

Implementation Procedures for the Narrative Bottom Deposits Standard



April 2015





Douglas A. Ducey
Governor

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT
OF
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY




Henry R. Darwin
Director

APPROVALS

I approve the attached "Implementation Procedures for the Narrative Bottom Deposits Standard" document as a final document adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality for use in interpreting the associated Surface Water Quality Standards, 18 A.A.C. 11, Article 1.

Approved by: _____



Trevor Baggione, Water Quality Division Director
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

4-22-15

Date

Executive Summary

This document sets forth implementation procedures for the narrative “bottom deposits” water quality standard found at A.A.C. R18-11-108(A)(1). The document explains ADEQ’s approach to objectively determining compliance with this narrative bottom deposits standard. The narrative bottom deposits standard states:

“A surface water shall not contain pollutants in amounts or combinations that settle to form bottom deposits that inhibit or prohibit the habitation, growth, or propagation of aquatic life.” [A.A.C. R18-11-108(A)(1)]

This narrative standard is intended to identify conditions of excessive sedimentation and siltation in amounts that adversely affect aquatic life. Excessive sediment alters aquatic habitats and suffocates fish eggs and bottom-dwelling organisms. Clean stream bottom substrates are essential for the health of many fish and aquatic insect communities. Habitat degradation due to sedimentation occurs when key habitat components such as spawning gravels and cobble surfaces are covered by fine sediment, decreasing inter-gravel oxygen transfer and reducing or eliminating the quality and quantity of pool and interstitial habitat for fish, benthic macroinvertebrates and algae. Fine sediment is defined as particles that are less than 2 mm in size (i.e., sand, clay, and silt).

ADEQ measures the percentage of fine sediments to determine compliance with the narrative bottom deposits standard. There are separate bottom deposits criteria for warm and cold water streams, based upon interpretation of the existing scientific literature. Fine sediment levels of <30% fines for cold water streams and <50% fines for warm water streams are required to protect aquatic life. These fine sediment thresholds constitute the objective criteria that ADEQ uses to determine compliance with the narrative bottom deposits standard.

The minimum percent fines threshold of 30% is protective for cold water streams. The scientific literature indicates that negative effects to salmonid propagation (e.g., trout) are shown to occur when the percentage of fine sediment in riffle habitats is above this threshold. Bjornn et. al (1977) found that when the percentage of fine sediment exceeds 20% to 30% in spawning riffles, the survival and emergence of salmonid embryos begins to decline. ADEQ’s “Riffle Pebble Count” field procedure must be used to determine the percentage of fine sediments in the riffle habitats of a cold water stream (Appendix A).

The minimum percent fines threshold of 50% is protective for warm water streams. This threshold is a composite of multiple macroinvertebrate species tolerance values developed by Relyea et al. (2000), many of which reside in Arizona’s warm water streams. This criterion represents a loss of habitation by aquatic life, primarily the aquatic insects. There is supporting empirical macroinvertebrate data indicating that sediment effects to the macroinvertebrate community occurs at levels of 40-50% fines in San Pedro River streams (Spindler, 2004). ADEQ’s “Reachwide Pebble Count” field procedure must be used to determine compliance with the warm water bottom deposits criterion (Appendix B).

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
INTRODUCTION	5
DEFINING EXCESS SEDIMENT AS REGULATED BY THE NARRATIVE BOTTOM DEPOSITS STANDARD	6
APPLICABILITY	7
ADVERSE EFFECTS OF SEDIMENT DEPOSITS ON AQUATIC LIFE IN STREAMS	8
BENTHIC MACROINVERTEBRATES.....	8
FISH.....	9
DETERMINING THRESHOLDS FOR THE NARRATIVE BOTTOM DEPOSIT STANDARD	10
DETERMINING A NARRATIVE BOTTOM DEPOSIT STANDARD VIOLATION	11
IMPLEMENTATION OF NARRATIVE BOTTOM DEPOSITS STANDARD IN AZPDES PERMITS	11
WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENTS §305(B) USING BOTTOM DEPOSITS STANDARD	11
DEFINITIONS:	13
LITERATURE CITED:	14
APPENDIX A. RIFFLE PEBBLE COUNT FIELD PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING PERCENT FINES IN RIFFLE HABITATS	16
APPENDIX B. REACHWIDE PEBBLE COUNT FIELD PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING PERCENT FINES WITHIN MULTIPLE HABITATS	17

