

# Managing Runoff to Protect Natural Streams: The Latest Developments on Investigation and Management of Hydromodification in California



Technical Report 475  
December 2005



**SMC**



Eric D. Stein

Susan Zaleski

*Southern California Coastal Water Research Project*

# Managing Runoff to Protect Natural Streams: The Latest Developments on Investigation and Management of Hydromodification in California

Proceedings of a Special Technical Workshop  
Co-sponsored by:

- *California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)*
- *Stormwater Monitoring Coalition (SMC)*
- *University of Southern California Sea Grant (USC Sea Grant)*

Eric D. Stein  
*Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP)*

Susan Zaleski  
*University of Southern California Sea Grant (USC Sea Grant)*

December 30, 2005

Technical Report #475

**SMC**



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Stream channel downcutting, widening, and erosion due to increased surface runoff present the most profound and difficult to manage problems resulting from conversion of natural land surfaces to developed areas. Land use changes that reduce the capacity for infiltration and evapotranspiration of rainfall may result in an increase in the magnitude and frequency of erosive flows and changes in the proportion and timing of sediment delivery downstream. These effects, termed *hydromodification*, can adversely impact the physical structure, biologic condition, and water quality of streams.

This document summarizes the presentations and discussions from a workshop convened to provide an overview of key technical and managerial issues associated with hydromodification, with specific focus on California's climatic setting. The goal of this workshop was to identify key conclusions regarding the mechanisms and causes of hydromodification and to provide managers and decision makers with a list of recommended priorities for future work in terms of both technical and managerial products.

Recent studies indicate that California's intermittent and ephemeral streams are more susceptible to the effects of hydromodification than streams from other parts of the United States (US). Physical degradation of stream channels in the central and eastern US can initially be detected when watershed impervious cover approaches 10%, although biological effects (which may be more difficult to detect) may occur at lower levels. In contrast, initial response of streams in the semi-arid portions of California appears to occur between 3% and 5% impervious cover.

Managing the effects of hydromodification requires attention to changes in runoff volume, magnitude of flows, frequency of erosive events, duration of flows, timing of high flows, magnitude and duration of base flows, and patterns of flow variability. Slope, composition of bed and bank materials, underlying geology, watershed position, and connections between streams and adjacent floodplains are also key considerations in the management of hydromodification effects.

A contemporary toolbox for assessing the effects of hydromodification consists of three technical approaches: continuous simulation modeling, physical process modeling using geomorphic metrics, and risk-based modeling. Independently and in a range of combinations, these approaches are instrumental to understanding and predicting channel responses. In conjunction with these approaches, the following research areas are recommended for enhanced understanding and assessment of hydromodification:

- Establishment of appropriate reference conditions for various stream types
- Establishment of linkage between geomorphic changes and biologic effects
- Development and calibration of linked models that provide long-term simulation of hydrologic, and resultant physical changes in channel morphology

Furthermore, ongoing monitoring programs should be established for reference streams, streams subject to effects of hydromodification, and streams where various hydromodification management strategies have been employed.

Hydromodification is best addressed with a suite of strategies including site design, on-site controls, regional controls, in-stream controls, and restoration of degraded stream systems. To improve the effectiveness of hydromodification management, it is important to identify the most appropriate set of strategies based on the type of channel, setting, stage of channel adjustment, and amount of existing and expected impervious cover in drainage catchments. Management of hydromodification could be improved by integrating it into a multi-objective strategy that addresses hydrology, water quality, flood control, and stream ecology. In addition, streams should be surveyed and classified in order to identify areas with the greatest risk of impact from hydromodification. Output from dynamic modeling can be used to develop easy to use management guides, and standard monitoring protocols and performance criteria need to be developed. These management tools should be geared toward application by land-use planners and regulators at the municipal and state levels. Finally, a hydromodification workgroup should be formed to facilitate communication and exchange of ideas and information on technical and management strategies relevant to hydromodification.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This document summarizes two days of collaborative, prescient, and enlightening discussion on one of the most daunting challenges facing aquatic resource managers. We would like to thank all workshop presenters and panelist for sharing their insight and expertise to help develop the conclusions and recommendations contained in this document. We would like to especially thank the workshop organizing committee who made this event possible. Finally, we thank the California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies, the southern California Stormwater Monitoring Coalition, and University of Southern California (USC) Sea Grant for their generous funding and support.

### Workshop Presenters and Panelists

Mark Abramson  
*Heal the Bay*

Tony Donigian  
*AQUA TERRA Consultants*

Aaron Allen  
*United States Army Corps of Engineers*

Rebecca Drayse  
*TreePeople*

Jill Bicknell  
*EOA, Inc. (for Santa Clara Valley Urban  
Runoff Pollution Prevention Program)*

Jeff Haltiner  
*Philip Williams and Associates*

Jon Bishop  
*Los Angeles Regional Water Quality  
Control Board*

Larry Kolb  
*San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality  
Control Board*

Brian Bledsoe  
*Colorado State University*

Shelley Luce  
*Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission*

Derek Booth  
*University of Washington*

Craig MacCrae  
*Aquafor Beech*

Dan Cloak  
*Dan Cloak Consulting  
(for Contra Costa County)*

Gary Palhegyi  
*GeoSyntec Consultants*

Susan Cloke  
*Los Angeles Regional Water Quality  
Control Board*

Marolyn Parson  
*National Association of Homebuilders*

Laura Coley-Eisenberg  
*Rancho Mission Viejo*

Jeff Pratt  
*Ventura County Watershed Protection District*

Rene DeShazo  
*Los Angeles Regional Water Quality  
Control Board*

John Robertus  
*San Diego Regional Water Quality  
Control Board*

Mark Subbotin  
*Newhall Land and Farming Company*

Jason Uhley  
*Riverside County Flood Control and Water  
Conservation District*

Xavier Swamikannu  
*Los Angeles Regional Water Quality  
Control Board*

**Organizing Committee**

Eric Stein – Chair  
*Southern California Coastal Water  
Research Project*

Gary Palhegyi  
*GeoSyntec Consultants*

Chris Crompton  
*Orange County Resources and Development  
Management Department*

Xavier Swamikannu  
*Los Angeles Regional Water Quality  
Control Board*

Bill DePoto  
*Los Angeles County Department of  
Public Works*

Matt Yeager  
*San Bernardino County Flood  
Control District*

Mike McCann  
*San Diego Regional Water Quality  
Control Board*

Susan Zaleski  
*University of Southern California  
Sea Grant*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	<i>i</i>
Acknowledgements.....	<i>ii</i>
Workshop Overview .....	1
Introduction to Hydromodification .....	2
Technical Approaches to Assessing Hydromodification.....	6
Priority Technical Needs and Information Gaps .....	9
Regulatory and Management Strategies .....	11
Priority Management Needs .....	13
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	16
Literature Cited.....	18
Appendix A – Workshop Agenda.....	20
Appendix B – Case Studies.....	22
Appendix C – Additional Resources.....	26

## WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

The process of urbanization has the potential to affect stream courses by altering watershed hydrology. Development and redevelopment can increase impervious surfaces on formerly undeveloped (or less developed) landscapes and reduce the capacity of remaining pervious surfaces to capture and infiltrate rainfall. In addition, in semi-arid regions, development is usually accompanied by significant supplemental landscape irrigation that maintains high soil moisture conditions. Development practices also tend to reduce or eliminate native vegetation, thus reducing evapotranspiration of rainfall. Consequently, as watersheds develop, a larger percentage of rainfall becomes runoff during any given storm; runoff reaches stream channels much more rapidly, resulting in peak discharge rates that are higher than those for an equivalent rainfall prior to development. These changes to the runoff hydrograph have been termed *hydromodification*.

Hydromodification can result in adverse effects to stream habitat and water supply, and stream erosion associated with hydromodification often threatens infrastructure, homes, and businesses. In response to these effects, state and local agencies have developed, or are developing, standards and management approaches to control and/or mitigate the effects of hydromodification on natural and semi-natural stream courses.

On October 2 and 3, 2005, 26 speakers and 175 participants gathered in Ontario, California to discuss the results of recent research inside and outside of California. This technical workshop was convened to provide an overview of the key technical and managerial issues associated with hydromodification, with specific focus on California's climatic setting. The specific objectives of the workshop were:

- Exchange of information on technical and managerial approaches to hydromodification
- Identification of common conclusions regarding a general understanding of hydromodification
- Recommendation of priority needs for future work relevant to technical and managerial products in response to hydromodification issues

The workshop consisted of two evening and one all-day session. The first night, a small group of scientists and managers gathered to discuss key knowledge gaps and technical information needs. The day session was open to all attendees, who interacted with a slate of speakers summarizing technical, regulatory, and management approaches to responding to the effects of hydromodification. The workshop concluded with an evening session in which a small group discussed priority needs for future research and management tool development. The agenda for the workshop is provided in Appendix A.

This document summarizes key conclusions resulting from the presentations and discussions that occurred during the workshop. The document also provides managers and decision makers with a list of recommend priorities for future work in terms of both technical and managerial products related to hydromodification response.



## INTRODUCTION TO HYDROMODIFICATION

Hydromodification is defined by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as the “alteration of flow characteristics through a landscape which has the capacity to result in degradation of water resources” (<http://www.epa.gov/owm/mtb/cwns/1996rtc/glossary.htm>). Most often, hydromodification results from changes in land use practices or direct management of surface runoff. Consequences of hydromodification can include stream channel incision, aggradation, desiccation, and/or inundation.

Land use practices over the past several hundred years have resulted in hydromodification of western landscapes ([Haltiner et al. 1996](#), [Leopold 1968](#)). Historically, many small streams were not connected to main river channels, but rather existed as shallow swales and wetland systems connected to larger rivers via subsurface flow. Surface hydrologic connections occurred intermittently following periodic large storm events. Increased surface runoff and channel disturbance, beginning during the cattle-grazing era circa 1700 – 1900, resulted in many of these systems becoming permanently channelized ([Cooke and Reeves 1976](#)). Channel modification through either direct alteration, or as a consequence of changes in patterns of surface runoff, e.g. through increases in impervious cover, continues today.

Hydromodification has typically resulted in channel incision and bank erosion in the upper and middle portions of the watershed, and in deposition, aggradation, and increased channel meandering in the downstream, flatter portions of the watershed. Often, as the main channel has incised, the lowered base level results in the formation of “knickpoints” (abrupt drops in the channel floor) that migrate upstream into the headwater areas. Often, these migrating “knickpoints” result in severe gully formation in lower order streams, i.e. first- through third-order streams, based on the Strahler stream ordering system. These smaller headwater streams are important from a watershed perspective because much of the sediment generation, carbon export, and initial nutrient processing occur in the upper watershed ([Rheinhardt et al. 1999](#)). The vast majority of stream miles in any given watershed exist as small headwater streams ([Beschta and Platts 1986](#)); consequently, impacts to these streams can result in profound cumulative effects to sediment and water movement patterns throughout the watershed. In many areas, the majority of remaining semi-intact streams is in the upper portions of watersheds. Notably, these areas are the most susceptible to land use change and associated effects of hydromodification. When development occurs in headwater areas rather than lower in the watershed, it tends to result in larger increases in peak discharge due to cumulative decreases in the time of concentration of rainfall to runoff ([Beighley and Moglen, 2002](#)).

Small, frequent runoff events, i.e. two-year frequency storms and smaller, demonstrate the most dramatic effects due to increased imperviousness, effects of supplemental irrigation, or other changes in land use practices ([Beighley et al. 2003](#), [Donigian and Love 2005](#), [Hollis 1975](#)). These small events account for the majority of long-term movement of sediment and consequently are the most deterministic of the geomorphic stability of the stream channels ([Wolman and Miller 1960](#)). However, small increases in basin impervious cover can also result in dramatic increases in runoff during 0.5-5 year flow events. For example, an increase of a few percent in impervious cover can increase the magnitude of a 1- or 2-year flood event by 20-fold ([Hollis 1975](#), [Urbonas and Roesner 1992](#)).

Studies from parts of the country with climates more humid than California’s indicate that physical degradation of stream channels can initially be detected when watershed impervious cover approaches 10%, although biological effects, which may be more difficult to detect, may


occur at lower levels (CWP 2003). Recent studies from both northern and southern California indicate that intermittent and ephemeral streams in California are more susceptible to the effects of hydromodification than streams from other regions of the US, with stream degradation being recognized when catchment's impervious cover is as little as 3-5%<sup>1</sup> (Coleman et al. 2005). Furthermore, supplemental landscape irrigation in semi-arid regions, like California, can substantially increase the frequency of erosive flows (AQUA TERRA Consultants 2004). However, because all streams are constantly undergoing change and adjustment, effects of impervious cover should be investigated in terms of changes in the rate of channel response in addition to the absolute magnitude of response.

