Improving Water Resource Management Decisions through the 1-2-3 Framework

Presentation to

California Water Quality Monitoring Council

November 30, 2011

Louisa Squires, Sr. Project Manager Watershed Stewardship Division Santa Clara Valley Water District

Santa Clara Valley Water District

The Mission of the District

A healthy, safe, and enhanced quality of living in Santa Clara County through watershed stewardship and comprehensive management of water resources in a practical, cost-effective, and environmentally sensitive manner.

Stewardship: To entrust the careful and responsible management of the environment and natural resources to one's care for the benefit of the greater community

QMS Manual, Doc No. Q422D01



District's Ecological Monitoring & Assessment Framework

The goal is to provide costeffective, scientifically-based, and integrated information on stream ecosystem health to inform asset management decisions

Ecological Monitoring & Assessment Framework

The Problem

Project-based Delivery Lacks Efficiency & Effectiveness

- Escalating ecological monitoring costs
- Limited ability to use ecological information
- Lack standards & integration
- Unpredictable & inconsistent regulatory outcomes



The Solution

Shift from Project to Programmatic Strategy

- Ecological Monitoring and Assessment Framework
- Tailored USEPA 1-2-3 Framework



The Result

Informed & Cost-effective Asset Management Decisions

- Standardized toolkit
- Contained & relevant monitoring costs
- Synthesized stream condition information
- Stewardship Performance Monitoring
- Informed investment decisions
- Common communication framework



1-2-3 Framework Overview



Resource Management Questions

Standardized Core MQ's

- What is the extent and distribution of stream ecosystem resources?
- What are the conditions of stream ecosystem resources?
- What are the risk to stream ecosystem resources?
- What are the monitoring and management actions could improve stream ecosystem conditions and reduce risk?

Watershed-Specific MQ's Examples (Level 3)

- How are the mitigation sites performing in relation to the streams in the watershed?
- What are the optimal locations for steelhead enhancements to promote juvenile rearing?
- Do partnership efforts appear to have improved physical stream structure?

1-2-3 Framework





Level 1 Inventory of Riverine Wetlands

- Distribution and extent of riparian ecosystem in Santa Clara County
- Defines District Primary Area of Interest
- Base map for selecting representative assessment sites for Level 2





Measuring Overall Stream Condition



CRAM Attributes & Metrics





CRAM Attributes & Metrics









Level 3: Targeted-site Monitoring

- Intensive, quantitative, site-specific ecological data
- Pertain to specific aspects of ecological processes and functions
- Project-specific performance monitoring (e.g., mitigation monitoring) and special studies
- Leverage external data (e.g., SCVURPPP)



Reporting on Stream Condition Coyote Creek Watershed Pilot



- 2011: First assessment in the Coyote Creek Watershed using the Framework
- Demonstration of Framework & lessons learned
- Emphasis on Levels 1 and 2
- Ambient condition of streams:

 Coyote Creek Watershed
 Upper Penitencia Creek Subwatershed
- Stream Ecosystem Condition Profile

Coyote Creek Watershed Pilot Assessment Site Distribution



Coyote Creek Watershed Pilot Assessment & Reporting Tools

Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF)

- Summarize CRAM data using CDF's
- CRAM scores as proportion of stream miles
- Better stream condition—CDF shifts to right
- Compare targeted sites to watershed scores





Ecological Services Index (ESI)

- Establish targets for stream condition
- ESI: area weighted average of all CRAM scores in the CDF
- Tool to track stream ecosystem condition over time

Coyote Creek Watershed Pilot

- Of 2,830 miles of stream, District owns 76 miles (<3%)
- Ecological Services Index: 75
- 86% of stream miles in high or mediumhigh condition
- No stream miles in lowest condition category





- Attributes of stream condition scored moderately high, except physical structure
- Lowest scores: Middle reaches Mid-Coyote, adjacent development, poor hydrology condition, invasive plant species.
- Highest scores: urban transition zone, development risk

Framework Implementation Profile Recommends Actions

ACTIONS NEEDED	WHO NEEDS TO DO IT?		
	SCVWD	Municipal	Other
Alter management of impoundments flushing of aggraded sediment	✓		
Flood Protection Projects: Mid-Coyote increasing gradient and floodplain connectivity. Upper Penitencia Creek enhance physical structure. Lower Silveraddress high turbidity Lake Cunningham restore riparian and wetland areas	✓		
Maintain existing urban growth boundaries.		✓	
Implement and enforce riparian and wetland protection policies and ordinances		\checkmark	
Urban development plans and land management actions: provide opportunities to enhance wetland and riparian areas and achieve flood control and water supply objectives.		✓	
Ranchland best management practices to prevent livestock over grazing			✓

Framework Implementation Putting the Profile to Use

- Establish targets for stream condition
- Evaluate the Boards ends policy to protect creek & bay ecosystems
- Guide investment decisions on actions to maintain and improve stream condition
- Provide basis for public input on stream goals, priority projects, and funding
- Guide decisions to fill priority data gaps
- Guide design, management and assessment of projects
- To share stream ecosystem condition information with public, land use agencies and the environmental resource agencies.



Contact: Lsquires@valleywater.org (408) 439-8639

Acknowledgements

Project done under contract with EOA, Inc. & San Francisco Estuary Institute

EMAF Technical Plan:

http://www.valleywater.org/Services/HealthyCreeksandEcoSystems.aspx

Coyote Creek Watershed Streams Assessment Pilot Report: http://www.valleywater.org/Services/Coyote.aspx