Introduction

Excessive sediment alters aquatic habitats, suffocates fish eggs and bottom-dwelling organisms, interferes with drinking water treatment processes, and impairs the recreational uses of rivers and streams. Clean stream bottom substrates are essential for the health of many fish and aquatic insect communities. Habitat degradation due to sedimentation occurs when key habitat components such as spawning gravels and cobble surfaces are covered by fine sediment, decreasing inter-gravel oxygen transfer and reducing or eliminating the quality and quantity of pool and interstitial habitat for fish, benthic macroinvertebrates, and algae.

Excessive sediment of anthropogenic origin is a major stressor of aquatic ecosystems in the United States. According to the EPA National Water Quality Inventory-2000 Report, excessive sediment and siltation were identified as leading causes of water quality impairment of the Nation's rivers and streams (USEPA, 2002). In the 2000 Water Quality Inventory, 31% of all river and stream miles were listed as impaired because of sedimentation.

The protection of aquatic life from excess sedimentation originates from the goals and objectives of the Clean Water Act. The protection of aquatic life is a key component of the Clean Water Act objective "to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the nation's waters." Protection of aquatic life is reinforced in Clean Water Act §101(a)(2) which sets forth the national goal that "...wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and provides for recreation in and on the water be achieved." Protection of aquatic life from the adverse effects of excess sedimentation and siltation is provided by the narrative bottom deposits standard.

Arizona's narrative bottom deposits standard is found in the water quality standards rules at A.A.C. R18-11-108(A)(1), which states:

"A surface water shall not contain pollutants in amounts or combinations that... settle to form bottom deposits that inhibit or prohibit the habitation, growth, or propagation of aquatic life."

This document establishes the procedures required to implement and interpret the existing narrative bottom deposits standard to identify conditions of excessive sedimentation and siltation in streams in amounts that adversely affect aquatic life.

Defining Excess Sediment as Regulated by the Narrative Bottom Deposits Standard

The narrative bottom deposits standard is intended to regulate excessive amounts of uncontaminated fine sediment in stream bottoms which adversely affect aquatic life. Fine sediment is defined as particles that are less than 2 mm in size (i.e., clay, silt and sand). Fine sediment is also defined as “clean” or uncontaminated sediment for purposes of the bottom deposit standard. Excess sediment means an accumulation of fine particles that settle out of the water column to form deposits on the streambed.

ADEQ uses a modified Wolman pebble count procedure (Wolman, 1954; Harrelson, et al., 1994) to calculate the percentage of fine sediment that is present in the stream substrate. In this method, streambed particles are placed into size classes, modified from the Wentworth scale (Wentworth, 1922). These size classes include particles that range from silt and clay to sand, gravel, cobbles and boulders (Table1).

Table 1. Particle size classes used in the Wolman pebble count.

Size Class	Size Range (mm)
Silt / Clay	<0.062
Sand	0.063 – 2
Very Fine Gravel	3-4
Fine Gravel	5-8
Medium Gravel	9-16
Coarse Gravel	17-32
Very Coarse Gravel	33-64
Small Cobble	65-96
Medium Cobble	97-128
Large Cobble	129-180
Very Large Cobble	181-256
Small Boulder	257-512
Medium Boulder	513-1024
Large Boulder	1025-2048
Very Large Boulder	2049-4096
Bedrock	>4097

Applicability

The narrative bottom deposits standard applies to all “surface waters.” “Surface water” is defined in the surface water quality standards rules at A.A.C. R18-11-101(41). The regulatory definition of “surface water” is as follows:

“Surface water” means a water of the United States and includes the following:

