A tool for identifying constraints on stream biointegrity
Background

• We created a landscape model that predicts likely ranges of CSCI scores for nearly all stream segments in California

• Local watershed groups have applied models to prioritize management decisions (restoration, protection, monitoring)
  • Interactive, online tools help visualize outcomes of priorities

• We will briefly review the development and validation of this tool
What’s the purpose of the tool?

- WB staff wanted a tool to help identify streams where constraints (development, channel modification) create challenges for maintaining bio-integrity
- WB staff is considering whether/how to incorporate tool into biointegrity-biostimulatory policy
- With or without formal incorporation, the tool is intended to help regulated community
  - It provides a technical foundation for discussions with regulators about goals
  - It can support the setting of priorities in watershed plans (e.g., WQIPs, EWMPs), conservation planning
Development can constrain biological integrity

High scores (above threshold) rarely, if ever, seen in certain stream types
Two ways to identify constrained streams: Channels vs Landscapes

- Field determination vs. GIS
- Harder to map channel mod
- Channel mod may define the problem too narrowly
- Both approaches have strengths, but landscape approach is better for screening and statewide application

Modified channel

Developed landscape
Caveats on purposes and goals

• We set out to create maps and models to provide a screening tool that starts a conversation, not to create a regulatory designation.

• The maps and models alone are not a use attainability analysis (UAA) but may help prioritize where they may be needed.

• Analyses are associative and based on observed condition, and they can only indirectly inform constraints, restoration potential, or impacts of future management.

• More interest in predicting condition, not explaining mechanisms of impairment.

• We are trying to predict biological condition, not locations where channel modification has occurred.
Approach

- CSCI scores statewide
- Landscape metrics statewide
- Predict ranges of CSCI scores from landscape metrics
- Results mapped to all CA streams
- Classification of CA streams
How models were built

Quantile Random Forest

• 3252 sites, split 80% calibration 20% validation
  • Stratified by 6 regions
  • Each region further stratified into thirds by imperviousness

• Where multiple samples are available, only one selected at random for modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSA6</th>
<th>Bottom third</th>
<th>Top third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predictor data source: STREAMCAT

- Nearly all stream segments from NHD+ (1:100k scale) represented
- Lots of data calculated for each watershed and catchment
  - Metrics also calculated for 100-m riparian buffers
- STREAMCAT makes it easy to explore statewide landscape models on a large scale
We evaluated 117 predictor variables to calibrate models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURAL</th>
<th>ANTHROPOGENIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watershed area</td>
<td>Landcover &amp; impervious surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>Road density &amp; crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Dams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>Atmospheric deposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Canal density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-native veg cover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex models (dozens of predictors) aren’t much better than simpler models (core land use variables)

Stressors with long-term impacts
- Difficult to manage
- Generally outside WB purview
Model predicted CSCI scores well

Pseudo $r^2$: 0.62

% correct:
  - Cal: 89%
  - Val: 81%
Little evidence of bias along natural or anthropogenic gradients

Cal $F = 0.56$, $p = 0.73$
Val $F = 0.88$, $p = 0.49$
What we get from the model:

• For each stream reach, a range of modelled biological expectations
• Expectations from distribution of scores at calibration sites with similar levels of disturbance
How are reaches classified using the model?

(a) Range of expected CSCI scores for stream segments
(b) Expected CSCI scores within certainty range
(c) Stream segment classification by CSCI threshold

likely unconstrained
possibly unconstrained
possibly constrained
likely constrained
Statewide classifications

- Likely unconstrained: 39%
- Possibly unconstrained: 46%
- Possibly constrained: 11%
- Likely constrained: 4%
Explore how decision-points affects outcomes

Streams constrained below CSCI 0.63

Streams constrained below CSCI 0.79

Streams constrained below CSCI 0.92
Models provide context to help set priorities

- Lots of sampling
- Many low-scoring sites
- Which ones to fix?
Prioritizing actions based on observed scores and landscape context

An applied example from the San Gabriel watershed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Example activity</th>
<th>Example high-priority site</th>
<th>Example low-priority site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Higher frequency of sampling. Evaluate additional data (e.g., habitat).</td>
<td>Sites scoring outside prediction interval</td>
<td>Sites scoring as expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Extra scrutiny for proposed impacts.</td>
<td>Unconstrained sites</td>
<td>Constrained sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore</td>
<td>Make funding recommendations. Conduct causal assessment. Prioritize TMDL development.</td>
<td>Low-scoring unconstrained sites.</td>
<td>Low-scoring constrained sites. (high priority for UAA?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the impacts and outcomes of key decisions?

- Developed an online application for selected watersheds – transparent and exploratory

**SCAPE: Stream Classification And Priority Explorer**

![SCAPE Logo](http://shiny.sccwrp.org/scape/)

These maps show stream reach classifications and CSCI scores at monitoring stations. The left map shows the predicted median CSCI score for a reach and observed CSCI score at a station from field data. The right map shows the CSCI score expectation for a reach and the relative CSCI score at a station for the expectation (over scoring as up triangle, expected as circle, under scoring as down triangle). See the plot tab (step 2) for more details on how expectations and relative site scores are determined. The toggle switch controls how the CSCI scores at the stations (points) on the left map are displayed. The observed scores from field samples are shown when the switch is off and the differences between the observed scores and the stream reach median expectations are shown when the switch is on.

Current status

• Manuscript completed EPA internal review, and has been submitted to *Freshwater Science*
• Review by advisory groups requested concurrently with journal review
Charge Questions

• Comment on the adequacy of the data set, the analytical approaches to predict ranges of biointegrity scores associated with landscape development, the evaluation of performance and findings of the Channels in Developed Landscape Tool.

• Are there technical ways to address stakeholder concerns?
Questions?
Dampened response to WQ gradients

Improving WQ may not protect bio-integrity
Model can’t be applied to *every* stream.

Some streams **excluded** from NHD+, or StreamCat

No data to make predictions
Can we characterize ranges here too?

Options:
- Derive ranges for "typical" ag/urban site from model
- Derive ranges observed at SoCal engineered channels

Can Sci. Panel comment on options for characterizing index score ranges at these sites?
Feedback: Unmodelled factors may be important!

• We developed a simple and complex model
  • Both performed similarly (based on accuracy, as well as user feedback)
  • Excluded factors were redundant

• But constraints can be caused by other factors besides urban/ag
  • E.g., Hydromodification, silviculture/timber harvesting, cannabis cultivation
  • Unfeasible for statewide application and/or data unavailable – invest in stressor data acquisition!

• Landscape models are one approach for evaluating constraints, best suited for screening-level application on a statewide scale
Example: Effluent-dominated streams

Red: Effluent-dominated sites in 3 SoCal rivers (Los Angeles, San Gabriel, Santa Ana)
How about effluent-dominated streams?
A quick test in SoCal:

24 of 28 are constrained
27 of 28 are low-scoring

Although we couldn’t include this as a model predictor, we still can tell that most are constrained.
Comment: “Constrained” does not mean “unfixable”

We agree

- Model is based only on association between landscape pressures and biological response
  - Does not identify mechanism
  - Causal assessment for *manageable stressors* is logical follow-up

- Model is based on CSCI
  - Other biological endpoints may exhibit different constraints
How narrow is the range of predicted scores?

- Narrow range: More confidence in classifications!
- Range = 90th percentile minus 10th percentile
- Narrowest range (~0.3) at very low impervious
- Widest range at Desert/Modoc, and high-impervious North Coast.
Restoration priorities in the San Gabriel Watershed