Managing the effects of hydromodification requires attention to more than just the peak runoff. The work (or energy) that affects physical and biological channel structure results from movement of water and sediment controlled by runoff volume, flow magnitude and duration, frequency of erosive events, timing of high flows, and magnitude and duration of base flows (Konrad and Booth 2005, Montgomery and MacDonald 2002, Paul and Meyer 2001, Roesner and Bledsoe 2003). Changes in patterns of flow variability and increases in the frequency of high flows have been shown to have measurable effects on the community composition of stream biota (Konrad and Booth 2005). Because streams are coupled hydrologic, geomorphic, biologic systems, it is important to understand the various effects of all changes in surface runoff patterns and to develop appropriate management strategies for each potential effect.

As channels incise, they often go through a series of adjustment stages from initial downcutting, to widening, to establishing new floodplains at lower elevations (Figure 1). This process can occur over years or decades depending on the type of channel and flow regime. Sand-dominated channels may pass through the full sequence of stages in a few decades, whereas channels in more resistant materials, such as clay, may take much longer, in some cases 50–100 years (Roesner and Bledsoe 2003). Therefore, it is important to understand a channel's stage of adjustment, and target management strategies to account for current and expected future evolution of the channel form.

---

<sup>1</sup> Most studies evaluate the response of stream channels to "total impervious cover". However, a more appropriate assessment would be based on "effective impervious cover", i.e., the amount of impervious cover that is hydrologically connected to the stream channel. Assessment based on effective impervious cover is more likely to result in observed channel response at lower levels of imperviousness.



**Figure 1: Stages of sand-bed channel adjustment (Schumm et al. 1984).**

The pattern and rate of channel response to hydromodification will vary based on channel type and recent disturbance history (Montgomery and MacDonald 2002). Underlying geology, composition of bed and bank materials, slope, watershed position, and floodplain connectivity all affect channel response. Several stream classification systems have been developed over the years, including Shumm (1963), Montgomery and Buffington (1993), Rosgen (1994), and Church (2002). Most of these systems classify streams based on their sensitivity to change and therefore can be used to help assess, prioritize, and customize hydromodification management approaches. For example, Montgomery and Buffington (1993) define the following five channel types, listed from most to least resilient:

- Cascade
- Step pool
- Plane bed
- Pool riffle
- Dune ripple

Classification systems provide a useful starting point for evaluation of channel response to hydromodification; however, the classification systems above were developed in regions more humid and/or mountainous than those typical to California. Given differences in substrate and the extreme range of flows typically observed in arid regions, it is important to develop and regionally calibrate a classification system for dryland channels. Furthermore, the assessment of channel condition and the development of management strategies must be interpreted in terms of both spatial context (i.e. valley slope and position within the watershed) and temporal context (i.e. disturbance history) of the stream (Montgomery and MacDonald 2002). For example,

channel incision may be most dramatic in the middle portions of the watershed; however, these reaches may have stabilized, while the most active erosion and sediment production is occurring in smaller headwater channels. For these reasons, simplistic classification and assessment schemes based on channel appearance must be supported by in-depth geomorphic assessment, historical studies, and thorough understanding of physical and hydrologic processes.

Ultimately, some management strategies may vary based on the channel type, as well as the degree of current and anticipated hydromodification, while others may be more uniformly applied. For example, controlling the magnitude and duration of runoff may be an effective strategy for all stream types, while bioengineered streambank stabilization may only be effective for specific stream types under specific circumstances.

## TECHNICAL APPROACHES TO ASSESSING HYDROMODIFICATION

The contemporary toolbox for assessing the effects of hydromodification consists of several technical approaches that may be combined in various ways. Continuous simulation hydrologic models can be used to assess elements in rainfall-runoff cycles and to describe conditions of flow in stream channels. These approaches can be used to assess the way changes in land cover may affect stream flow and to develop management strategies aimed at preventing or reducing such effects. A second, more involved approach, physical process modeling uses hydrologic models to predict changes in stream flow and to predict how these changes may affect the physical structure of the channel itself. This approach may couple hydraulic and sediment transport models, and/or incorporate geomorphic metrics to predict whether or not a channel will remain stable when subjected to the effects of hydromodification. Finally, risk-based assessments are used to account for the uncertainty associated with long-term cumulative effects of altered hydrology on stream channel flow, sediment transport, and stream geomorphology.

### Continuous Simulation Modeling

Continuous simulation modeling provides a powerful tool for investigating the way rainfall-runoff patterns change over time with respect to normal climatic cycles and changes in land use practices. Hydrologic models integrate land use, precipitation, soils, topography, and other physical factors to simulate resultant runoff patterns. These models can be used to evaluate the way changes in the extent and distribution of impervious cover may affect flow magnitude, timing, frequency, and duration. In addition, continuous simulation models can be used to assess changes in the shear stress of channel beds and banks over time. Predicted shear stress ( $\tau_{\text{actual}}$ ) values can be compared to critical shear stress ( $\tau_{\text{critical}}$ ) values associated with the onset of erosion in order to predict conditions that may result in initiation of scour. Recent studies in Ventura County have successfully used  $\tau_{\text{actual}}/\tau_{\text{critical}}$  values between 1.2 - 1.5 as a threshold for initiation of channel scour along with an assessment of the frequency of occurrence of these erosive flow events (AQUA TERRA Consultants 2004). When using hydrologic models it is important to simulate runoff and erosion patterns over periods of at least 20-30 years. Short-term or single-event modeling is not sufficient to capture the continuous erosion and aggradation processes that occur during large and small storm events over extended periods of time.

### Physical Process Modeling/Geomorphic Metrics


Physical process modeling aims to establish relationships between impervious cover, runoff patterns, and channel response based on field observations of changes in channel form over time. These field observations are used to derive mathematical relationships that can be used to predict channel response to changes in land use practices. Erosion Potential ( $E_p$ ) is a geomorphic metric that has been used in several recent studies relevant to the effects of increased runoff associated with increases in impervious cover. The  $E_p$  represents the ratio of pre- and post-development erosive forces for a given stream type, expressed as:

$$E_p = \frac{W_{\text{post}}}{W_{\text{pre}}}$$

Where:  $W_{\text{post}}$  = Cumulative erosive energy or work after development  
 $W_{\text{pre}}$  = Cumulative erosive energy or work before development

Where: Erosive energy is defined as the energy that is above the threshold of erosion for the stream boundary materials, also referred to as excess specific stream power

Values for  $E_p$  are derived for both the channel bed and bank, and the boundary that is more susceptible to erosion is used as the basis of setting response thresholds. The  $E_p$  of a stream channel should be evaluated based on long-term simulations (e.g. 50 yrs) or based on empirical data collected over extended periods of time. Geomorphic metrics can be used to project changes in channel cross-section area over time in response to increases in impervious cover, as shown in Figure 2, which describes the expected effect of increases in total impervious cover (TIMP) on channel cross-sectional area. Channel response thresholds can be inferred according to inflection points on the curve. In this plot, the upper curve is derived from southern California data; the lower curve is derived from data observed in other parts of the US. Expected threshold of response for southern California streams is approximately 4% (Coleman et al. 2005).