- a. A water that is currently used, was used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce;
- b. An interstate water, including an interstate wetland;
- c. All other waters, such as an intrastate lake, reservoir, natural pond, river, stream (including an intermittent or ephemeral stream), creek, wash, draw, mudflat, sandflat, wetland, slough, backwater, prairie pothole, wet meadow, or playa lake, the use, degradation, or destruction of which would affect or could affect interstate or foreign commerce, including any such water:
 - i. That is or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes;
 - ii. From which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; or
 - iii. That is used or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate or foreign commerce;
- d. An impoundment of a surface water as defined by this definition;
- e. A tributary of a surface water identified in subsections (41)(a) through (41)(d); and
- f. A wetland adjacent to surface water identified in subsections (41)(a) through (e).

While the narrative bottom deposits standard technically applies to all surface waters, ADEQ has developed implementation procedures that apply only to wadeable, perennial streams with either an A&Wc or A&Ww designated use. The ADEQ field procedures described in Appendices A and B must be used for determining the percentage of fine sediments in warm water and cold water streams.

Bottom deposits assessments will only be conducted for perennial, wadeable stream segments because the existing research used to develop the implementation procedures is based upon perennial stream data.

Perennial refers to stream segments which flow continuously throughout the year (excluding effluent dependent waters). If the streamflow at a study site is low flow and potentially intermittent, flow conditions should be monitored during the year prior to sampling to ensure perennial conditions exist prior to the spring macroinvertebrate sample event. Perennial conditions should be documented using one of the following methods: 1) Streamflow should be monitoring during the summer season and ideally through the three seasons prior to the spring season to ensure continuous flow, 2) In-stream flow sensors with data loggers that record daily mean flows, or 3) Photo documentation of flow at the sampling location during June or throughout all seasons of the prior year.

Wadeable means no deeper than can be safely waded across when collecting samples.

The new narrative bottom deposits criterion will not apply to the following water body types: 1) Intermittent streams, 2) Effluent dependent waters, 3) Ephemeral streams, 4) Lakes or 5) Wetlands at this time.

While there is no defined “index period” for collecting pebble count samples, there are some guidelines to follow. Sampling should occur during baseflow conditions. Sampling for bottom deposits should not occur during or immediately following a bankfull or greater flood event. Hydrologic conditions at the nearest USGS gage are checked in the office prior to a site visit. Bottom deposit samples are not collected if: a) A bankfull or greater magnitude flow event has occurred within 4 weeks of site visit, or b) Extreme high flow events have occurred within a 3-month period (>10-year return interval flood) resulting in deep scouring of the streambed.

Adverse Effects of Sediment Deposits on Aquatic Life in Streams

Benthic Macroinvertebrates

There is an extensive body of scientific literature documenting adverse impacts of excessive sedimentation and siltation on aquatic life in streams. In a major review of the effects of sediment in streams, Waters (1995) notes that most of the published research dealing with bottom deposits of sediment and benthic macroinvertebrates addresses three major areas:

1) the correlation between the abundance of benthic macroinvertebrates and substrate particle size, 2) the embeddedness of streambed substrates and habitat loss associated with the decrease in the amount of interstitial space or habitat available to benthic macroinvertebrates, and 3) changes in species composition associated with changes in habitat caused by sedimentation.

In an extensive literature review, Chapman and McLeod (1987) found that benthic macroinvertebrate abundance, diversity and species composition was highly correlated with the quantity of fine sediment in stream courses, as follows:

