all restoration projects. Even anecdotal information should be conveyed in a public forum, such as the Lead Entity Habitat Work Schedule (refer to Chapter 1), so that others can continue to understand how their project's effectiveness can be maximized. No single discipline covers the many influencing variables that are involved in restoration project planning, and thus, assessments are improved when they involve an interdisciplinary team of professionals.
- Rare events that occurred in the past or elsewhere in the watershed may influence sites a considerable distance downstream, many years or even decades later. Consequently, the temporal and spatial scope of analysis should be sufficient to identify remote or historic influences.
- Lack of historical records may limit our understanding of past conditions. In many areas of Washington, aerial photos date to the 1930's. Local or state libraries and historical societies are often productive sources of these valuable resources.
- The quality, accuracy, and precision of data are dependent upon the knowledge and skill of those collecting and interpreting the data. Training is essential to minimize human error and ensure consistent application of data collection methods.
- The quality, accuracy, and resolution of data are influenced by the tools and methods employed for data collection.

3.3 Assessment Methodologies

Several resources exist that provide comprehensive guidance and instruction in how to conduct an assessment of stream habitat for restoration purposes. As discussed previously, a basic issue for stream habitat assessments lies in deciding the level of detail needed for a worthwhile yet cost-effective assessment. Approaches range from rapid assessment methods that involve reconnaissance-level surveys to more complex appraisals. Based on the Conducting Assessment section (3.2), a robust assessment should touch on the physical, chemical and biotic elements of habitat. In this synoptic introduction to assessment methodologies, some approaches collectively integrating these habitat elements are introduced here, and assessment resources that address individual habitat elements are introduced in the following subsections.

Despite their name, integrated approaches have foci that range from narrow to broad, so their use depends on project-specific needs. For example, the USGS National Water-Quality Assessment Program^{17,18} characterizes stream habitat in an integrated physical, chemical, and biological context, but its goal is to relate these habitat factors specifically to describing water-quality conditions. Evaluation is based on a spatially hierarchical framework that incorporates habitat data at basin, segment, reach, and microhabitat scales. This framework provides a basis for consistency in collection techniques while allowing flexibility in assessment within individual study units. Procedures are described for collecting habitat data at basin and stream segment scales that encompass use of GIS databases, maps, and aerial photographs.

On the broader end of the spectrum are different iterations of watershed analysis, several of which were discussed in section 3.2.2. Watershed analysis is a procedure used to characterize the human, aquatic, riparian, and terrestrial features, conditions, processes, and interactions (collectively referred to as “ecosystem elements”) within a watershed.¹⁹ One of its original uses was one of the principal analyses for implementing the Aquatic Conservation Strategy set forth in the Northwest Forest Plan.²⁰ In Washington State, its primary use has been to develop a forest practices plan for individual Watershed Administrative Units.²¹ In general, a watershed analysis approach may be beyond what is needed for assessment on a restoration project, but many aspects of watershed analysis can be quite useful in restoration project assessment. The state of Oregon uses Watershed Assessment,²² which is similar to watershed analysis.

A number of other excellent watershed-based integrative analysis approaches exist, but some are focused on specific targets, such as salmon and salmon habitat. Some good examples of the latter are the river basin analysis of the Skagit and Samish Basins that was developed by The Habitat Restoration and Protection Committee of the Skagit Watershed Council,²³ the ecosystem planning and recovery document developed for listed salmon by Beechie and colleagues,²⁴ and the ecosystem approach to salmonid conservation by Spence and colleagues.²⁵ If one chooses an integrative analysis for assessment, whether such an analysis assesses over a broad wildlife brush, is salmon-specific, or focuses on other stream-associated wildlife should be a primary consideration in assessment choice.

3.3.1.1 Physical Habitat Assessment

Similar to integrative assessment methods, methods that focus exclusively on assessment of the physical habitat exhibit a large range in complexity and cost. Rapid assessment methods, which involve reconnaissance level surveys (such as the habitat mapping approach) identifying,

mapping and measuring key habitat features over long stretches of river in a relatively short space of time, are tools that have been developed by EPA²⁶. Diverse intermediate levels of assessment also exist^{27,28} and more complex appraisals, such as the Physical Habitat Simulation System (PHABSIM),²⁹ require more detailed data on microhabitat variation in flow.^{30,31} A key aspect of assessing the physical habitat of streams is basing them on biologically meaningful features to enable a connection that aids evaluating the biological integrity of the stream (see section 3.3.1.3).

