Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program's

Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Sampling Program

Benthic Macroinverterbrate Sampling Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figures

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The macroinvertebrate faunas of four Marin County watersheds (Arroyo Corte Madera Creek, Corte Madera Creek, Miller Creek, and Novato Creek) were sampled in fall 1999 and spring 2000 using the California Stream Bioassessment Procedure. Sampled stations differed in the quality of aquatic habitats, and ranged from heavily urbanized sites to undisturbed natural sites. Macroinvertebrate taxonomic composition and biological metrics were used to evaluate the biological conditions of each station.

The macroinvertebrate fauna reflected the environmental quality of the aquatic habitat. In general, the four Marin County watersheds exhibited similar patterns of biological conditions, with poorer conditions in the urbanized, lower elevation stream reaches and better conditions in the natural, higher elevation stream reaches. Thus, gradients of biological conditions and macroinvertebrate taxa were observed along the continuum of most streams. In some streams, the improvement in biological conditions from lower to higher elevations was slight or possibly questionable, in other streams distinct changes from poor to good quality occurred.

Macroinvertebrate faunas exhibited remarkable similarity between the four Marin County watersheds. Dominant or common taxa were often the same in all watersheds. Seasonal variations in the faunas were also similar for the fall 1999 and spring 2000 sampling in all watersheds. These variations were dependent on growth and development characteristics of each macroinvertebrate taxa. All drainage basins were impacted by seasonal cycles of streamflow, which was intermittent at many stations.

We recommend that the index period or best time for sampling these streams should be primarily in mid-April when all streams are flowing, and for some lower elevation sites, in late summer or early fall, after a long stable period, but before the streams become too dry. We further recommend continuing the monitoring of the biological and physical/habitat conditions of these or a subset of these sites, first to verify the results of this first set of data and then, to follow trends in biological and physical/habitat quality over time. We also recommend assembling information on human disturbances such as percent impervious area and percent land-use activity, especially those human activities related to sediment production and nutrient loading. This information can help in determining relationships between biological and physical/habitat conditions at the various stations within the Marin County watersheds. Finally, biological and physical/habitat condition data becomes a useful tool in stormwater management, after Best Management Practices (BMPs) are implemented and improvements in water quality and stream habitat is realized. We recommend the use of watershed stakeholders both in assisting professionals in collecting bioassessment data and in implementing BMPs associated with habitat restoration and sediment control.

Introduction

In August 1999, the Marin County Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program , with the assistance of the Sustainable Land Stewardship Institute (SLSI) initiated an ambient water quality monitoring program in four Marin County watersheds: Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio(AMC); Corte Madera Creek (CM); Miller Creek(MC) and Novato Creek (NC). This program will:

1) Provide base line information on the macroinvertebrate assemblages within the five streams;
2) Evaluate the biological and physical/habitat condition of various sampling sites within the four watersheds;
3) Provide recommendations and strategies for continued monitoring and the use of volunteer monitors.

Information and data generated could also contribute to the biannual Water Quality Assessment [Clean Water Act, Section 305(b) Report], the Section 303(d) list of impaired water bodies, development of TMDLs, assessments of nonpoint sources, assessments of the effectiveness of nonpoint source management measures. It can also be used to define issues, set priorities, evaluate effectiveness of actions within the Watershed Management Initiative, and provide information towards the selection of reference sites and a regional Index of Biological Integrity (IBI).

Marin County is using the technical guidance and laboratory support of the Sustainable Land Stewardship Institute (SLSI) in Sacramento, for the biological and physical/ habitat quality assessment portion of the ambient program. The California Stream Bioassessment Procedure (CSBP), developed by the Department of Fish and Game's Aquatic Bioassessment Laboratory (ABL) was used to evaluate the benthic macroinvertebrate community (Harrington 1996). The CSBP is a regional adaptation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Rapid Bioassessment Protocols (Barbour et al. 1999) and is recognized by the U.S. EPA as California's standardized bioassessment procedure (Davis et al. 1996).

The CSBP is a cost-effective tool which utilizes measures of the stream's benthic macroinvertebrate (BMI) community and its physical/ habitat structure. BMIs can have a diverse community structure with individual species residing within the stream for a period of months to several years. They are also sensitive, in varying degrees, to temperature, dissolved oxygen, sedimentation, scouring, nutrient enrichment and chemical and organic pollution (Resh and Jackson 1993). Together, biological and physical assessments integrate the effects of water quality over time, are sensitive to multiple aspects of water and habitat quality, and provide the public with more familiar expressions of ecological health (Gibson 1996).

This report presents results from benthic macroinvertebrates samples collected in September 1999 and April 2000.

Materials and Methods

Location

Arroyo Corte Madera, Corte Madera, Miller, and Novato Creeks are small streams flowing to the east and southeast toward San Pablo Bay from the low hills of Marin County, California. In all drainage basins, sampling stations were located in a range of possible stream environments, from relatively natural undisturbed upper reaches to highly altered lower urban reaches. In each watershed, samples were taken at several locations along the main stream and its tributaries. Monitoring reach descriptions are summarized in **Table 1** and a map of Marin County Watersheds and monitoring reaches is shown in **Figure 1**. All sites were sampled in September 1999 and April 2000 except for the sites which were dry during the September sampling period. Monitoring reaches were selected to correspond, when appropriate, to the site were water samples for chemical and toxicological analysis are collected.

Benthic Macroinvertebrate Sampling

Aquatic macroinvertebrate samples were collected using the California Stream Bioassessment Procedure (CSBPs) for non-point source assessments (Harrington 1996), (**Appendix A**). Three riffles in each monitoring reach were randomly chosen and one sample was collected in the top third of each. Starting with the lowermost riffle, the benthos within a 2 ft^2 area was disturbed upstream of a 1 ft wide, 0.5 mm mesh D-frame kick-net. Sampling of the benthos was performed manually by rubbing cobble and boulder substrates in front of the net followed by "kicking" the upper layers of substrate to dislodge any invertebrates remaining in the substrates. The duration of sampling ranged from 60-120 seconds, depending on the amount of boulder and cobble-sized substrates that required rubbing by hand; more and larger substrates required more time to process. Three locations representing the habitats along the transect were sampled and combined into a composite sample (representing a 6 ft^2 area). This composite sample was transferred into a 500 ml wide-mouth plastic jar containing approximately 200 ml of 95% ethanol.

Five to thirteen sampling stations were located within each drainage basin and three samples were collected at each station. A total of 96 samples were taken during the study (Arroyo Corte Madera 15, Corte Madera 39, Miller 18, and Novato 24), in addition to several reference samples. The five Arroyo Corte Madera sampling stations were labeled ACM1 to ACM5. The thirteen Corte Madera sampling stations were labeled CM1 to CM10 and CM3b, CM7b, and CM8b. The six Miller sampling stations were labeled MC1 to MC6. The eight Novato sampling stations were labeled NC1 to NC8. Samples were taken within each drainage basin from stations located along the main named creek and from tributary creeks having other names.

BMI Laboratory Analysis

The 96 samples were processed in the laboratory according to the California Stream Bioassessment Procedure. Rose Bengal was added to each sample to stain the macroinvertebrates, aiding their discovery and removal. Each sample was rinsed through a No. 35 standard testing sieve (0.5 mm brass mesh) and transferred into a tray marked with twenty, 25 cm^2 grids. All detritus was removed from one randomly selected grid at a time and placed in a petri dish for inspection under a stereomicroscope. All invertebrates from the grid were separated from the surrounding detritus and transferred to vials containing 70% ethanol and 2% glycerol. This process was continued until 300 organisms were removed from each sample. The material left from the processed grids was transferred into a jar with 70% ethanol and labeled as "remnant" material. Any remaining unprocessed sample from the tray was transferred back to the original sample container with 70% ethanol. Macroinvertebrates were then identified to a standard taxonomic level, (typically genus level for insects and order or class for non-insects) using standard taxonomic keys (Brown 1972, Edmunds et al. 1976, Klemm 1985, Merritt and Cummins 1995, Pennak 1989, Stewart and Stark 1993, Surdick 1985, Thorp and Covich 1991, Usinger 1963, Wiederholm 1983, 1986, Wiggins 1996, Wold 1974).