- 1) Fine sediment is inversely correlated with abundance of aquatic insects. Aquatic insect abundance was reduced 50% with an increase from 7% to 9% fines (<0.84mm) from a sediment core sample (Cederholm and Lestelle, 1974).
- 2) Insect abundance and diversity generally declined as a result of sediment addition in an Idaho stream (McClelland and Brusven, 1980). Two stoneflies were highly sensitive to bottom sediment and several species of EPT taxa were moderately sensitive to low amounts of sediment but highly sensitive to large increases in bottom sediment. McClelland found that the microhabitat area beneath cobble was very important for most of the EPT taxa he studied.
- 3) Loss of species and shifts in species composition occurred in streams with increased percent fines. The highest production of aquatic macroinvertebrates was found in streams with gravel to rubble sized substrate (Reiser and Bjornn, 1979). Five species of aquatic insects studied by Brusven and Prather (1974) generally preferred unembedded cobble substrates to half to completely embedded cobble. Nutall (1972) found that sand deposition led to increased abundance of a few macroinvertebrates, such as Tubificid worms and two tolerant mayflies, but also led to loss of many other species.

In a study of 562 stream segments located in four northwestern states, Relyea et al. (2000) found that there are species specific responses to the amount of fine sediment in streambeds and that a Fine Sediment Biotic Index (FSBI) could be constructed, based on aggregated macroinvertebrate sediment tolerance levels, to be used as a predictive tool. While Relyea's work on 83 insect taxa revealed important information about species specific maximum sediment tolerance values, we find the aggregate FSBI scoring categories to be more useful in a regulatory context. For example, specific taxa such as the mayfly *Drunella doddsi* occurred in streams containing <37% fines, but was completely missing at greater levels of fines. For the FSBI, Relyea has placed the 83 taxa she investigated into four scoring categories of intolerant (<30% fines), moderately intolerant (30-50% fines), moderately tolerant (50-70% fines), and tolerant (>70% fines). Of the 83 taxa used to develop the FSBI, there is an aggregate of 29 sediment intolerant taxa which were lost at maximum fine sediment levels of <50% and 54 tolerant taxa found at ranges of 50-100% fines. While species specific tolerance values, especially for taxa found in Arizona, are relevant and important information, the aggregate FSBI scoring categories are a more robust tool for use in standards development.

In a study of stream pollution problems associated with sedimentation and urban runoff in North Carolina, Lenat et.al. (1979) found that density, species richness and diversity were decreased with increased sedimentation. They summarized the effects of sedimentation upon benthic macroinvertebrate communities, as follows: 1) with small amounts of sediment, the density and standing stock of the benthos may be decreased due to reduction of interstitial habitat, although community structure and species richness may not change, and 2) greater sediment amounts that drastically change the substrate type (i.e. from cobble / gravel to sand / silt) will change the taxonomic composition, thus altering community structure and species diversity. The classic example of taxonomic alteration due to sedimentation is a shift from a community of EPT organisms in the stream to one of oligochaetes (worms) and burrowing chironomids (midges).

Fish

The loss or reduction of fish populations has been associated with sedimentation of streams. Waters (1995) categorized the existing scientific literature on the effects of sediment on fish in streams into 4 main categories: 1) the direct effect of suspended sediment, including turbidity; 2) effects on reproductive success of salmonids; 3) effects on reproductive success on non-salmonid, or warm water fishes; and 4) effects of deposited sediment on the habitat of fry, juvenile, and adult fish.

Most of the published research on the effects of deposited sediment in streams relates to effects on fish, particularly salmonids (e.g., salmon and trout). The adverse effects of deposited sediment on the reproductive success of salmonids have been extensively studied. All North American salmon and trout (including inland trout populations of brook, brown, cutthroat, and other trout) use redds (spawning nests) in flowing waters as part of their reproductive strategy. Salmonid redds are vulnerable to deposited sediment because the developing eggs, embryos, and newly hatched sac fry in the redd require inter-gravel flows of oxygen-rich water. The primary source of oxygen reaching the redd is in the downwelling water of the stream. The deposition of excessive sediment is a major problem because sediment deposits interfere with or prevent the transfer of dissolved oxygen within the redd. When excessive sediment settles to form deposit deposits, adverse effects include the coating of fish eggs and embryos and the filling of interstitial spaces in the redd gravel so that the flow of oxygen-rich water through the redd is impeded or stopped. Three adverse effects of excessive sediment on salmonid redds have been recognized: 1) filling of interstitial spaces in the redd by sediment deposits, thus reducing or preventing the flow of water through the redd and the supply of oxygen to the embryos or sac fry; 2) smothering of embryos and sac fry by high concentrations of

suspended sediment entering the redd; and 3) entrapment of emerging fry if an armor of consolidated sediment is deposited on the surface of the redd.