**Figure 2: Enlargement curve showing expected effect of increases in total impervious cover (TIMP) on channel cross-sectional area. (Re) is the ratio of ultimate channel cross-sectional area to current cross sectional area. Upper curve is derived from data from southern California, lower curve is derived from data from other parts of the US. Expected threshold of response for southern California streams is approximately 4% (from Coleman et al. 2005 and C. MacRae).**

It is important to note that curves such as those shown in Figure 2 assume a consistent hydrologic response to increased impervious cover. Long-term hydrologic simulations should be coupled with physical process models to fully explore these relationships and help validate the curves. Furthermore, different channel types respond differently to changes in runoff. Therefore, an enlargement curve, such as the one shown in Figure 2 for a single channel type, should be developed for each major channel type in a region in order to help focus the timing and location of strategic runoff management measures.

## Risk-based Modeling

Unlike physical process modeling, which aims to establish response thresholds, risk-based modeling estimates the probability of channel response to increases in erosion potential associated with anticipated changes in runoff as a result of increases in impervious cover. Managers can then determine acceptable risk levels. Typically, risk-based modeling uses the output of continuous simulation or physical process models to generate time-series data relevant to flow and sediment transport. Often this type of modeling includes linear and logistic regressions, in addition to probability networks. These data are then used to estimate the risk of channel response with respect to anticipated changes in runoff volume and sediment. Figure 3 provides an example of the way logistic regression analysis can be used to estimate the likelihood of channel instability based on progressive degrees of erosion potential.



**Figure 3: Logistic regression analysis showing the probability of various channel erosion potentials (from B. Bledsoe).**

For studies conducted in the San Francisco Bay Area, an  $E_p$  value of 1.2 was proposed as an acceptable threshold based on a 15% probability of channel instability<sup>2</sup>. This was typically associated with approximately 3 - 6% impervious cover for channels in sand substrates and 10-12% for channels in clay substrates.

<sup>2</sup> The negotiated  $E_p$  value of 1.0 was adopted for the final Hydromodification Management Plan for Santa Clara Valley and included in a permit amendment for agencies in that area.

## **PRIORITY TECHNICAL NEEDS AND INFORMATION GAPS**

Workshop participants identified five priority areas for additional research and data collection:

- Regional reference conditions for various stream channel types
- Links between geomorphic change and biologic effects
- Dynamic simulation models calibrated for local conditions
- Potential consequences of increased storm water infiltration from urbanized areas
- Ongoing monitoring programs to assess hydromodification impacts and to develop effective management strategies

### *Regional reference conditions for various stream channel types need to be established*

Because most areas in the western US have been subjected to historic grazing or logging, many channels in this region have undergone some degree of change over time. Furthermore, the dynamic nature of this region's fluvial systems means that these streams are constantly undergoing some degree of change. Understanding the historic conditions of stream channels can provide valuable insight; however, historic conditions may not be the most appropriate "reference" in light of current constraints. Rather, reference should be considered a condition where stream channels are in a state of dynamic equilibrium under contemporary natural watershed processes. Once a regional reference condition is defined, data on flow, sediment movement, and geomorphology should be collected on an ongoing basis from representative reference stream reaches. These data will facilitate modeling that more effectively differentiates natural cycles from human-induced changes, especially during long wet or dry cycles where changes may be dramatic but infrequent.

### *Links between geomorphic change and biologic effects need to be more clearly defined*

Hydromodification can cause a variety of physical changes to streams. However, hydrologic changes that are most relevant to biologic communities have not been well defined. For example, it is unclear how changes in base flow duration; peak flow magnitude, duration, and timing; or flow variability affect the structure and function of stream communities. Ultimately, there is a need to develop biologic indices to assess the effects of hydromodification and more effectively direct management strategies.

### *Dynamic simulation models need to be developed and calibrated for local conditions*

Although continuous hydrologic simulation and physical process models have been developed for California streams, these models have not been routinely linked to the assessment of stream channel response to various forms of hydromodification. Hydrologic, physical process, and risk-based models are much more effective when used in combination and appropriately calibrated and validated for California streams. The resultant tool(s) can greatly improve assessments that predict the likelihood of stream channel response to anticipated changes in hydrology associated with changes in land use patterns. Model output may also be useful in the development of objective criteria for establishing land use practices that minimize



hydromodification effects, designing tools for best management practices (BMP) design, and evaluating the performance of management measures.

*Potential consequences of increased storm water infiltration from urbanized areas need to be investigated*

Infiltration of substantial volumes of storm water runoff from developed land surfaces may introduce unacceptable levels of contaminants into groundwater and/or shallow aquifers. The risk of groundwater contamination and the fate of pollutants introduced into subsurface waters need to be investigated by increased monitoring, development of coupled surface water-groundwater models, and implementation of demonstration projects.

*Ongoing monitoring programs to assess hydromodification impacts and develop effective management strategies need to be designed and implemented*

First, more extensive flow monitoring needs to be instituted to compensate for the difficulty of calibrating hydrologic models for un-gauged headwater streams. Second, regular geomorphic data needs to be collected from reference streams as well as streams subject to the effects of hydromodification. Routine measurement of channel cross-sections and substrate will greatly improve understanding of channel adjustment processes and allow better discrimination between natural and anthropogenic changes. Third, streams subject to various hydromodification management strategies need to be monitored and documented to support adaptive management and education on emerging techniques and strategies.

## **REGULATORY AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES**

### **Regulatory Approaches to Address Potential Effects of Hydromodification**

A variety of regulatory programs and tools exist to help in the regulation of hydromodification effects, including:

- Clean Water Act Section 401 certifications
- Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)
- Municipal storm water (MS4) permits under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, and the associated Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Program (SUSMP) requirements
- Watershed Urban Runoff Management Plans (WURMPs) and the Watershed Management Initiative (WMI) which encourage municipalities to work cooperatively to manage issues such as hydromodification

In addition, California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act (CEQA/NEPA) processes can be used to better address hydromodification issues, especially with regard to cumulative effects.

Looking to the future, Regional Water Boards in California are considering development of numeric criteria and objectives for new development and redevelopment projects to offset and/or mitigate hydromodification effects. These objectives may involve requirements for managing flow and/or reducing effective impervious cover as well as strategies to maximize infiltration and reuse of storm water. Some Regional Boards are also considering ways to better coordinate with other regulatory agencies that have authority over hydromodification and stream alteration. Similarly, some State and Regional Water Boards are evaluating their existing regulatory authority over hydromodification and considering ways to strengthen their authority, particularly under section 401 of the Clean Water Act, or as part of Basin Plans.