Data Analysis

A taxonomic list of benthic macroinvertebrates identified from the samples was entered into a Microsoft Excel® spreadsheet program. Excel® was used to generate a taxa list and to calculate and summarize macroinvertebrate community-based metric values. Descriptions of the metric values used are presented in **Table 2**. The Index of Biological Integrity (IBI) scores were determined using the IBI developed for the Russian River (DFG, 1996).

Physical Habitat Quality Assessment

Physical habitat quality was assessed for the monitoring reaches using U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Rapid Bioassessment Protocols (RBPs) (Plafkin *et al.* 1989). Habitat quality assessments were recorded for each monitoring reach during macroinvertebrate sampling events within riffle/ run habitats. Photographs were taken within each of the monitoring reaches to document overall reach condition at the time of sampling. Description of reach scale habitat parameters used to document local habitat conditions along stream corridors is shown in **Table 3**.

<u>**Data Consistency**</u>

Before analyzing the macroinvertebrate data in detail for each creek, it is often instructive to quickly examine the overall identification data and metrics calculations for variability between the three replicates. Generally similar results between the three replicates at a station suggest that field collections and laboratory sub-sampling were done consistently. Data sets with wide variability between replicates suggest the possibility of inconsistent methods. However, some variability is expected because of naturally-clumped macroinvertebrate populations or different habitat conditions along a stream reach.

Results

<u>**Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio Creek Watershed**</u>

Taxa lists for ACM Fall and Spring sampling are presented in **Appendix A and B,** respectively. The five dominant taxa for each season are listed in **Table 4**. IBI for ACM are listed in **Table 5**. Physical habitat quality scores for each seasons are listed in **Table 6**. Taxonomic metrics means for the Fall are listed in **Table 7**, and Spring in **Table 8**.

<u>**Corte Madera Creek Watershed**</u>

Taxa lists for CM Fall and Spring sampling are presented in **Appendix C and D,** respectively. The five dominant taxa for each season are listed in **Table 9**. IBI for ACM are listed in **Table 10**. Physical habitat quality scores for Fall 99 are listed in **Table 11 and Spring** 00 in Table 12. Taxonomic metrics means for the Fall 99 **are listed in Table 13**, and Spring 00 in **Table 14**.

<u>**Miller Creek Watershed**</u>

Taxa lists for CM Fall and Spring sampling are presented in **Appendix E and F**, respectively. The five dominant taxa for each season are listed in **Table 15**. IBI for ACM are listed in **Table 16**. Physical habitat quality scores for Fall and Spring are listed in **Table 17.** Taxonomic metrics means for the Fall are listed in **Table 18**, and Spring in **Table 19**.

<u>**Novato Creek Watershed**</u>

Taxa lists for NC Fall and Spring sampling are presented in **Appendix G and H**, respectively. The five dominant taxa for each season are listed in **Table 20**. IBI for ACM are listed in **Table 21**. Physical habitat quality scores for Fall and spring are listed in **Table 22**. Taxonomic metrics means for the Fall are listed in **Table 23**, and Spring in **Table 24**.

<u>**Data Consistency**</u>

In general, the data collected from the four Marin County drainage basins showed remarkable consistency between replicates. This observation added validity to the following results and discussions. For this study, benthic macroinvertebrate populations in all four drainage basins were affected by three overriding environmental factors – seasonal changes (fall 1999 vs. spring 2000), flow conditions (perennial vs. intermittent), and watershed quality (undisturbed vs. urban).

Discussion

Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio Creek Watershed

Distinct differences existed in the aquatic macroinvertebrate fauna in the Arroyo Corte Madera drainage basin. In particular, the lowest station, ACM1, had the poorest macroinvertebrate fauna, and all stations upstream were significantly better. Two stations (ACM2 and ACM4) were not sampled in fall 1999 because they were dry.

The poor macroinvertebrate fauna at ACM1 was well demonstrated by the taxonomic composition and metrics found at this station. Very low values were found for Taxonomic Richness (9-16) and Shannon Diversity (1.0-1.7) in both fall and spring. Likewise, very low values occurred in both seasons for EPT Taxa, Ephemeroptera Taxa, Plecoptera Taxa, Trichoptera Taxa, Sensitive EPT Index, and Percent Intolerant Organisms.

Only four taxonomic groups dominated the macroinvertebrate fauna at ACM1 – chironomid midges, *Baetis* mayflies, snails, and oligochaete worms. Seasonally, dominance changed between groups, with Tanytarsini midges, baetids, and snails abundant in fall and Orthocladinae midges, baetids, and oligochaete worms abundant in spring. Abundant *Baetis* mayflies, especially during fall 1999, greatly increased the EPT Index, diminishing its habitat predictive value. This taxa is known to be adaptable to a wide range of freshwater environments, including both warmer and cooler waters. They can be especially abundant in urban or disturbed creeks with warm, sunlit waters and abundant filamentous algae.

In contrast to the lowest station, all stations upstream (ACM2-5) showed improved biological condition. Taxonomic Richness typically ranged from 25 to 30 and Shannon diversities were normally well above 2.0, reaching a maximum of 2.8 at ACM3. Diversities approached typical values for undisturbed, small, low-elevation streams in the California Coast Range. Similar improvements occurred in EPT Taxa, Ephemeroptera Taxa, Plecoptera Taxa, Trichoptera Taxa, Sensitive EPT Index, and Percent Intolerant Organisms. Other metrics showing improved biological condition upstream were declines in Tolerance Values, Percent Tolerant Organisms, and Percent Dominant Taxon.

Although all four upstream stations were higher in biological condition than ACM1, some differences were noted between these four sites. Biological condition continuously improved along the mainstem of Arroyo Corte Madera Creek, from ACM1 to ACM2 to ACM3. These continuous improvements were most obvious for the spring 2000 samples in Taxonomic Richness (9 to 29), EPT Taxa (2 to 17), EPT Index (6 to 60), Sensitive EPT Index (1 to 30), Shannon Diversity (1.0 to 2.7), Tolerance Value (6.1 to 3.5), Percent Intolerant Organisms (1 to 29), Percent Tolerant Organisms (35 to 5), and Percent Dominant Taxon (65 to 19).

Fall and spring samples at Arroyo Corte Madera had an inverse relationship between macroinvertebrate abundance and diversity, demonstrating a widespread ecological principal of animal communities. Mean abundance values were always highest (about 4,200) at ACM1, the site with the lowest diversity. Abundance values for the other four stations ranged from 850 to 3,300, and higher diversities were present. Similar macroinvertebrate abundances were found for both fall and spring samplings.

The IBI scores for the Arroyo Corte Madera watershed ranged from a low of 6, indicating poor biotic conditions at ACM1, to a high of 18, indicating good conditions at ACM3. Intermediate values occurred at ACM2 (12, fair), ACM4 (7, poor), and ACM5 (14, fair).

While it is difficult to isolate specific environmental factors causing a poorer habitat at ACM1, increases in fine sediments, warmer waters, and loss of riparian vegetation in urban areas were likely important. Chironomid midges, baetid mayflies, snails, and oligochaete worms often dominate disturbed or altered aquatic habitats having sunny, warm waters and fine substrates. Based upon the macroinvertebrate taxa collected and the Index of Biological Integrity, it was possible that intermittent flow conditions in fall 1999 at ACM2 and ACM4 caused both habitats to be rated lower than they would have been if perennial flow had existed. It is unknown how often these two stations are dry in the autumn. Future monitoring of Arroyo Corte Madera would answer this question. If perennial flows are more typical of both stations, their faunas and biological metrics would likely improve.