In contrast to salmonid reproduction, the effect of sediment upon reproductive success of warm water fishes is less well known. Waters (1995) notes that correlations between warm water fish species distribution and heavy sedimentation in streams suggest some cause and effect relationship, but only circumstantial evidence is available.

The scientific literature on the subject of deposited sediment and fish habitat has concentrated primarily on fish-rearing habitat. Two major areas of study have been investigated: 1) mortality to fish fry by the filling in of the interstitial spaces in riffles of gravel and cobbles, and 2) loss of juvenile-rearing and adult habitat by the filling of pools. Again, most of the research in this area has been done on salmonids. Salmonid fry require the protection of streambed “roughness” conditions for winter survival. Salmonid fry seek the protection of the interstitial spaces in clean stream bed substrates for over-wintering cover. Although not as extensively studied, there is evidence of the adverse effect of deposited sediment on juvenile rearing habitat in pools. When heavy sediment deposits reduce or eliminate pool habitat, reduced growth and loss of fish populations result. Waters (1995) presumed that fry of warm water fishes have similar habitat requirements for survival of early life stages but Waters states that little research has been done on these sediment relationships for warm water fishes.

Bjornn et. al. (1977) found that when the percentage of fine sediment exceeds 20 to 30 percent in spawning riffles, the survival and emergence of salmonid embryos begins to decline. Bjornn et. al. (1977) advocate using the percentage of fine sediment in riffle areas as the primary indicator for monitoring deposition of fine sediment in streams and for determining when too much sediment deposition is occurring.

Determining Thresholds for the Narrative Bottom Deposit Standard

Separate bottom deposits criteria have been established for warm and cold water streams, based upon interpretation of the existing literature. Sediment levels of $\leq 30\%$ fines for cold water streams and $\leq 50\%$ fines for warm water streams are required to protect aquatic life. These sediment levels will constitute the narrative bottom deposits criteria. The rationale for these criteria is presented below.

The cold water sediment criterion is more protective than the warm water criterion. There are native Arizona trout species resident in our cold water streams, which should be protected at the 30% level of fine sediment, which inhibits propagation of salmonids, as reported by Bjornn et al. (1977). In addition, excess sediment is less common in high gradient, erosional stream types of the cold water, mountain streams of Arizona. The cold water bottom deposits criterion will be applicable to only perennial, wadeable, non-effluent streams at this time. ADEQ’s “Riffle Pebble Count” field procedure (Jones, 2012) must be used to determine the percentage of fines in a cold water stream (Appendix A).

The 50% fines criterion is reasonable for warm water streams of Arizona for several reasons. This value is a composite of multiple macroinvertebrate species sediment tolerance values developed by Relyea et al. (2000). Many of these species reside in Arizona’s warm water streams. This criterion represents a loss of habitation by aquatic life, namely the aquatic insects. In addition, empirical macroinvertebrate research indicate that sediment effects to macroinvertebrates occur at levels of 40-50% fines in San Pedro River streams (Spindler, 2004). Thus, an initial criterion for warm water streams is set at a greater percentage of fines than for cold water streams. The warm water bottom deposits criterion will be applicable to only perennial, wadeable, non-effluent streams at this time.

ADEQ's "Reachwide Pebble Count" field procedure (Jones, 2012) must be used to support the warm water bottom deposits criterion (Appendix B).