### **Management Approaches to Address the Effects of Hydromodification**

Hydromodification is best addressed by using a suite of strategies, including site-design, restoration of degraded stream systems, as well as in-stream, on-site control, and regional controls. Managers need to identify the most appropriate set of strategies based on channel type and setting, channel adjustment stage, and amount of existing and anticipated impervious cover in the drainage catchment. However, attempting to have the post-development condition match pre-development runoff magnitude and duration should be an initial consideration for all circumstances.

Management strategies should address not only changes in peak flows but also changes in flow duration and sediment yield. Research to support development of several recent Hydromodification Management Plans indicates that post-project BMPs should ensure no change in runoff volume and cumulative duration of all flows greater than the critical flow for bed or bank mobility. Case studies of three Hydromodification Management Plans/Strategies are provided in Appendix B.

Over the long term, land-use planning, runoff management, as well as channel and floodplain restoration, should be the cornerstones of any hydromodification management strategy. The planning cycle for new development or re-development projects should begin with

hydromodification management assessment as part of the preparation of General and Specific Plans, master drainage plans, and zoning designations. Hydromodification effects must be managed with respect to long-term cycles; therefore, strategies should be adaptive. As conditions change and stream channels evolve, the management approaches must be adjusted. However, it is important to recognize that because changes to watershed hydrology are continual; it is unlikely that any management strategy will be able to achieve full hydrologic mitigation. Over the long term, some lasting physical and biological effects should be expected. Management goals should realistically reflect these anticipated changes.

The Center for Watershed Protection, the National Association of Homebuilders, the Water Environment Research Foundation, the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association, and others have developed resources that land managers can use to guide improved site design. A list of some of these resources is provided in Appendix C.

## PRIORITY MANAGEMENT NEEDS

In response to rapidly developing technical tools, regulations, and management goals, workshop participants identified the following management and information priorities:

1. Establish mapping and classification of streams based on their susceptibility to hydromodification effects. Susceptibility should be evaluated with respect to both stream properties, potential for future increases in impervious cover, and concomitant changes in land use practices, such as supplemental irrigation. Such a system would help managers prioritize streams requiring protection and hydromodification management.
2. Model stream systems in ways that are useful for regulators to make decisions. Once models are validated with local data, output should be:
  - Readily understandable and usable by planners and managers
  - Easily interpreted by regulators for development of consistent requirements and evaluation criteria for the specific region
  - Readily used to develop standardized flow control sizing and design tools for BMPs, where applicable
3. Develop a series of management tools that can be easily used to make recommendations or set requirements relative to hydromodification for new development and re-development projects. These tools would utilize the results of monitoring, modeling, and assessment completed under previous projects to develop a series of plots, nomographs, checklists, or similar managerial tools. It is envisioned that ideally, tools should be developed for three different levels of analysis:
  - Screening tools – Checklists or similar tools that allow planners and managers to evaluate whether or not a project is likely to involve substantial hydromodification issues.
  - Effects tools – For projects that are considered likely to have hydromodification effects based on the results of the screening tool, this tool would serve as a nomograph or series of plots used to evaluate the expected magnitude or intensity of effects associated with a particular project. This tool could also be used to identify projects that should be subjected to subsequent in-depth analysis.
  - Mitigation tools – Once the expected magnitude of effects are determined, this tool would be used to guide recommended mitigation and management measures. This tool could be a series of fact sheets, design criteria, and sizing standards to be used to aid in the development of standards or mitigation requirements.
4. Construct metrics and monitoring protocols to measure the effects of hydromodification on biological communities including riparian habitat.
5. Determine standard monitoring protocols for hydromodification effects and facilitate regional information sharing on project performance.
6. Evaluate the relative costs and benefits of hydromodification management at the site level (e.g. low impact development), and at the regional level (e.g. large retention and infiltration facilities). The economic costs of hydromodification have not been well documented, nor have the economic benefits of managing the physical and biological

effects of hydromodification. Information is also needed on the cost to maintain and manage hydromodification BMPs.

7. Establish recommended short-term measures for use while longer-term solutions, such as low-impact development and alternative site design are evolving.

In addition to management and information priorities, several institutional barriers were identified that may hinder effective management of hydromodification effects. Steps to overcome such barriers include:

- A. Hydromodification management needs to be part of an integrated multi-objective management strategy. Stream planning and management should integrate hydromodification, water quality, flood control, and habitat management strategies as a whole rather than addressing each issue in isolation. Increased coordination between agencies, departments, and stakeholders should be strongly supported. Specifically, agencies that have authority over hydromodification and stream alteration should work toward coordinating regulatory approaches to achieve greater consistency.
- B. Local ordinances need to be revised to facilitate integrating water quality and water quantity management into project design. These ordinances should be flexible enough to allow for variances from standard design requirements, such as curb and gutter and street width parameters, to help reduce impervious cover and increase infiltration.
- C. Hydromodification needs to be addressed in both General and Specific Plans in terms of the location and design of new development. Site-by-site or project-specific approaches tend to be less effective and more costly to implement.
- D. Better linkage between theory and practice need to be established through case studies, academic research, demonstration projects, and long-term BMPs monitoring.
- E. Management of hydromodification needs to be incorporated into regional resource planning efforts, such as the Corps of Engineers Special Area Management Plans (SAMPs) or US Fish and Wildlife Service's Multi-species Habitat Conservation Plans. These regional planning efforts may be effective tools to address cumulative effects of hydromodification at the watershed scale.
- F. A more effective public communication and education strategy needs to be developed. Property owners, local businesses, and community groups need to be better educated about the causes and effects of hydromodification in the context of the watersheds where they live and work. Simple definitions of streams and watersheds should be provided as part of the education strategy. Hydromodification effects need to be linked to health, aesthetic, recreational, and economic endpoints. Citizens should be made aware of simple actions, such as redirecting downspouts, using xeriscaping, and installing planter boxes, that help reduce hydromodification effects.
- G. An ongoing working group should be established to coordinate research, monitoring, technology transfer, education, and management approach evaluation that includes all stakeholder groups.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Presentations and discussions during the two-day hydromodification workshop resulted in the following key conclusions and recommendations:

### Conclusions

- Physical degradation of stream channels in semi-arid climates of California may be detectable when basin impervious cover is between 3% and 5%. However, biological effects are probably occurring at lower levels.
- Frequent, 0.5-5 years, small runoff events, are most affected by hydromodification.
- Not all streams will respond in the same manner. Certain management strategies need to account for differences in stream type, stage of channel adjustment, current and expected amount of basin impervious cover, and existing or planned BMPs.
- Management strategies should address effects on flow magnitude, duration, and volume.
- Assessment of potential effects and suitability of possible management approaches must account for decadal scale climatic cycles and associated stream channel response.
- Improved site design is likely to be the most effective hydromodification management strategy and should be incorporated at the planning stage of a project.
- It is unlikely that all the effects of hydromodification can be fully mitigated. Changes in impervious cover will result in some changes to the flow patterns and ecology of the affected stream. Realistic management goals should be established to acknowledge long-term effects of increased impervious cover.