3.3.1.2 Chemical Habitat Assessment

Chemical habitat assessment of streams addresses diverse water quality parameters. Similar to other aspects of assessment, the detail with which chemical habitat assessments can be done varies enormously. The National Water-Quality Assessment Program (NWQAP)³² provides an excellent structure to enable understanding the chemical and spatial diversity in stream sampling for diverse assessments. Discussed are sampling structures for what are termed Basic versus Intensive Sites. Basic Sites involve measurement of general water quality parameters (dissolved oxygen (DO), pH and alkalinity, specific conductance, and temperature), suspended sediments, and major constituents (dissolved solids, major ions and metals, nutrients, and organic carbon). In contrast, Intensive Sites, besides the water quality parameters measured at Basic Sites, include measurement of a diverse suite of contaminants (herbicides, pesticides, etc.), contaminant derivatives, and other compounds. The choice of what water quality parameters to measure will be project-specific and dependent on *a priori* knowledge of anticipated inputs to the stream, costs, and other conditions. For these reasons, the number of parameters measured at Basic Sites, the number of Basic Sites sampled, and whether or not measurement of any Intensive Sites are even used will also depend on the project. Lastly, a number of water quality parameters, such as temperature and dissolved oxygen, are temporally labile, so careful attention needs to be paid to what kind of temporal profile is needed to measure labile parameters.

3.3.1.3 Biological Habitat Assessment

Chemical habitat assessments are diverse, but approaches to biological habitat assessment are even more so, largely because of the combination of biotic diversity and its spatial complexity. The book edited by Rosenberg and Resh is a particularly useful tool.³³ Macroinvertebrates are favorite target biological habitat assessments in streams, in part because both their numbers and their diversity allow much better assessment resolution than any vertebrates and in part because they can be targeted even in streams lacking fishes. The approaches to sampling them for the purpose of biological assessments are diverse. Rapid assessment approaches for sampling macroinvertebrates are numerous as well,³⁴ and contrasts of the advantages and disadvantages of different rapid assessment methods have been done.³⁵ Also, the Washington Department of Ecology has an established protocol for macroinvertebrate assessment in rivers and streams.³⁶ Biological assessments using fish assemblages have been developed,³⁷ and can be useful under selected circumstances as long as sampling is spatially and temporally adequate. Using fish in biological assessments is often more costly than using macroinvertebrates and as indicated above, they cannot be used where fish are absent. Use of other groups, such as amphibians, may be useful under selected circumstances, but stream-associated amphibians have restricted distributions that prohibit their widespread use, and they suffer from many of the same problems as sampling fishes, often to a greater degree. Suggested Sources of Data and Information.

When conducting an assessment, always start with existing information and previous watershed assessments and inventories to avoid duplicating efforts. Most watersheds in Washington State have undergone previous assessment and restoration planning. However, the scope, scale, or quality of the assessment may be inadequate for some purposes. Considerable data may exist for many components of the assessment. Other components may require considerable original field data collection and data from remote sources. Be aware that the scale and scope of assessment is greatly influenced by the objectives of those conducting it. For instance, methods employed and data collected during a reach assessment that evaluates channel migration over time will differ from that collected during a reach assessment of available pool habitat, large wood, spawning redd counts, or dissolved oxygen levels. Assessments conducted at a site level will likely be highly project specific as site assessments are conducted primarily for the purpose of implementing a project.