Determining a Narrative Bottom Deposit Standard Violation

ADEQ will determine compliance with the narrative bottom deposits standard from pebble count sample results collected during baseflow conditions and comparison to the applicable warm or cold water threshold. The percent fines values in Table 2 comprise the numeric thresholds ADEQ will use to determine whether there is a violation of the narrative bottom deposits standard. A violation of the standard occurs when the percent fines, as determined by the appropriate pebble count method, is greater than the numeric criterion in Table 2. These criteria apply only to perennial, wadeable streams with either an A&Wc or A&Ww designated use. ADEQ's bottom deposits sampling and analysis procedures or comparable procedures shall be followed in order to determine compliance with the bottom deposits standards. Sampling methods for pebble counts are described in the ADEQ Surface Water field procedures document, *Standard Operating Procedures for Surface Water Quality Sampling* (Jones, 2012).

Table 2. Numeric Bottom Deposits Standard Thresholds

Wadeable, perennial stream	Bottom Deposit criterion (percentage of fine sediment <2mm)
A&Wc	> 30 %
A&Ww	> 50 %

Implementation of Narrative Bottom Deposits Standard in AZPDES Permits

The narrative bottom deposits standard at R18-11-108(A)(1) and associated criteria specified in R18-11-108.02 are not intended to be used as a basis for calculating numeric water quality based effluent limits in AZPDES permits. Numeric effluent limits to control the point source discharge of sediment may be based on applicable technology-based requirements (e.g., secondary treatment requirements for total suspended solids in 40 CFR, Part 133) or applicable numeric water quality standards for suspended sediment concentration prescribed at A.A.C. R18-11-109(C). ADEQ may develop AZPDES permit conditions which require water quality monitoring of stream bottom deposits consistent with these procedures to assess stream conditions and to confirm point source discharge controls or effectiveness of best management practices to control discharges of sediment.

Water Quality Assessments §305(b) Using Bottom Deposits Standard

CWA §305(b) water quality assessments will be based on the narrative bottom deposits standard (A.A.C. R18-11-108-A(1)), the bottom deposit rules contained in R18-11-108.02 and these implementation procedures. The following guidance is provided for 305(b) Water Quality Assessment purposes only. Guidance for 303(d) listings of impaired waters is not provided here because the "Impaired Waters Identification Rule" language must be updated first.

Attaining or inconclusive determinations shall be made with at least two bottom deposits samples spaced greater than 7 days apart. The attainment status of the narrative bottom deposits standard is inconclusive where there is only one violation of the narrative bottom deposits standard within a five-year assessment period. A finding of "inconclusive" does not result in the identification of a wadeable,

perennial stream as an impaired water. A verification sample is required to determine whether there is a violation of the narrative bottom deposits standard. The verification sample must be collected more than 7 days apart from the original sample. Samples collected within a 7-day timeframe within the same reach shall be averaged for assessment purposes. A reach is attaining when the two most recent samples meet the bottom deposit criteria established in R18-11-108.02(B). ADEQ will accept data from outside sources that is collected using ADEQ protocols and meets quality control objectives.

Determinations of “impairment” using the biocriteria standard cannot be made until the Impaired Waters Identification Rule has been updated in rule.

Definitions:

Benthic means the bottom of a sea, lake or stream. Benthic macroinvertebrates generally refers to aquatic insects and other invertebrates which reside on stream bottom substrates.

Biological integrity: The capacity of supporting and maintaining a balanced, integrated, adaptive community of organisms having a species composition, diversity, and functional organization comparable to that of the natural habitat of the region.

Fine sediment refers to the percentage of particles occurring in the stream substrate, which are less than 2 mm in particle size (i.e., clay, silt and sand).

Index of biological integrity means a multimetric tool used for assessing the condition of a biological community.

Interstitial refers to the spaces between grains of sediment in a stream substrate (interstitial spaces).

Macroinvertebrates are invertebrate animals that are large enough to be seen with the naked eye and have no backbone or spinal column; such as insects, snails, and worms.

Perennial surface water means a surface water that flows continuously throughout the year.

Redd - A spawning nest dug in the streambed substrate by a fish, especially a salmon or trout.

Riffle habitat refers to the portions of streams where moderate velocities and substrate roughness produce moderately turbulent conditions which break the surface tension of the water and may produce whitewater.