### Recommendations

- Integrate management of hydromodification into a multi-objective strategy that addresses hydrology, water quality, flood control, stream ecology, and overall watershed and land use planning.
- Institute interim management measures until runoff management becomes a more standard and accepted element of site design, for example, low impact development principles become commonly accepted and implemented in all site designs.
- Establish and implement a stream channel classification system based on expected vulnerability of different streams to hydromodification-induced change.
- Establish appropriate regional reference conditions should for each stream type based on the established classification system.
- Develop and calibrate dynamic simulation models for local streams. Models that combine continuous hydrologic simulations, physical process models, and risk-based modeling will be the most effective.
- Establish ongoing regional hydromodification monitoring programs. These programs should collect flow and geomorphic data from reference streams, unmitigated streams impacted by hydromodification, and streams subject to hydromodification management measures. Helping to separate natural variability from urban-induced changes in stream condition should be a primary goal of such ongoing monitoring programs.
- Develop indices to assess the biological effects of hydromodification.

- Develop protocols for measuring the economic costs and benefits of hydromodification management. Assemble case studies that document these economic costs and benefits.
- Initiate a hydromodification workgroup to facilitate exchange of ideas and information on technical and managerial approaches.
- Increase public education about what can be done at homes, businesses, and in the community to address hydromodification effects.

## LITERATURE CITED

- AQUA TERRA Consultants. 2004. *Urbanization and Channel Stability Assessment in the Arroyo Simi Watershed of Ventura County CA*. FINAL REPORT. Prepared for Ventura County Watershed Protection Division, Ventura CA.
- Beighley, R.E. and G.E. Moglen, 2002. Trend Assessment in Rainfall-Runoff Behavior in Urbanizing Watersheds. *ASCE Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 7(1):27-34.
- Beighley, R.E., J.M. Melack, and T. Dunne, 2003. Impacts Of California's Climatic Regimes And Coastal Land Use Change On Streamflow Characteristics. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 39(6):1419-1433.
- Beschta, R.L. and W.S. Platts, 1986. Morphological Features of Small Streams: Significance and Function. *Water Resources Bulletin*, 22(3):369-379.
- Center for Watershed Protection (CWP). 2003. *Impacts of Impervious Cover on Aquatic Systems*, Ellicott City, MD.
- Church, M., 2002. Geomorphic Thresholds In Riverine Landscapes. *Freshwater Biology*, 47(4):541-557.
- Coleman, D., C. MacRae, and E.D. Stein, 2005. *Effect of Increases in Peak Flows and Imperviousness on the Morphology of Southern California Streams. A Report from the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition*. Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Technical Report #450, Westminster, CA.
- Cooke, R.U. and R.W. Reeves, 1976. *Arroyos and Environmental Change in the American Southwest*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Donigian, A.S. Jr. and J.T. Love, 2005. The Use of Continuous Watershed Modeling to Address Issues of Urbanization and Channel Stability in Southern California. In *Proceedings of the Environmental and Water Resources Institute World Water and Environmental Resources Congress 2005: Impacts of Global Climate Change*, Walton, R. (Ed.), American Society of Civil Engineers, Anchorage, AK, May 15-19, 2005.
- Haltiner, J.P., G.M. Kondolf, and P.B. Williams, 1996. Chapter 11: Restoration Approaches in California. In: Brooks and Shields (eds). *River Channel Restoration*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- Hollis, G.E., 1975. The Effect of Urbanization on Floods of Different Recurrence Interval. *Water Resources Research*, 11(3): 431-435.
- Konrad, C.P. and D.B. Booth, 2005. Hydrologic Changes in Urban Streams and Their Ecological Significance. *American Fisheries Society Symposium*, 47:157-177.



- Leopold, L.B., 1968. *Hydrology for Urban Land Planning: A Guidebook on the Hydrologic Effects of Urban Land Use: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 554*. U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA.
- Montgomery, D.R. and J.M. Buffington, 1993. *Channel Classification, Prediction of Channel Response, and Assessment of Channel Condition*. Report TFW-SI-110-93-002 prepared for the SHAMW committee of the Washington State Timber/Fish/Wildlife Agreement, Seattle, WA.
- Montgomery, D.R. and L.H. MacDonald, 2002. Diagnostic Approach to Stream Channel Assessment and Monitoring. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 38(1):1-16.
- Paul, M.J. and J.L. Meyer, 2001. Streams in the Urban Landscape. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 32:333-365.
- Rheinhardt, R.D, M.C. Rheinhardt, M.M. Brinson, and K.E. Faser, 1999. Application of Reference Data for Assessing and Restoring Headwater Ecosystems. *Restoration Ecology*, 7(3):241-251.
- Roesner, L.A. and B.P. Bledsoe, 2003. *Physical Effects of Wet Weather Flows on Aquatic Habitats: Present Knowledge and Research Needs*. Water Environment Research Foundation, Report #00-WSM-4. Alexandria, VA.
- Rosgen, D.L., 1994. A Classification Of Natural Rivers. *Catena* 22:169-199.
- Schumm, S.A., 1963. *A Tentative Classification Of Alluvial River Channels*: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 477.
- Schumm, S.A. M.D. Harvey, and C.C. Watson, 1984. *Incised Channels: Morphology, Dynamics, And Control*, Water Resources Publications, Littleton, CO.
- Urbonas, B. and L.A. Roesner, 1992. Hydrologic Design for Urban Drainages and Flood Control, In *Handbook of Hydrology* Maidment, D.R. (ed.) McGraw Hill Publishers, New York, NY.
- Wolman, M.G. and J.P. Miller, 1960. Magnitude and Frequency of Forces in Geomorphic Processes; *Journal of Geology*, 68(1):54-74.