Besides published assessments, a wealth of publicly available information exists that may be useful. These include, but are not limited to:

- Air photos
- GIS maps
- Satellite photos
- Historic records
- USGS stream gage and water quality data (also available from the Washington Department of Ecology)
- Landslide and unstable slope information (available from the Department of Natural Resources)
- Fish passage barrier data (available from WDFW)
- Reach-scale gradient and confinement data (available from the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission and WDFW)
- Fish distribution maps and GIS data (available from the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission and WDFW)
- Previous restoration efforts (from the Recreation and Conservation Office)
- Current conservation and restoration planning efforts (available from local government offices and Lead Entity organizations – see WDFW for a map of these resources)
- Literature search
- Priority habitat species maps (available from WDFW)
- Anecdotal information. Speak with local city, county, and agency experts (biologists, geomorphologists, historians, etc) and landowners

The quality of information directly influences its utility. Therefore, those conducting an assessment should consider the following factors before using such information:⁹

- Are the data relevant to the assessment question or issue being addressed?
- Are the data compatible with other relevant analyses?
- Are the data of an appropriate age?
- Are the data of sufficient quality?

Consider the accuracy, completeness, data collection, handling, and analysis methods prior to

conducting assessments.

We strongly encourage those conducting watershed, reach, or site assessments to make the results of their work publicly available so that others may benefit and build upon them.

3.4 References

3.4.1 Additional Reading

Abbe, T.B., and D.R. Montgomery. 1996. Large woody debris jams, channel hydraulics and habitat formation in large rivers. *Regulated Rivers: Research and Management* 12:201-221.

Bilby, R.E., and J.W. Ward. 1989. Changes in characteristics and function of woody debris with increasing size of streams in western Washington. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 118:368-378.

Church, M. 1992. Channel Morphology and Typology, pp. 126–143. *In*: P. Calow and G.E. Petts (editors). *The Rivers Handbook, Vol. 1*. Blackwell Scientific Publications Ltd, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Gordon, N.D., T.A. McMahon., B. L. Finlayson, C.J. Gippel, and R.J. Nathan. 2004. *Stream Hydrology: An Introduction for Ecologists, 2nd edition* John Wiley & Sons, England. 429 pp.

Knighton, D. 1998. *Fluvial Forms and Processes: A New Perspective*. Edward Arnold, London, England. 383 pp.

Knighton, D., and G.C. Nanson. 1993. Anastomosis and the continuum of channel pattern. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 18:613-625.

Leopold, L.B., M.G. Wolman, and J.P. Miller. 1964. *Fluvial Processes in Geomorphology*. W.H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco, California. 522 pp.

Makaske, B. 2001. Anastomosing rivers: a review of their classification, origin, and sedimentary products. *Earth-Science Reviews* 53:149-196.

Montgomery, D.R., G. Grant, and K. Sullivan. 1995. Watershed analysis as a framework for implementing ecosystem management. *Water Resources Bulletin* 31(3):369-386.

Mount, J.F. 1995. *California Rivers and Streams the Conflict between Fluvial Process and Land Use*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California. 376 pp.

Moody, J.A., and B.M. Troutman. 2000. Quantitative model of the growth of floodplains by vertical accretion. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 25:115-113.

Naiman, R., and R.E. Bilby (editors). 1998. *River Ecology and Management: Lessons from the Pacific Coastal Ecoregion*. Springer-Verlag, New York, New York. 477 pp.

Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP). 2010.
<http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/>

Rapp, C.F., and T.B. Abbe. 2003. *A Framework for the Delineation of Channel Migration Zone*. Publication # 03-06-027. Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, Washington. 139 pp.

3.4.2 Cited References

¹ Reid, L.M. 1998. Cumulative watershed effects and watershed analysis, pp. 476-501 *In*: Naiman, R.J., and R.E. Bilby (editors), *River Ecology and Management – Lessons from the Pacific Coastal Ecoregion*. Springer-Verlag, Inc., New York.

² Montgomery, D. R., and J. M. Buffington. 1998. Channel processes, classification, and response, pp. 13-42 *In*: Naiman, R.J., and R.E. Bilby (editors), *River Ecology and Management – Lessons from the Pacific Coastal Ecoregion*. Springer-Verlag, Inc., New York.

³ Cowx, I.G., and R.L. Welcomme. 1998. *Rehabilitation of Rivers for Fish*. Fishing News Books, Blackwell Science, Oxford, United Kingdom. 260 pp.