Run habitat refers to segments of streams where there is moderate velocity water, but non-turbulent conditions which do not break the surface tension of the water and do not produce whitewater.

Seasonally intermittent refers to a stream segment which has had no flow in the study reach at some period of time since the last spring index period.

Substrate refers to the bottom material in a stream, which is composed of a mixture of particle sizes.

Wadeable means no deeper than can be safely waded across when collecting samples. ADEQ recommends sampling in streams that are flowing at velocities and depths whose quotient is less than 9 (eg. Velocity $4.5\text{ft} / \text{s} \times 2\text{ ft deep}$).

Literature cited:

ADEQ. 2003. Arizona Administrative Code, Title 18, Chapter 11. Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Phoenix, AZ.

Bjornn, T.C., M.A. Brusven, M.P. Molnau, and J.H. Milligan. 1977. Transport of granitic sediment in streams and its effects on insects and fish. University of Idaho, College of Forestry, Wildlife and Range Sciences, Bulletin Number 17. Moscow, Idaho.

Brusven, M.A. and K. Prather. 1974. Influence of stream sediments on distribution of macrobenthos. *J. Entomological Society B.C.* 71:25-32.

Cederholm, C.J. and L.C. Lestelle. 1974. Observations of the effects of landslide siltation on salmon and trout resources of the Clearwater River, Jefferson County, Washington, 1972-73. University of Washington, Fisheries Research Institute, Report #FRI-UW-7404.

Chapman, D.W. and K.P. McLeod. 1987. Development of criteria for fine sediment in the northern Rockies ecoregion. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, USEPA Report 910/0-87-162, Washington, D.C.

Harrelson, C.C., C.L. Rawlins, and J.P. Potyondy. 1994. Stream channel reference sites: an illustrated guide to field technique. General Technical Report RM-245. Fort Collins, CO. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Jones, J.D. ed. 2012. Standard Operating Procedures for Surface Water Quality Sampling. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Surface Water Section Technical Bulletin, TB06-02. Phoenix, AZ.

Lenat, D.R., D.L. Penrose, and K.W. Eagleson. 1979. Biological evaluation of non-point source pollutants in North Carolina streams and rivers. North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development, Biological series 102, Raleigh, NC.

Leopold, L.B., M.G. Wolman, and J.P. Miller. 1964. *Fluvial Processes in Geomorphology*. Freeman Publishing, San Francisco, CA.

McClelland, W.T. and M.A. Brusven. 1980. Effects of sedimentation on the behavior and distribution of riffle insects in a laboratory stream. *Aquatic Insects* 2:161-169.

Nuttall, P.M. 1972. The effects of sand deposition upon the macroinvertebrate fauna of the River Camel, Cornwall. *Freshwater Biology* 2:181-186.

Reiser, D.W. and T.C. Bjornn. 1979. Influence of forest and rangeland management of anadromous fish habitat in Western North America: Habitat requirements of anadromous salmonids. Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experimental Station, General technical report #PNW-96.

Relyea, C.D., G.W. Minshall, and R.J. Danehy. 2000. Stream Insects as bioindicators of fine sediment. Idaho State University, Department of Biological Sciences, Stream Ecology Center. Pocatello, Idaho.

USEPA. 2002. National Water Quality Inventory 2000 Report. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Report #EPA-841-R-02-001. Washington, D.C.

Waters, T.F. 1995. Sediment in streams: sources, biological effects and control. American Fisheries Society Monograph 7. Bethesda, MD.

Wentworth, C.K. 1922. A scale of grade and class terms for clastic sediments. Journal of Geology 30:377-392.

Wolman, M.G. 1954. A method of sampling coarse river-bed material. American Geophysical Union Transactions, (35):951-956.

Appendix A. Riffle Pebble Count Field Procedure for Determining Percent Fines in Riffle Habitats

Use the most current version of the “*Standard Operating Procedures for Surface Water Quality Sampling*” located at <http://www.azdeq.gov/envirom/water/assessment/download/sampling.pdf>

ADEQ – STREAM ECOSYSTEM MONITORING FIELD FORM

REVISED MARCH 2013

Instructions: Tally 100-pebbles in riffle habitat only. Measure particles at equal increments across 3 transects within the wetted width throughout the reach. A reachwide and transect/riffle pebble count is required for coldwater streams.