Although the Arroyo Corte Madera watershed had intermittent flow conditions during fall 1999, the macroinvertebrate fauna was composed of taxa typical of perennial flow habitats. Both ACM2 and ACM4 were dry in fall 1999, but apparently resumed flowing during the winter rains and extending into spring 2000. When sampled in the spring, their macroinvertebrate faunas were very similar to upstream perennial stations. Undoubtedly, the two dry stations were recolonized by drifting and migrating taxa from upstream. Macroinvertebrate taxa typical of truly intermittent streams were absent from Arroyo Corte Madera.

The distributions of several macroinvertbrate taxa within the Arroyo Corte Madera watershed suggested that fine sediments predominated at ACM1 and coarser sediments predominated upstream. The psychodid *Maruina* is unique in having ventral sucker-like adaptations for clinging to clean, coarse substrates on which it grazes. The stoneflies *Suwallia, Sweltsa,* and Leuctridae have small, elongated bodies at least partially adapted for moving within the pore spaces of the upper hyporheic zone of stream sediments. Suitably-sized pore spaces only exist in coarser substrates, not in silt or sand. Both *Maruina* and the stoneflies were only collected at the upstream stations of Arroyo Corte Madera, not at ACM1. Fine sediments would completely exclude both groups.

It is of interest that only stations with perennial flow contained macroinvertebrate taxa having a life cycle of greater than one year. For example, the perlid stoneflies, *Calineuria* and *Hesperoperla* have at least a two-year life cycle and only inhabited ACM5. Likewise, the crayfish, *Pacifasticus,* has a long life cycle and was only found at ACM5.

In general, the macroinvertebrates fauna of Arroyo Corte Madera remained remarkably similar between fall 1999 and spring 2000. Notable differences were the much greater abundances of oligochaete worms and ephemerellid mayflies, and greater variety of heptageniid mayflies in spring 2000. In contrast, snails were much more abundant in fall 1999. Tanytarsini and Orthocladinae midges appeared to be most abundant in fall and spring, respectively. Many of these differences were likely caused by natural seasonal changes in growth and development.

Few predictable and distinct changes occurred in the macroinvertebrate Functional Feeding Groups of Arroyo Corte Madera. During spring, collectors were most abundant at the lowest station (ACM1) and decreased upstream. Over 90% of the macroinvertebrate fauna were collectors at ACM1, primarily oligochaetes and chironomids. Shredders were almost absent from ACM1 and increased upstream, possibly caused by the amount of riparian vegetation. Both trends in collectors and shredders were predicted by the River Continuum Concept; however, distinct changes in filterers, grazers, and predators were less clear. As might be expected with coarser substrates, grazers were more abundant upstream during the spring sampling.

Corte Madera Creek

Thirteen stations were sampled for macroinvertebrates within the Corte Madera Creek watershed. This included two stations on Corte Madera Creek (CM1-2), one station on Ross Creek (CM3), one station on Bill Williams Creek (CM3b), three stations on San Anselmo Creek (CM4, 8, 8b), four stations on Sleepy Hollow Creek

(CM5-7, 7b), and two stations on Cascade Creek (CM9-10). Station CM1 was the lowest in the watershed and contained the most urban drainage area upstream. In contrast, Stations CM3b, 7b, and 10 were located highest in the watershed and were the least disturbed. The nine other stations were intermediate in urban disturbance.

Similar to most creeks in Marin County, the small streams in the Corte Madera Creek drainage basin were susceptible to the drying conditions of summer and autumn. Thus, many stations were dry during the fall 1999 sampling period. Only four stations at low elevations (CM1-2, 8a, 8b) had sufficient flow for collection of macroinvertebrates. Because so few stations were sampled, it was difficult to find distinct differences in the biological metrics for fall 1999.

However, several metrics indicated slightly improving biological conditions between downstream and upstream stations. Improvements occurred in EPT Taxa, Ephemeroptera Taxa, Plecoptera Taxa, EPT Index, Sensitive EPT Index, Tolerance Value, Percent Intolerant Organisms, and Percent Tolerant Organisms. When taken together, these metrics must reflect true improvements at higher stations. Macroinvertebrate abundance varied erratically from 400 to 3,300. Dominant taxa during fall 1999 were chironomid midges, *Baetis* mayflies, *Lepidostoma* caddisflies, water mites, and oligochaete worms.

By spring 2000, streamflow had resumed at all stations, allowing twelve stations to be sampled along larger gradients of watershed disturbance and elevation. In contrast to the somewhat ambiguous results of fall 1999, most biological metrics in spring 2000 had distinct changes between lower and upper elevation stations. For example, dramatic differences existed in the metrics along at least three elevation and continuum gradients – (1) CM1 to CM3b, (2) CM5 to CM7b, and (3) CM4 to CM10. Other continuum and elevation comparisons were also possible with similar, though occasionally erratic, results. Comparison of the biological metrics for CM1 (elevation 19') and CM3b (elevation 325') provided one example of improving biological conditon with increasing elevation -- Taxonomic Richness (12 to 30), EPT Taxa (2 to 18), Ephemeroptera Taxa (2 to 9), Plecoptera Taxa (0 to 3), Trichoptera Taxa (0 to 5), EPT Index (2 to 64), Sensitive EPT Index (1 to 31), Shannon Diversity (1.0 to 2.6), Tolerance Value (5.4 to 3.7), Percent Intolerant Organisms (1 to 32), Percent Tolerant Organisms (13 to 3), and Percent Dominant Taxon (74 to 23). Generally, macroinvertebrate abundance was lower (680 to 1,100) for the more diverse, high elevation stations (CM3b, 7b, 10), than for the less diverse, low elevation stations (840 to 5,700). Dominant taxa during spring 2000 were chironomid midges, simulid black flies, *Baetis* mayflies, chloroperlid stoneflies, *Lepidostoma* caddisflies, water mites, and oligochaete worms.

Most low-elevation stations (CM1-7) of the Corte Madera Creek watershed had a poor rating of the Index of Biological Integrity, while high-elevation stations were rated fair (CM 7b, 8, 9) or good (CM 3b, 10). These results were consistent with the other biological metric values. Stations rated good were especially rich in intolerant taxa and EPT taxa requiring coarse stream substrates.

When the macroinvertebrate fauna was subdivided into Functional Feeding Groups, the results were mixed for the fall 1999 sampling period, but much more consistent for the spring 2000 period. In fall 1999, only the Shredder group increased somewhat with elevation, while other functional groups changed erratically or opposite to that predicted by the River Continuum Concept. In spring 2000, Collectors and Filterers generally decreased with elevation, while Grazers and Shredders increased, as expected by theory.

In general, the macroinvertebrate fauna of the Corte Madera Creek watershed was very similar to the three other Marin County watersheds in 1999 and 2000. All four watersheds were impacted by varying degrees of urbanization in their lower reaches, while their upper reaches approached natural conditions. All four watershed experienced similar Mediterranean-type climates, with hot dry summers and cool wet winters, causing streamflows to be distinctly seasonal. Most small streams in Marin County have very low flows in late summer and autumn, often becoming intermittent. Intermittent flow conditions were strongly indicated at CM 7 and CM7b by the presence of the perlodid stonefly *Baumannella,* which is adapted for seasonal stream drying. Because of the distinct seasonality of water temperatures and streamflows, the macroinvertebrate fauna of small streams in Marin County often exhibited similar growth and development. As for the other watersheds, Corte Madera Creek watershed had much greater abundance and diversity of ameletid, ephemerellid, and heptageniid mayflies in spring 2000 than was present in fall 1999.

Station CM3 on Ross Creek was located downstream of Phoenix Lake, and the macroinvertebrate fauna may have been influenced by lake discharges of organic particles and plankton. In particular, the occurrence of Hydridae at CM3 in spring 2000 may be caused by lake discharges.

As was typical of other Marin County streams, snails tended to be concentrated in the lower reaches of the Corte Madera watershed. This was true of the Lymnaeidae, Physidae, and Planorbidae for both fall 1999 and spring 2000 samplings. However, during spring 2000, hydrobiid snails were only found at the high elevation station CM3b. Hydrobiidae are often referred to as "spring snails" since they often inhabit the headwater spring sources of small streams.