⁴ Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP). 2011.
<http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/index.htm>

⁵ Madej, M.A., and V. Ozaki. 1996. Channel response to sediment wave propagation and movement, Redwood Creek, California. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 21:911-927.

⁶ Maddock, I. 1999. The importance of physical habitat assessment for evaluating river health. *Freshwater Biology* 41(2): 373-391.

⁷ Roni, P., T.J. Beechie, R.E. Bilby, F.E. Leonetti, M.M. Pollock, and G.R. Pess. 2002. A Review of Stream Restoration Techniques and a Hierarchical Strategy for Prioritizing Restoration in Pacific Northwest Watersheds. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 22:1-20.

⁸ Gersib, R.A., A. Wald, T. Hilliard, R. Schanz, L. Driscoll, A. Perez, J. Franklin, B. Aberle. 2003. *Enhancing Transportation Project Delivery Through Watershed Characterization: Methods and SR522 Case Study*. Review Draft Report to the Transportation Permit Efficiency and Accountability Committee. Washington Departments of Transportation and Ecology. Olympia, Washington. 104 pp. www.wsdot.wa.gov/environment/streamlineact/watershed.htm

⁹ Joint Natural Resources Cabinet. 2001. *Guidance on Watershed Assessment for Salmon*. Governor's Salmon Recovery Office, Olympia, Washington. 54 pp.

¹⁰ Regional Ecosystem Office. 1995. *Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale: Federal Guide for Watershed Analysis, Version 2.2*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Portland, Oregon. 26 pp.

-
- ¹¹ Kauffman, J.B., R.L. Beschta, N. Otting, and D. Lytjen. 1997. An ecological perspective of riparian and stream restoration in the western United States. *Fisheries* 22(5):12-24.
- ¹² Washington Forest Practices Board. 2011. *Board manual: Standard methodology for conducting watershed analysis, version 5.0*. Washington Forest Practices Board, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, Washington. 125 pp. + appendices
- ¹³ Reid, L.M. 1998. Cumulative watershed effects and watershed analysis, pp. 476-501 *In*: Naiman, R.J., and R.E. Bilby (editors), *River Ecology and Management – Lessons from the Pacific Coastal Ecoregion*. Springer-Verlag, Inc., New York.
- ¹⁴ U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. 1993. *Riparian Area Management: Process for Assessing Proper Functioning Condition*. Technical Reference 1737-9. Denver, Colorado. 51 pp.
- ¹⁵ Beechie, T.J., E.A. Steel, P.R. Roni, and E. Quimby (editors). 2003. *Ecosystem recovery planning for listed salmon: an integrated assessment approach for salmon habitat*. US Department of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-58. 269 pp.
- ¹⁶ Konrad, C.P., and D.B. Booth. 2005, Hydrologic changes in urban streams and their ecological significance, pp. 157-177. *In*: Brown, L.R., R.H. Gray, R.M. Hughes, and M.R. Meador (editors), *Effects of Urbanization on Stream Ecosystems*. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 47, Bethesda, Maryland.
- ¹⁷ Meador, M.R., C.R. Hupp, T.E. Cuffney, and M.E. Gurtz. 1993. Methods for characterizing stream habitat as part of the National Water-Quality Assessment Program. US Geological Survey Open-File Report,93-408, Earth Science Information Center, Denver, Colorado. 48 pp.
- ¹⁸ Fitzpatrick, F.A., J.R. Waite, P.J. D'Arconte, M.R. Meador, M.A. Maupin, and M.E. Gurtz. 1998. Revised Methods for Characterizing Stream Habitat in the National Water Quality Assessment Program. Water Resources Investigations Report 98-4052, U.S. Geological Survey, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- ¹⁹ RIEC (Regional Interagency Executive Committee) and IAC (Intergovernmental Advisory Committee). 1995. *Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale: Federal Guide for Watershed Analysis, Version 2.2*. Regional Interagency Executive Committee and Intergovernmental Advisory Committee, Regional Ecosystem Office, Portland Oregon. 26 pp.
- ²⁰ USDA and USDI. 1994. *Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl; Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl*. U.S. Department of Agriculture; U.S. Department of the Interior, Portland, Oregon.
- ²¹ Washington Forest Practices Board. 2011. *Board manual: Standard methodology for conducting watershed analysis, version 5.0*. Washington Forest Practices Board, Washington

Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, Washington. 125 pp. + appendices

²² Watershed Professionals Network. 1999. *Oregon watershed assessment manual*. Prepared for the Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board, Salem, Oregon. I-1 to XI-15 pp. + appendices

²³ Habitat Restoration and Protection Committee, Skagit Watershed Council. 1999. *Application of the Skagit Watershed Council's strategy: river basin analysis of the Skagit and Samish basins – tools for salmon habitat restoration and protection*. Skagit Watershed Council, Mount Vernon, Washington. 80 pp.

²⁴ Beechie, T.J., E.A. Steel, P.R. Roni, and E. Quimby (editors). 2003. *Ecosystem recovery planning for listed salmon: an integrated assessment approach for salmon habitat*. US Department of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-58. 269 pp.

²⁵ Spence, B. C., G. A. Lomnický, R. M. Hughes, and R. P. Novitzki. 1996. *An ecosystem approach to salmonid conservation*. ManTech Environmental Research Services, TR-4501-96-6057, Corvallis, Oregon.

²⁶ Barbour, M.T., J. Gerritsen, B.D. Snyder, and J.B. Stribling. 1999. Chapter 5. Habitat Assessment and Physicochemical Parameters, pp. 5-1 to 5-34. In: *Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Wadeable Rivers: Periphyton, Benthic Macroinvertebrates and Fish, Second Edition*. EPA/841/B-99/002. US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.

²⁷ Kaufmann, P.R., P. Levine, E.G. Robison, C. Seeliger, and D.V. Peck. 1999. *Quantifying stream habitat in wadeable streams*. US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. EPA/620/R-99/003. 102 pp. + appendices

²⁸ Kaufmann, P.R. and E.G. Robison. 1998. Physical Habitat Characterization, pp. 77-118 In: J.M. Lazorchak, D.J. Klemm and D.V. Peck (editors). *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program -- Surface Waters: Field Operations and Methods for Measuring the Ecological Condition of Wadeable Streams*. US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. EPA/620/R-94/004F.

²⁹ Waddle, T.J. (editor). 2001. *PHABSIM for Windows: User's Manual and Exercises*. US Geological Survey, Fort Collins, Colorado. 288 pp.

³⁰ Shuler, S.W., and R.B. Nehring. 1993. Using the physical habitat simulation model to evaluate a stream habitat enhancement project. *Rivers* 4(3):175-193.

³¹ Booker, D.J. and M.J. Dunbar. 2004. Application of physical habitat simulation (PHABSIM) modelling to modified urban river channels. *River Research and Applications* 20(2):167-183.

-
- ³² Shelton, L.R. 1994. Field guide for collecting and processing stream-water samples for the National Water-Quality Assessment Program. Open-File Report 94-455, US Geological Survey, Sacramento, California.
- ³³ Rosenberg, D.M., and V.H. Resh. 1993. *Introduction to freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates*. Chapman and Hall, New York.
- ³⁴ Resh, V.H., and J.K. Jackson. 1993. Rapid assessment approaches to biomonitoring using macroinvertebrates, pp. 195-233. *In*: D. M. Rosenberg and V. H. Resh (editors). *Freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates*. Chapman and Hall, London.
- ³⁵ Growns, J.E., B.C. Chessman, J.E. Jackson, and D.G. Ross. 1997. Rapid assessment of Australian Rivers using macroinvertebrates: Cost and efficiency of 6 methods of sample Processing. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 16(3):682-693.
- ³⁶ Plotnikoff, R.W., and C. Wiseman. 2001. *Benthic Macroinvertebrate Biological Monitoring Protocols for Rivers and Streams*, 2001 Revision. Department of Ecology, Environmental Assessment Program, Olympia, Washington. 34 pp.
- ³⁷ Karr, J.R. 1981. Assessment of biotic integrity using fish communities. *Fisheries* 6(6):21-27.