2.12 COLDWATER - TRANSECT PEBBLE COUNT			
Size Class	Size (mm)	Tally	Count
Silt/Clay	<0.062		
Sand	0.063 – 2.0		
Very Fine Gravel	3 – 4		
Fine Gravel	5 – 8		
Medium Gravel	9 – 16		
Coarse Gravel	17 – 32		
Very Course Gravel	33 – 64		
Small Cobble	65 – 90		
Medium Cobble	91 – 128		
Large Cobble	129 – 180		
Very Large Cobble	181 – 256		
Small Boulder	257 – 512		
Medium Boulder	513 – 1024		
Large Boulder	1025 – 2048		
Very Large Boulder	2049 – 4096		
Bedrock	>4097		
Attach separate sheet or the “Pebble Count” Excel spreadsheet to summarize and calculate pebble count metrics.			

2.13 EMBEDDEDNESS
Use a Visual Estimate Only for riffle embeddedness. The visual estimate is used to fill out the Habitat
Gravel, cobble and boulders are surrounded by how much fine sediment in the riffles? (Check One)
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 25 %
<input type="checkbox"/> 26 – 50 %
<input type="checkbox"/> 51-75 %
<input type="checkbox"/> 76-100 %

Appendix B. Reachwide Pebble Count Field Procedure for Determining Percent Fines within Multiple Habitats

Use the most current version of the “Standard Operating Procedures for Surface Water Quality Sampling” located at <http://www.azdeq.gov/environ/water/assessment/download/sampling.pdf>

ADEQ – STREAM ECOSYSTEM MONITORING FIELD FORM

REVISED MARCH 2013

Instructions: Tally 100-pebbles in throughout the reach using the 5 point or 9 point method. Don't include bedrock in the 100 count tally. Sand/Silt= High Embeddedness.

Bedrock = 0 A reachwide and transect/riffle pebble count is required for coldwater streams.

2.15 REACHWIDE - (WARM AND COLDWATER STREAMS)

Size Class	Size (mm)	Reach	Riffle	Count
Silt/Clay	<0.062			
Sand	0.063 – 2.0			
Very Fine Gravel	3 – 4			
Fine Gravel	5 – 8			
Medium Gravel	9 – 16			
Coarse Gravel	17 – 32			
Very Course Gravel	33 – 64			
Small Cobble	65 – 90			
Medium Cobble	91 – 128			
Large Cobble	129 – 180			
Very Large Cobble	181 – 256			
Small Boulder	257 – 512			
Medium Boulder	513 – 1024			
Large Boulder	1025 – 2048			
Very Large Boulder	2049 – 4096			
Bedrock	>4097			
Enter D100 (Largest particle)		Estimated Particle Tally		

2.16 EMBEDDEDNESS

Category	Low	Med	High
Range	0 – 33	34 – 66	67 – 100
Tally	Mid-pt = 17	Mid-pt = 52	Mid-pt = 83
Reach			
Riffle			
A = Tally Sum by Class			
B = Class Mid-pt * A	17 * A	52 * A	83 * A
C = Sum of A across classes			
D = Sum of B across classes			
Mean Embeddedness = D/C			
Attach separate sheet or the “Pebble Count” Excel spreadsheet to summarize and calculate pebble count metrics.			

2.17 PLANT ID (USE CODES IN 2.18)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56
57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88
89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100				
Algae Points				% Algae			
Plant Points				% Plant			
(a) # of runs				(b) Total Points			
(a/b) diversity							
<input type="checkbox"/> 0-0.3 = Poor; <input type="checkbox"/> 0.3-0.6 = Fair; <input type="checkbox"/> 0.6-1.0 = Good							

Form Checked by

Page 10 of 26