The high elevation station CM3b contained several macroinvertebrate taxa not found elsewhere in the Corte Madera watershed. Most notable was the amphipod *Stygobromus,* which lives in small water-filled pore spaces of coarse stream substrates. When fine sediments are present, pore spaces become filled, completely excluding this subterranean amphipod. Thus, it is very unlikely that this amphipod would occur at lower elevation stations which often have finer sediments. Other macroinvertebrate taxa requiring coarse substrates for feeding, hiding, and clinging occurred exclusively or most commonly at CM3b and CM10. These included the perlid stonefly *Calineuria,* peltoperlid stonefly *Soliperla,* and caddisflies *Glossosoma, Rhyacophila, Neophylax, and Dolophilodes.* Their claws are adapted for clinging and moving on coarse substrates, not the fine sediments more common at lower stations. Although elmid and psephenid beetles and heptageniid mayflies were found at several stations in the Corte Madera Creek watershed, their claws also allow them to cling to and prefer coarse substrates, not fine sediments. Such preferences at least partly explain their abundance at CM3b and CM10. Another group requiring coarse substrates were the chloroperlid stoneflies *Suwallia* and *Sweltsa.* These elongated stoneflies inhabit the small pore spaces in the upper hyporheic zone of streams. These taxa were especially abundant at upper elevation stations (CM3b, 7b, 9, 10).

Miller Creek

Six stations were sampled for macroinvertebrates along the continuum of Miller Creek (MC1-6). In fall, only the first four stations (MC1-4) were sampled because the upper two stations (MC5-6) were dry. Most biological metrics in fall 1999 showed little or no change for the four stations MC1-4. Slight increases were noted in Taxonomic Richness (19 to 23), EPT Taxa (5 to 8), and Shannon Diversity (2.2 to 2.5), and abundance's varied from 4,400 at MC1 to 2,000 at MC4. Dominant taxa included chironimid midges, *Baetis* mayflies, *Lepidostoma* caddisflies, and oligochaete worms.

All six stations of Miller Creek were sampled in spring 2000, and unlike in the fall, many biological metrics demonstrated significant changes. For example, distinct improvements were found between MC1 and MC6 in Taxonomic Richness (9 to 23), EPT Taxa (2 to 15), Ephemeroptera Taxa (1 to 8), Plecoptera Taxa (0 to 6), EPT Index (28 to 80), Sensitive EPT Index (0 to 41), Shannon Diversity (1.5 to 2.1), Tolerance Value (5.6 to 3.6), Percent Tolerant Organisms (12 to 0), and Percent Intolerant Organisms (0 to 43). Macroinvertebrate abundances varied from 2,800 at MC1 to 870 at MC6. Dominant taxa included chironimid midges, *Baetis* mayflies, simulid black flies, and oligochaete worms.

The IBI scores indicted a a subtle trend in improved biological condition along the continuum of Miller Creek. The first three stations (MC1-3) were rated as poor habitat (IBI Values 6-10), while MC4 was slightly improved (12, fair) in spring 2000. The upper two stations were only sampled in spring 2000, but MC5 was rated poor (10), while MC6 rated fair (14).

Biological conditions improvement at MC4-6 during spring 2000 was apparent in the general taxonomic composition of macroinvertebrates. In comparison with the lower three stations (MC1-3), several faunal groups were much more abundant at the upstream stations (MC4-6), including all Plecoptera, most Ephemeroptera, all Megaloptera, *Lepidostoma* and *Rhyacophila* caddisflies, most tipulids, and all dytiscid beetles. An increased diversity of mayflies and stoneflies was noticeable. Some of these differences were also detected at MC4 in fall 1999. A counter trend of decreasing abundance with distance upstream was observed for some dominant taxa, such as chironomid midges, simulid black flies, and oligochaete worms.

It was difficult to find consistent trends in the Functional Feeding Groups of Miller Creek. Most groups exhibited few or irregular changes along the continuum. Possibly during spring, filterers may have increased and shredders decreased between upper and lower stations, in agreement with the River Continuum Concept.

During fall 1999, the upper two stations (MC5-6) of Miller Creek were dry, but flow had resumed by spring 2000. By spring, these two stations had been recolonized primarily by macroinvertebrate taxa typical of perennial streams. However, Miller Creek's flow may frequently be intermittent in late-summer and autumn as indicated by the perlodid stonefly *Baumannella,* which is adapted for the summer-autumn drying conditions of Coast Range small streams. Possibly, the fall 1999 drying of stations MC5-6 and complete loss of the macroinvertebrate fauna was partially responsible for the ambiguous results for Miller Creek. Faunal recovery may have been incomplete by spring 2000, negatively affecting the biological metrics, Index of Biological Integrity, and Functional Feeding Groups.

Three other macroinvertebrate taxa of Miller Creek were of special interest. The mayfly *Tricorythodes* found at MC1 and MC4 commonly inhabits streams with fine sediments. It possesses a special thick gill plate which covers and protects the remaining fragile gill plates from abrasion by silt and sand. The caddisfly *Gumaga* is of environmental interest because of its ability to inhabit very warm streams. As found in the other Marin County watersheds, the chloroperlid stoneflies *Suwallia* and *Sweltsa* found in Miller Creek primarily occurred at upstream stations where coarser substrates allowed them to inhabit the upper hyporheic zone.

Seasonal differences in the macroinvertebrate composition of Miller Creek were similar to that found in the other Marin County watersheds and were primarily caused by natural cycles of growth and development in individual taxa. Higher abundances and diversities of ameletid, ephemerellid, and heptageniid mayflies occurred in spring 2000 in most Marin creeks. The caddisfly *Lepidostoma* was notable in being very common in Miller Creek during the fall 1999 sampling, but scarce in spring 2000.

Novato CreekWatershed

Six stations were sampled for macroinvertebrates along the continuum of Novato Creek (NC1-6) and two stations were sampled along Warner Creek (NC7-8), an urban tributary of Novato Creek. Sampling results were somewhat ambiguous within the Novato watershed, with most stations being rated as poor or fair stream habitats. The small streams in this watershed were influenced by intermittent flow conditions in fall 1999, stations NC3, NC6, and NC7 being dry.

The biological condition along the Novato Creek continuum from low elevation (NC1, 25') to higher elevation (NC5, 122') showed only slight improvements during fall 1999. Taxonomic Richness remained above 20, but there were few changes along the continuum. Only slight improvements occurred in EPT Taxa (6 to 10), Trichoptera Taxa (3 to 5), Shannon Diversity (2.3 to 2.5), Tolerance Value (4.9 to 4.6), and Percent Dominant Taxon (31 to 22). Two metrics were distinctly improved, Sensitive EPT Index (1 to 10) and Percent Intolerant Organisms (1 to 12). Other biological metrics showed erratic or no change along this continuum. Macroinvertebrate abundance's varied within a narrow range from 2,000 to 3,400, without a consistent trend along the continuum. These ambiguous results may have been impacted by intermittent flow conditions in fall 1999. Dominant taxa in fall 1999 were chironomid midges, *Baetis* mayflies, *Tricorythodes* mayflies, hydropsychid caddisflies, planarian flatworms, and oligochaete worms.

During spring 2000, biological condition as measured by the biological metrics showed distinct improvements along the Novato Creek continuum. For example, distinct improvements were found between NC1 and NC6 in Taxonomic Richness (10 to 19), EPT Taxa (4 to 11), Plecoptera Taxa (0 to 3), Trichoptera Taxa (0 to 3), EPT Index (9 to 63), Sensitive EPT Index (2 to 39), Shannon Diversity (1.1 to 2.1), Tolerance Value (5.4 to 3.5), Percent Intolerant Organisms (2 to 39), Percent Tolerant Organisms (14 to 1), and Percent Dominant Taxon (67 to 29). Some of these trends had irregularities at certain stations, especially at NC5 which was located downstream of a reservoir. No consistent trends were found in macroinvertebrate abundance's, these narrowly ranging from 420 to 1,900. During spring 2000, all stations had good streamflows and none were dry. Dominant taxa in fall 1999 were chironomid midges, *Baetis* mayflies, *Drunella* mayflies, simulid black flies, and oligochaete worms.