## APPENDIX A – WORKSHOP AGENDA

### HYDROMODIFICATION WORKSHOP AGENDA – October 2-3, 2005

#### SUNDAY EVENING, INVITED SESSION

- 5:00- 5:15 **Welcome and Introductions** – Eric Stein (Chair), *Southern California Coastal Water Research Project*
- 5:15 – 5:30 **Regulatory Perspective** – John Robertus, *San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board*
- 5:30 – 6:30 **Status of Science on Evaluating/Studying Hydromodification** (panel discussion)
- Jeff Haltiner, *Philip Williams and Associates*
  - Gary Palhegyi, *Geosytec Consultants*
  - Craig MacCrae, *Aquafor Beech*
  - Brian Bledsoe, *Colorado State University*
  - Derek Booth, *University of Washington*
- 7:30 – 8:30 **Dinner and Open Discussion of Data Gaps and Areas for Future Research**

#### MONDAY, OPEN SESSION

- 8:30 – 8:40 **Welcome and Opening Remarks** – Chris Crompton (Chair), *SMC*
- 8:40 – 9:15 **Introduction to Hydromodification** – Jeff Haltiner, *Philip Williams and Associates*
- 9:15 – 10:15 **Why is Hydromodification Such a Big Deal?** (mini-panel discussion)
- Policy Perspective – Susan Cloke, *Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board*
  - Regulatory Perspective – John Robertus, *San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board*
  - Homebuilders Perspective – Marolyn Parson, *National Association of Home Builders*
  - Natural Resource Perspective – Shelley Luce, *Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission*
- 10:15 – 10:30 **Break** ~
- 10:30 – 12:30 **Hydromodification Research and Studies**
- Risk-Based Channel Stability Analysis for Urbanizing Watersheds – Brian Bledsoe, *Colorado State University*
  - Changes in Streamflow Patterns from Urbanization: A Humid-Region Perspective – Derek Booth, *University of Washington*
  - Modeling Urbanization Impacts and Channel Stability in Ventura County – Tony Donigian, *AQUA TERRA Consultants*
  - Southern California Peak Flow study results and conclusions – Craig MacRae, *Aquafor Beech*
  - Santa Clara Valley HMP Studies- Gary Palhegyi, *GeoSyntec Consultants*

12:30 – 1:30 **Lunch** ~

1:30 – 2:15 **Regulatory Response to Hydromodification**

- Northern California Perspectives – Larry Kolb, *San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board*
- Southern California Perspectives – Xavier Swamikannu, *Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board*

2:15 – 3:30 **Implementation of Hydromodification Management Practices**

- Contra Costa County – Dan Cloak, *Dan Cloak Consulting (for Contra Costa County)*
- Santa Clara Valley – Jill Bicknell, *Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Program*
- Newhall Land and Farming– Mark Subbotin, *Newhall Land and Farming Company*
- Control of Hydromodification Through Land Planning – Laura Coley-Eisenberg, *Rancho Mission Viejo*

3:30 – 4:30 **Panel Discussion on Implementation Issues** – Facilitated by Matt Yeager, *San Bernardino County Flood Control District*

- Rene DeShazo, *Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board*
- Mark Abramson, *Heal the Bay*
- Marolyn Parson, *National Association of Home Builders*
- Jeff Haltiner, *Philip Williams and Associates*
- Jill Bicknell, *Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Program*

#### **MONDAY EVENING, INVITED SESSION**

5:30 – 6:00 **Welcome & Summary of Open Session** – Matt Yeager, *San Bernardino County Flood Control District*

6:00 – 7:00 **Dinner** ~

7:00 – 8:00 **Key Needs of Managers for Addressing Hydromodification** (panel discussion)

- Jeff Pratt, *Ventura County Watershed Protection District*
- Bill DePoto, *Los Angeles County Dept. of Public Works*
- Aaron Allen, *US Army Corps of Engineers - Regulatory Branch*
- Laura Coley-Eisenberg, *Rancho Mission Viejo*
- Jon Bishop, *Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board*
- Rebecca Drayse, *TreePeople*

8:00 – 8:30 **General Conclusions and Outline for Workshop Report**

## **APPENDIX B – CASE STUDIES**

### **Case Study 1 – Contra Costa County**

Contra Costa County's Hydromodification Management Plan was developed in response to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements from the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. The goal of this Hydro-modification Management Plan (HMP) is to protect urban watersheds from ongoing hydro-modification by applying these requirements to development projects that are greater than or equal to 1 acre. They assist applicants to comply by providing designs and sizing factors. Permit conditions require municipalities to propose a plan to manage increases in flow and volume where increases could:

- Increase erosion
- Generate silt pollution
- Impact beneficial uses

The goal of these plans is to ensure that post-project runoff does not exceed pre-project rates and durations. Contra Costa's plan encourages Low Impact Development Integrated Management Practices (LID IMPs) and allows proposals for stream restoration in lieu of flow control where benefits clearly outweigh potential impacts. The plan includes four options for compliance:

1. Demonstrate project will not increase directly connected impervious area
2. Implement pre-designed hydrograph modification IMPs
3. Use a continuous simulation model to compare post- to pre-project flows
4. Demonstrate increased flows will not accelerate stream erosion

Management approaches are selected according to risk:

- Low risk = channelized systems
- Medium risk = channels in substrates with high bed and bank resistance
- High risk = all other channels

Project proponents need to develop a comprehensive analysis of management options for all high risk channels.

### **Case Study 2 – Santa Clara Valley**

The Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program's (SCVURPPP's) NPDES permit requires that increases in runoff peak flow, volume, and duration shall be managed for all projects involving one or more acres of impervious cover, where increased flow and/or volume can cause increased erosion of creek beds and banks. SCVURPPP's overall approach to creating a HMP was to conduct geomorphic and hydrologic assessments of three representative watersheds in the valley, conduct channel stability analyses to establish thresholds

for hydromodification control, develop design criteria for flow control measures, and provide guidance for best management practice implementation<sup>3</sup>.

The performance criteria in the HMP state that post-project runoff shall not exceed estimated pre-project rates and/or durations, where the increased storm water discharge rates and/or durations will result in increased potential for erosion. Projects shall not cause an increase in  $E_p$  of the receiving stream over the pre-project (existing) condition. Furthermore, the  $E_p$  value should not be increased at any point downstream of the project. These requirements can be met with a combination of on-site and off-site control measures.

On-site controls should be designed to match flow-duration curves of post-development conditions to pre-development conditions for all flows between 10% of the 2-year peak flow and the 10-year peak flow. Example sizing of flow-duration basins are shown in Table B-1. Management measures are considered “practicable” if construction cost of treatment plus flow controls is less than or equal to 2% of project cost, excluding land value.

**Table B-1: Basin Sizing Case Studies from the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Program Hydromodification Management Plan (SCVURPPP Final HMP Report, 2005).**

	<b>Thompson</b>	<b>San Jose</b>	<b>Alameda</b>
<b>Basin Depth</b>	4 feet	2.25 feet	2 feet
<b>Basin Area</b>	30 acres	0.06 acre	0.8 acre
<b>Basin Size % DCIA</b>	5.7% (4% catchment)	3.7% (1.7% catchment)	10% (7% catchment)
<b>Drain Time</b>	3 days (90% of the time)	< 1 day	1 day
<b>Q<sub>cp</sub> (low flow)</b>	2.4 cfs	0.1 cfs	0.25 cfs
<b>Infiltration Rate (rainfall)</b>	0.2 inch/hour	0.2 inch/hour	0.5 inch/hour
<b>Infiltration Rate (flow)</b>	5.5 cfs	0.012 cfs	--

\*cfs = cubic feet per second

This hydromodification management plan lays out on-site and in-stream options. Projects in highly urbanized areas with more than 90 % build out and a large percentage of impervious cover are exempt. Additional information on this program is available at [www.SCVURPPP.org](http://www.SCVURPPP.org).

### Case Study 3 – Newhall Land

Newhall Ranch is a specific plan approved for 26,000 homes in the Santa Clara watershed. Runoff from the proposed new development will be addressed by a Natural River Management Plan and a Newhall Ranch Stormwater Plan developed by the land owner.

<sup>3</sup> The Final HMP Report (April 2005) is available at [http://www.eoainc.com/hmp\\_final\\_draft](http://www.eoainc.com/hmp_final_draft)

The Natural River Management Plan is a long-term (20-year) master plan that provides for the construction of various infrastructure improvements to the Santa Clara River and tributaries. The plan maintains 15 miles of the Santa Clara River and its tributaries in a natural state with 75- to 200-foot setbacks from the river that sustains habitat quality and meets requirements for flood control. The plan calls for buried bank stabilization, instead of hardened systems, to meet county flood protection requirements and maintain habitat functions in riparian areas. Trenches have been dug far up from the streambed, filled with a compound called “sand cement” – similar to sandstone, then topped with soil, and replanted with native plant species.

The Newhall Ranch Stormwater Plan is a regional approach to storm water management that incorporates both water quality treatment and hydromodification control. The goals of this plan include:

- Reduction in percentage of impervious cover in the upper watershed using cluster design of development and maximizing open space
- Utilization of BMPs for both water quality and hydromodification source control
- Design of in-stream solutions that protect or enhance habitat.
- Incorporation of the “avoidance, minimization, mitigation” hierarchy in plan development

#### **Case Study 4 – Rancho Mission Viejo**

Rancho Mission Viejo, a private landowner, has voluntarily developed a set of land planning principles as part of a comprehensive land-use planning and resource management program for 25,000 acres in Orange County California. These planning principles will serve as self-imposed requirements, intended to minimize the effects of future development on natural streams in planning areas. Using these principles, the landowners are proposing to focus development on ridges, which are underlain by less pervious material, thereby preserving valleys which contain pervious areas that support infiltration important to creek functions.

##### *Planning Principles:*

###### Geomorphology/Terrains

- Recognize and account for the hydrologic response of different terrains at the sub-basin and watershed scale

###### Hydrology

- Emulate, to the extent feasible, the existing runoff and infiltration patterns in consideration of specific terrains, soil types, and ground cover
- Address potential effects of future land use changes on hydrology
- Minimize alterations of the timing of peak flows of each sub-basin relative to the mainstem creeks
- Maintain and/or restore the inherent geomorphic structure of major tributaries and their floodplains

###### Sediment Sources, Storage, and Transport

- Maintain coarse sediment yields, storage and transport processes

Groundwater Hydrology

- Utilize infiltration properties of sandy terrains for groundwater recharge and to offset potential increases in surface runoff and adverse effects to water quality
- Protect existing groundwater recharge areas supporting slope wetlands and riparian zones and maximize alluvial groundwater recharge to the extent consistent with aquifer capacity and habitat management goals

Water Quality

- Protect water quality using a variety of strategies, with particular emphasis on natural treatment systems, water quality wetlands, swales, and infiltration areas

## APPENDIX C – ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

BASMAA's Start at the Source: Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection, 1999. Prepared by Tom Richman & Associates and CDM. Available from [www.basmaa.org](http://www.basmaa.org).

BASMAA's Using Site Design Techniques to Meet Development Standards for Stormwater Quality: A Companion Document to Start at the Source, 2003. Prepared by CDM. Available from [www.basmaa.org](http://www.basmaa.org)

Better Site Design: A Handbook for Changing Development Rules in Your Community Available for \$35.00 from the Center for Watershed Protection at [www.cwp.org](http://www.cwp.org), under the "Publications" tab.

Redevelopment Roundtable, Consensus Agreement, Smart Practices for Redevelopment and Infill Projects.

Available for free download from the Center for Watershed Protection at [www.cwp.org](http://www.cwp.org), under the "Publications" tab; it is listed with the "Better Site Design" publications.

Builders for the Bay Program

Information about this program, which is joint project of the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, the Center for Watershed Protection and the National Association of Home Builders, can be found at [http://www.cwp.org/builders\\_for\\_bay.htm](http://www.cwp.org/builders_for_bay.htm).

The Practice of Low Impact Development

Available for \$5.00 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, at <http://www.huduser.org/publications/alpha/alpha.html>. It is also available for \$50.00 from the NAHB Research Center's bookstore at [www.nahbrc.org](http://www.nahbrc.org).

National Association of Homebuilders Research Center

"Builder's Guide to Low Impact Development" and "Municipal Guide to Low Impact Development". Available for free download from

<http://www.toolbase.org/tertiaryT.asp?TrackID=&CategoryID=36&DocumentID=3834>

"Growing Greener: Putting Conservation into Local Codes". Available for free download from <http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/growinggreener/growinggreener.htm>.

Low-Impact Development Design Strategies: An Integrated Approach; Low-Impact Development Hydrologic Analysis

Both are available for free download from US Environmental Protection Agency's website at <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lid/>.

Truckee Meadows Structural Control Design Manual: Guidance on Source and Treatment Controls for Storm Water Quality Management - Kennedy/Jenks Consultants

[http://ci.reno.nv.us/gov/pub\\_works/stormwater/management/controls/pdfs/TOC.pdf](http://ci.reno.nv.us/gov/pub_works/stormwater/management/controls/pdfs/TOC.pdf)



National NEMO (Non Point Education for Municipal Officials) Network - Educational Materials on the link between land use and water quality

<http://nemonet.uconn.edu/>

Physical Effects of Wet Weather Flows on Aquatic Habitats: Present Knowledge and Research Needs , by L.A. Roesner and B.P. Bledsoe – Water Environment Research Foundation, 2003.

<http://www.werf.org>

Impacts of Impervious Cover on Aquatic Systems – Center for Watershed Protection, 2003.

<http://www.cwp.org/>