During spring 2000, biological condition showed slight improvements between the two stations sampled on Warner Creek, the higher station NC7 (elevation 101') being better than the lower station NC8 (elevation 44'). These improvements were found in almost all biological metrics, giving confidence that the observed improvements reflected true changes.

While seasonal differences occurred in the IBI between fall 1999 and spring 2000, all eight stations in the Novato Creek watershed were rated as poor or fair aquatic habitats. The five stations sampled in fall 1999 were rated as fair, except for NC8 on lower Warner Creek, which was rated as poor. During spring 2000, all eight stations were rated as poor, except NC6 on upper Novato Creek, which was rated as fair.

The results for Functional Feeding Groups were mixed. Clearly, the proportion of Collectors significantly decreased from NC1 to NC6, in agreement with that predicted by the River Continuum Concept. Also in agreement, Grazers and Shredders apparently increased along the continuum, though both trends had irregularities and unexpected differences between fall and spring.

While macroinvertebrate distributions within the Novato Creek watershed had similarities with other Marin County small streams, several were especially interesting. In particular, the macroinvertebrate fauna at station NC5 may have been influenced by discharges from an upstream reservoir. Three filter feeders, simulid blackfly larvae, *Wormaldia* caddisfly larvae, and the coelenterate *Hydra,* were especially abundant at NC5 in spring 2000. It is a well-known fact of stream ecology that filter-feeding organisms can be very abundant downstream of reservoirs releasing large quantities of organic particles and plankton. This fine organic matter is filtered from the flowing water and consumed by these macroinvertebrates. It is also of interest that the two ephemerellid mayflies *Drunella* and *Serratella* were abundant at the lower stations NC1-4, but absent from NC5-6.

The mayfly *Tricorythodes* found at NC1-5 commonly inhabits streams with fine sediments. It possesses a special thick gill plate which covers and protects the remaining fragile gill plates from abrasion by silt and sand. Interestingly, *Tricorythodes* continuously decreased in abundance along the Novato Creek continuum from the lowest station NC1 (abundance = 160) to the higher station NC5 (abundance = 19). This change in abundance was especially noticeable during the fall 1999 sampling. The pronounced decrease in abundance may be caused by less fine sediments at higher stations. In contrast, a group of macroinvertebrate taxa requiring clean, coarser substrates were the chloroperlid stonefly nymphs *Suwallia* and *Sweltsa,* and the psychodid *Maruina.* These taxa were only collected at the upstream stations of NC5-6. It was also of interest that large crustaceans such as crangonyctid amphipods and isopods were only found at the lower stations (NC1-2, 8), though the reasons for this distribution were unknown.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In small California coastal streams, there are both advantages and disadvantages in sampling the spring and the fall invertebrate communities. Biological condition can be at its worst in the fall since it represents the most critical time for water quality conditions and the lowest amount of stream flow. However, there must be water to sample macroinvertebrates. In this study, 13 of the sites could not be sampled in the fall. Two stations in the Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio Creek watershed (ACM2 and ACM4) were not sampled in fall 1999 because they were dry. In the Corte Madera watershed, only four stations at low elevations (CM1-2, 8a, 8b) had sufficient flow to collect macroinvertebrates. Only the first four stations (MC1-4) in the Miller Creek watershed and three in the Novato Creek watershed could not be sampled because they were dry. Although sampling in the spring will guarantee that all sites have water, the invertebrates community can be unstable due to substrate disturbance from winter high flow events and the presence of transient organisms from upstream drift. We recommend that the index period or best time for sampling these streams should be primarily in mid-April when all streams are flowing, and for some lower elevation sites, in late summer or early fall, after a long stable period, but before the streams become too dry.

For both the fall 1999 and spring 2000 study of the four Marine County watershed, the biological condition varied from poor to good. Although the trend was more pronounced during the spring, there was a gradient of better condition from lower to upper elevation sites. This conclusion was reached using multiple measures of biological conditions and by the kinds and proportions of macroinvertebrates present. The poor condition ranking for these sites was supported using an IBI developed for first to third order Russian River tributaries. This IBI was developed for northern California reference streams and because of the proximity of the Marin County watershed to the Russian River, the use of the IBI should be appropriate. However, it must be emphysised that the Russian River IBI was intended as a demonstration project and that the scores will continue to be improved and made more appropriate for non-Russian River streams. Also, the Russian River IBI is intended for use in first to third order streams so it may be of limited use in the lower-most sites in the Marin County watersheds.

The IBI scores for the Arroyo Corte Madera watershed ranged from a low of 6, indicating poor biotic conditions at ACM1, to a high of 18, indicating good conditions at ACM3. Intermediate values occurred at ACM2 (12, fair), ACM4 (7, poor), and ACM5 (14, fair). Most low-elevation stations (CM1-7) of the Corte Madera Creek watershed had a poor IBI rating, while high-elevation stations were rated fair (CM 7b, 8, 9) or good (CM 3b, 10). These results were consistent with the other biological metric values. Stations rated good were especially rich in intolerant taxa and EPT taxa requiring coarse stream substrates. The IBI scores indicted a a subtle trend in improved biological condition along the continuum of Miller Creek. The first three stations (MC1-3) were rated as poor habitat (IBI Values 6-10), while MC4 was slightly improved (12, fair) in spring 2000. The upper two stations were only sampled in spring 2000, but MC5 was rated poor (10), while MC6 rated fair (14). While seasonal differences occurred in the IBI between fall 1999 and spring 2000, all eight stations in the Novato Creek watershed were rated as poor or fair aquatic habitats. The five stations sampled in fall 1999 were rated as fair, except for NC8 on lower Warner Creek, which was rated as poor. During spring 2000, all eight stations were rated as poor, except NC6 on upper Novato Creek, which was rated as fair.

The ability of macroinvertebrates to develop and survive in streams is dependent on many factors, and incorporates all physical and chemical aspect of a stream. A stream with intact habitat characteristics and balanced chemistry, will be able to support a wider array of biological communities. In general, the macroinvertebrate fauna, measures of biological condition and IBI scores were similar in all four Marin County watersheds. Additionally, the trend from better conditions in upper elevation sites compared to lower elevation sites was relatively consistent throughout the four watersheds. Figures 2 through 4 show the strong relationship between elevation and cumulative Taxa Richness ($r^2 = 0.70$) , cumulative EPT Taxa ($r^2 = 0.71$) and IBI scores ($r^2 = 0.71$), respectively. This was also supported by the kinds of macroinvertebrates found at the upper and lower elevation sites. Upper elevation sites had types of organisms with longer life spans and that need course substrate, good water quality and adequate riparian habitat, where the lower elevation sites had types of organisms that can tolerate fine sediment, organic enrichment, higher water temperatures and less stream side vegetative cover. This supports the observation that all four watersheds were impacted by varying degrees of urbanization in their lower reaches, while their upper reaches approached natural conditions.

In general, the physical/habitat quality scores were optimal or suboptimal (Table 25), except for the lowest elevation sites. However, in considering the sites in the four watersheds collectively, the measure of physical/habitat quality showed less ($r^2 = 0.56$) of a relationship with elevation (Figure 5) and there were very poor relationships with physical/habitat quality scores and Taxa Richness ($r^2 = 0.53$) , cumulative EPT Taxa ($r^2 = 0.47$) and IBI scores ($r^2 = 0.49$). This supports the observation that the stream side habitat is being preserved at most sites in the Marin County watersheds.

The information in this report provides a baseline from which future bioassessment data sets for the same sites may be compared. We recommend continuing the monitoring of the biological and physical/habitat conditions of these or a subset of these sites, first to verify the results of this first set of data and then, to follow trends in biological and physical/habitat quality over time. We also recommend assembling information on human disturbances such as percent impervious area and percent land-use activity, especially those human activities related to sediment production and nutrient loading. This information can help in determining relationships between biological and physical/habitat conditions at the various stations within the Malibu Creek watershed. Finally, biological and physical/habitat condition data becomes a useful tool in stormwater management, after Best Management Practices (BMPs) are implemented and improvements in water quality and stream habitat is realized. We recommend the use of watershed stakeholders in both assisting professionals in collecting bioassessment data and in implementing BMPs associated with habitat restoration and sediment control.

Literature Cited

Barbour, M.T., J. Gerritsen, B.D. Snyder and J.B. Stribling. 1999. Revision to rapid bioassessment protocols for use in stream and rivers: periphyton, benthic macroinvertebrates and fish. EPA 841-D-97-002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington DC.

Baumann, R.W., A.R. Gaufin and R.R. Surdick. 1977. The Stoneflies (Plecoptera) of the Rocky Mountains. American Entomological Society, Philadelphia, PA.

Brown, H.P. 1972. Aquatic Dryopoid Beetles (Coleoptera) of the United States. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Project, # 18050 ELD. Washington D.C.

Clifford, H.F. 1991. Aquatic invertebrates of Alberta. The University of Alberta, Calgary, Alberta.

Davis, W. S., B. D. Syder, J. B. Stribling and C. Stoughton. 1996. Summary of state biological assessment program for streams and wadeable rivers. EPA 230-R-96-007. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation: Washington, DC.

Davis, W. S. and T.P. Simons, eds. 1995. Biological Assessment and Criteria: Tools for Resource Planning and Decision Making. Lewis Publishers. Boca Raton, FL.

Department of Fish and Game (DFG). 1998. An Index of Biological Integrity for Russian River First to Third Order Tributary Streams, A Water Quality Inventory Report. Water Pollution Control Laboratory, Rancho Cordova, CA.

Edmunds, G.G., S.L. Jensen and B. Lewis. 1976. The Mayflies of North and Central America. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Mn.

Harrington, J. M. 1996. California stream bioassessment procedures. California Department of Fish and Game, Water Pollution Control Laboratory. Rancho Cordova, CA.

Gibson, G. R. 1996. Biological Criteria: Technical guidance for streams and small rivers. EPA 822-B-96-001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C.

Hilsenhoff, W.L. 1987. An improved biotic index of organic stream pollution. Great Lakes Entomologist 20:31-39.

Klemm, D.J. 1985. A guide to the freshwater Annelida (Polychaeta, Naidid and Tubidicid Oligochaeta, and Hineninea of Northe America. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., Dubuque, Iowa.

Merritt, R.W. and K. W. Cummins. 1995. An introduction to the aquatic insects of North America. Second Edition. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., Dubuque, Iowa

Pennak, R.W. 1989. Freshwater invertebrates of the United States, 3rd Ed. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.

Plafkin, J. L., M.T. Barbour, K. D. Porter, S. K. Gross, and R. M. Hughes. 1989. Rapid

bioassessment protocols for use in streams and rivers: benthic macroinvertebrates and
______fish. EPA 444/4-89-001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Resh, V. H. and J. K. Jackson. 1993. Rapid assessment approaches to biomonitoring using benthic macroinvertebrates. In: D. M. Rosenberg and V. H. Resh, eds., Chapman and Hall, New York.

Rosenberg, D. M. and V. H. Resh (eds). 1993. Freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates. Chapman and Hall, New York

Stewart, K.W. and B.P.Stark. 1993. Nymphs of North American Stonefly Genera (Plecoptera). University of North Texas Press, Denton, TX.

Surdick, R.F. 1985. Nearctic Genera of Chloroperlinae (Plecoptera: Chloroperlidae). University of Illinois Press. Chicago, IL.

Thorp, J. H. and A.P. Covich (eds.). 1991. Ecology and classification of North American invertebrates. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Usinger, R.L. Aquatic Insects of California. University of California Press. Berkeley, Ca.

Wiederholm, T. 1983. Chironomidae of the Holarctic region - Part 1. Larvae. Entomologica Scandinavica, Supplement No. 19. Sandby, Sweden.

_______. 1986. Chironomidae of the Holarctic region - Part 2. Pupae. Entomologica Scandinavica, Supplement No.28. Sandby, Sweden.

Wiggins, G.B. 1996. Larva of North American caddisfly genera (Trichoptera), 2nd ed. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Wold, J.L. 1974. Systematics of the genus Rhyacophila (Trichoptera: Rhyacophilidae) in western North America with special reference to the immature stages. Masters of Science Thesis. Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Table 1. Benthic macroinvertebrate sampling location information for selected reaches sampled September 18-21, 1999 and April 14, 15, 22 and 23, 2000 within the Arroyo Corte Madera, Corte Madera, Miller and Novato watersheds.

Stream Name	Location Description	Station Code	Latitude/ Longitude/Elevation
Arroyo Corte Madera	**Arroyo Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins d/s of Goma Bridge, and consists of 4 riffles.	**ACM1**	37.89763900/ -122.53501700 Elev.: 26ft
Arroyo Corte Madera	**Arroyo Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins 25M below footbridge and ends @ Gardner St. bridge, ~ 50M.	**ACM2**	Elev.:
Arroyo Corte Madera	**Arroyo Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins @ Xing @ Blithedale Park sign.	**ACM3**	37.92284800/-122.55542300 Elev.: 353 ft
Old Mill Cr.	**Arroyo Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins @ Cascade Rd bridge and ends @ sewer pipe Xing. (7 riffles)	**ACM4**	37.90537900/-122.55328400 Elev.: 93ft.
Old Mill Cr.	**Arroyo Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins at bridge and ends with cement riprap (8 riffles)	**ACM5**	37.91075400/-122.56093600 Elev.: 172ft
Corte Madera Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach bissected by Lagunita Rd. Xing, extend 3 riffles u/s from wire fencing entry to 1 riffle d/s. (4 riffles)	**CM1**	37.96308100/-122.55613100 Elev.: 19ft
Corte Madera Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach consist of 3 riffles only, begins where creek comes out from under buildings, and ends at the heights of wisteria arbor.	**CM2**	37.97533400/-122.56095200 Elev.: 63
Ross Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach Reach begins at last footbridge, extends 50M u/s to change in reach gradient and type.	**CM3**	Elev.:
Billy Williams Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach is above reservoir and extends from ~30M above culvert for 100M	**CM3b**	37.95181300/-122.57229500 Elev.: 325ft.
San Anselmo Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins 30M u/s of fish ladder @ bridge and ends at temporary buildings.	**CM4**	37.98213500/ -122.57251100 Elev.: 60ft.
Sleepy Hollow Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins @ footbridge by school and u/s ~ 150M	**CM5**	37.98390700/ -122.57137000 Elev.: 63ft.
Sleepy Hollow Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins @ footbridge by school and extends u/s ~ 100M.	**CM6**	37.99086600/-122.57560800 Elev.:96ft.
Sleepy Hollow Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins under block wall and ends Vanwinle Rd. Xing.	**CM7**	38.01634500/-122.58570800 Elev.: 247

Sleepy Hollow Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins up from parking lot 50M u/s from catholic school nursery (garden) and ends @ Y trib. split.	**CM7b**	Elev.:
San Anselmo Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins at Fairfax Cr. confluence and ends at fence.	**CM8**	37.98570600/-122.58240500 Elev.: 97ft.
San Anselmo Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins at 6th riffle above confluence of Fairfax Cr. and ends 1 riffle d/s of confluence. Sampled above and below.	**CM8b**	Elev.: 97ft
Cascade Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins @ Bolinas Bridge Xing extends u/s 70M.	**CM9**	37.98080000/-122.59262800 Elev.: 132
Cascade Cr.	**Corte Madera Watershed** Reach begins @ footbridge Xing and extend ~ 400M to small waterfall/treestump in creek	**CM10**	37.98255800/-122.61973300 Elev.: 303ft.

Stream Name	Location Description	Station Code	Latitude/ Longitude/Elevation
Miller Cr.	**Miller Creek Watershed** Reach begins after turning right at the end of the park rd. (5 riffles)	**MC1**	38.03066500/-122.53820500 Elev.: 22ft.
Miller Cr.	**Miller Creek Watershed** Reach begins to left of large stump after entering from right of playground. (7 riffles)	**MC2**	38.03042800/-122.54525300 Elev.: 38ft.
Miller Cr.	**Miller Creek Watershed** Reach begins at large tree that crosses the stream, .3 miles from where road starts Past Oak Canyon. (6 riffles)	**MC3**	38.02689900/-122.55226500 Elev.: 62
Miller Cr.	**Miller Creek Watershed** Reach begins u/s from path off Shasta Rd. (8 riffles)	**MC4**	38.02926800/-122.57595500 Elev.: 134
Miller Cr.	**Miller Creek Watershed** Reach begins 120M d/s of bridge and extends to ~ 20M d/s of estgate bridge.	**MC5**	38.03778500/-122.59778500 Elev.: 200
Miller Cr.	**Miller Creek Watershed** Reach begins @ eroded bank by stables and ends @ bridge.	**MC6**	Elev.:

Stream Name	Location Description	Station Code	Latitude/ Longitude/Elevation
Novato Cr.	**Novato Watershed** Reach begins u/s of bridge. (6 riffles)	**NC1**	38.10737200/-122.57846000 Elev.: 25
Novato Cr.	**Novato Watershed** Reach begins at the end of path long wood fence. (4 riffles)	**NC2**	38.11422900/-122.58741700 Elev.: 43
Novato Cr.	**Novato Watershed** Reach begins ~ 50M u/s of Novato Blvd bridge @ Eucalyptus Blvd and ends ~50M of large riprap in thalweg.	**NC3**	38.11503100/-122.60355500 Elev.: 73

Novato Cr.	**Novato Watershed** Reach begins just u/s of horse stables, until reach gradient changes (30 riffles)	**NC4**	38.11662700/-122.60993700 Elev.: 76
Novato Cr.	**Novato Watershed** Reach begins at stump and ends @ turnstile (7 riffles)	**NC5**	38.12218300/-122.62383500 Elev.: 122
Novato Cr.	**Novato Watershed** Reach begins above reservoir in Stafford Park, ~ 50M u/s of footbridge (skipped 1st 3 riffles u/s of bridge, and ends barbed wire.	**NC6**	38.11279500/ -122.64866600 Elev.: 186
Warner Cr.	**Novato Watershed** Reach begins 20M u/s of culvert under Mill Rd., and extends to house near stream.	**NC7**	38.10449300/-122.60689500 Elev.: 101
Warner Cr.	**Novato Watershed** Reach begins @bridge. (6 riffles)	**NC8**	38.10857600/-122.58592700 Elev.: 44

Table 2. Bioassessment metrics used to describe characteristics of the benthic macroinvertebrate (BMI) community and the metric value response to impairment.

BMI Metric	Description	Response to Impairment
Richness Measures		
1. Taxonomic Richness	Total number of individual taxa.	decrease
2. EPT Taxa	Number of taxa in the orders Ephemeroptera (mayfly), Plecoptera (stonefly) and Trichoptera (caddisfly)	decrease
3. Ephemeroptera Taxa	Number of mayfly taxa	decrease
4. Plecoptera Taxa	Number of stonefly taxa	decrease
5. Trichoptera Taxa	Number of caddisfly taxa	decrease
Composition Measures		
6. EPT Index	Percent composition of mayfly, stonefly and caddisfly larvae	decrease
7. Sensitive EPT Index	Percent composition of mayfly, stonefly and caddisfly larvae with Tolerance Values less than 3	decrease
8. Percent Hydropsychidae	Percentage of organisms in the caddisfly family Hydropsychidae	increase
9. Percent Baetidae	Percentage of organisms in the mayfly family Baetidae	increase
Tolerance/Intolerance Measures		
10. Tolerance Value (TV)	TVs between 0 and 10 weighted for abundance of individuals designated as pollution tolerant (higher values) and intolerant (lower values).	increase
11. Percent Intolerant Organisms	Percentage of organisms that are highly intolerant to water and/ or habitat quality impairment as indicated by TVs of 0, 1 or 2.	decrease
12. Percent Tolerant Organisms	Percentage of organisms that are highly tolerant to water and/ or habitat quality impairment as indicated by TVs of 8, 9 or 10.	increase
13. Percent Dominant Taxon	The highest percentage of organisms represented by one taxon.	increase
Functional Feeding Groups (FFG)		
14. % Collectors	Percent of macroinvertebrates that collect or gather material	increase
15. % Filterers	Percent of macroinvertebrates that filter suspended material from the water column	increase
16. % Grazers	Percent of macroinvertebrates that graze upon periphyton	variable
17. % Predators	Percent of macroinvertebrates that prey on living organisms	decrease
18. % Shredders	Percent of macroinvertebrates that shred leaf litter	decrease

Table 3. Description of reach scale habitat parameters used to document local habitat conditions along stream corridors.

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
1. Epifaunal Substrate sand: <0.08" gravel: 0.08-2.5" sm cobble: 2.5-5" lg cobble: 5-10" boulder: >10"	Small and large cobble comprises >70% of substrate. Range of substrate types present from sand to boulder but sand, gravel and/or boulder comprise <30% of substrate. Substrate provides ample and variably sized interstitial space.	Small and large cobble ranges from 40 to 70%. Range of substrate types more limited or present from sand to boulder but amount of sand, gravel and/or boulder accounts for >30-60% of substrate.	Small and large cobble comprises between 20-40% of available substrate. Substrate complexity and ranges of interstitial space limited. Sand, gravel and/or boulder accounts for 60-80% of substrate.	Substrate with little complexity and interstitial space; substrate >90% silt, sand, boulder, bedrock or rip-rap; or, channel is impervious due to concrete or asphalt lining
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
2. Embeddedness	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
	Gravel, cobble and boulder particles are 25% surrounded by fine sediment. Layering of cobble provides diversity of niche space.	Gravel, cobble and boulder particles are 25-50% surrounded by fine sediment.	Gravel, cobble and boulder particles are 50-75% surrounded by fine sediment.	Gravel, cobble and boulder particles are >75% surrounded by fine sediment. May be completely covered.
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
3. Velocity/Depth Regime	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
	All four velocity depth regimes present (slow-deep, slow-shallow, fast-deep, fast-shallow). (Slow is <0.3 m/s, deep is >0.5 m)	Only 3 of the 4 regimes present (if fast-shallow is missing, score lower than if missing other regimes).	Only 2 of the 4 regimes present (if fast-shallow are missing, score low).	Dominated by 1 velocity/depth regime (usually slow-deep).
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
4. Sediment Deposition	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
	Little or no enlargement of point bars just above or below riffle. Less than 5% of the bottom of riffle affected by fine sediment.	Some new increases in bar formation just above or below riffle. 5 - 30% of the bottom of the riffle affected by fine sediment.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on bars just above or below riffle. 50-80% of the bottom of the riffle affected by fine sediment.	Heavy deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on bars just above or below riffle. >80% of the bottom of the riffle affected by fine sediment.
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
5. Channel Flow Status	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
	Water reaches both banks; wetted channel width is equal to bankfull width.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel; or most of channel substrate is exposed.	Very little water present in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0

Table 3, continued

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
6. Channel Alteration	No channel alteration; no dredging, levees, rip-rap, gabion structures or bridge abutments	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization from dredging	Channelization extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks and 40 to 80% of riffle channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; entire riffle affected by channelization.
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Riffle Frequency	**Optimal**	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
	Occurrence of riffle relatively frequent; ratio of distance between riffles divided by the width of the stream <7:1 (generally 5 to 7); variety of habitat is key. In streams where riffles are continuous, boulders or other large, natural obstruction is important.	Occurrence of riffles infrequent; distance between riffles divided by the width of the stream is between 7 to 15.	Occasional riffle or bend; bottom contours provide some habitat; distance between riffles divided by the with of the stream is between 15 to 25.	Generally all flat water or shallow riffles ; poor habitat; distance between riffles divided by the width of the stream is a ratio of >25.
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
8. Bank Stability	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
	Both banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of banks adjacent to riffle and just upstream affected.	Banks moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of banks adjacent to riffle and just upstream affected.	Banks moderately unstable; 30-60% of banks adjacent to riffle and just upstream affected.	Unstable banks; 60-80% of banks adjacent to riffle and just upstream affected having "raw" areas and erosional scars.
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
9. Bank Vegetation	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces adjacent to and near riffle covered by native vegetation including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption by livestock grazing or mowing not evident.	70 - 90% of the streambank surfaces adjacent to and near riffle covered by native vegetation including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption by livestock grazing or mowing not evident.	50-70%of the stream bank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 cm or less in average stubble height.
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
10. Riparian Zone Width	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
	Width of riparian zone >18 m; human activities (eg. Parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 m; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 m; human activities have impacted zone substantially.	Width of riparian zone <6 m; little or no riparian zone due to human activities
	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0

Table 4. Dominant macroinvertebrate taxa and their percent contribution () by reach from samples collected September 1999 and April 2000 within the Arroyo Corte Madera watershed.

Reach	Dominant Taxa				
	1	2	3	4	5
ACM1 F 99	Orthocladiinae 155 (52%)	Oligochaeta 104 (35%)	*Baetis sp.* 17 (6%)	Chironomini 13 (14%)	Tanytarsini 3 (1%)
Sp 00	Planorbidae 92 (31%)	*Baetis sp.* 81 (27%)	Tanytarsini 61 (21%)	*Lepidostoma sp.* 13 (4%)	Oligochaeta 7 (2%)
ACM2 F 99	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 76 (25%)	*Drunella sp.* 64 (21%)	Chironomini 46 (15%)	Oligochaeta 36 (12%)	*Baetis sp.* 16 (5%)
ACM3 F 99	Tanytarsini 61 (21%)	Chironomini 47 (16%)	*Hydropsyche sp.* 20 (7%)	Orthocladiinae 16 (5%)	Optioserce 14 (5%)
Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 51 (18%)	*Epeorus sp.* 40 (14%)	Linygma 30 (10%)	*Baetis sp.* 26 (9%)	Malenka 22 (8%)
ACM4 F 99	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 79 (27%)	Oligochaeta 74 (25%)	Chironomini 40 (13%)	*Drunella sp.* 21 (7%)	*Baetis sp.* 21 (7%)
ACM5 F 99	Chironomini 50 (17%)	lepidostomatidea 31 (10%)	*Hydropsyche sp.* 25 (8%)	Orthocladiinae 25 (8%)	Optioservus sp 24 (8%)
Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 62 (26%)	Chironomini 52 (21%)	Optioservus sp 22 (9%)	Oligochaeta 16 (7%)	Acari 15 (6%)

Table 5. IBI scores by reach from samples collected September 1999 and April 2000 within the Arroyo Corte Madera watershed.

Reach	IBI						
	taxa richness	% dominance	EPT taxa	Modified EPT	Shannon	Tolerance value	SCORE
ACM1 F 99	(16) 1	(42) 1	(2)	(5) 1	(1.7) 1	(5.8) 1	6, poor
Sp 00	(9) 1	(65 1	(2) 1	(0) 1	(1.0) 1	(6.1) 1	6, poor
ACM2 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(24) 1	(26) 3	(10) 1	(29) 3	(2.2) 1	(4.3) 3	12, fair
ACM3 F 99	(31) 3	(25) 3	(17) 3	(48) 3	(2.7) 3	(3.5) 3	18, good
Sp 00	(29) 3	(19) 3	(13) 3	(22) 3	(2.8) 3	(4.5) 3	18, good
ACM4 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(19) 1	(30) 3	(9) 1	(18) 3	(2.1) 1	(5.1) 1	7, poor
ACM5 F 99	(25) 1	(21) 3	(11) 1	(25) 3	(2.7) 3	(4.2) 3	14, fair
Sp 00	(26) 3	(31) 3	(12) 3	(14) 1	(2.4) 3	(4.9) 1	14, fair

Table 6. Habitat assessment results for reaches within Arroyo Corte Madera Watershed, September 1999 and April 2000. Numbers in parentheses are ranges of ranks. (see Table 1 for a description of habitat parameters and ranking criteria)

Ranked Habitat Parameter	**ACM1** F 99	ACM1 SP00	**ACM2** F 99	ACM2 SP00	**ACM3** F99	ACM3 SP00	**ACM4** F99	ACM4 SP00	ACM5 F99	ACM5 SP00
1. Instream Cover (0 - 20)	8	12	dry	10	16	18	dry	15	15	16
2. Embeddedness (0 - 20)	12	15		17	17	17		17	17	17
3. Velocity/Depth Regime (0 - 20)	12	14		12	16	15		15	15	15
4. Sediment Deposition (0 - 20)	10	15		17	17	17		15	17	17
5. Channel Flow (0 - 20)	5	13		10	6	11		8	7	9
6. Channel Alteration (0 - 20)	8	9		5	16	16		15	18	15
7. Riffle Frequency (0 - 20)	16	14		16	18	18		18	18	18
8. Bank Stability (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	12	13		18	19	17		10	16	15
9. Vegetative Protection (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	10	8		5	17	13		11	15	15
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	4	5		4	16	14		12	18	16
Reach Total	97	118		114	158	156		136	156	153
condition	marginal	suboptimal		suboptimal	optimal	optimal		suboptimal	optimal	optimal
Other Reach Descriptions										
Vegetative Canopy Cover Estimate (%)	26	15		73	80	68		58	86	77
Water Temperature (° C)	15	12		12	16	12		12	13	13
Specific Conductance (µS/cm at 25°C)	280	161		165	200	153		173	560	150
Comments	stormdrain @ riffle 2	water turbid		water turbid, some foam. stormdrain between r-2 & 3	Pacific giant salamander larvae	Pacific giant salamander larvae. stormdrain bewteen r-2 & 3		stormdrain below r-1. bareground in park source of sediment	10cm crayfish released. Pacific giant salamander larvae	

Table 7. Cumulative total, mean and coefficient of variation values of biological metrics by reach for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from the Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio Creek drainage in Sept. 1999, Marin County

	Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio Creek						Old Mill Creek		
	ACM-1			ACM-3			ACM-5		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	19	16	7	45	31	4	31	25	10
EPT Taxa	3	2	25	18	13	13	13	11	14
Ephemeroptera Taxa	1	1	0	5	5	12	5	4	13
Plecoptera Taxa	0	0	-	3	2	50	3	2	25
Trichoptera Taxa	2	1	43	10	6	18	5	4	25
EPT Index	32	32	30	34	34	24	40	39	47
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	5	5	97	17	17	22	19	19	41
Shannon Diversity	1.9	1.7	17	3.0	2.8	7	2.8	2.7	4
Tolerance Value	5.8	5.8	5	4.5	4.5	5	4.2	4.2	15
Percent Intolerant Organisms	5	5	97	19	19	23	23	23	36
Percent Tolerant Organisms	5	5	85	2	2	25	3	3	53
Percent Hydropsychidae	0	0	-	7	7	67	8	8	88
Percent Baetidae	27	27	24	5	5	51	6	6	61
Percent Dominant Taxon	31	42	21	21	25	39	17	21	41
Percent Collectors	7	7	44	32	32	25	30	30	61
Percent Filterers	22	22	88	30	30	43	20	20	48
Percent Grazers	62	62	31	18	17	27	24	24	40
Percent Predators	5	5	26	11	11	22	13	13	33
Percent Shredders	5	5	99	9	9	15	14	14	55
Abundance									
(organisms per sample X 1000)	12	4.1	15	10	3.3	10	8.0	2.7	61

Table 8. Cumulative total, mean and coefficient of variation values of biological metrics by reach for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from the Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio Creek drainage in April 2000, Marin County

	Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio Creek									Old Mill Creek			Old Mill Creek		
	ACM-1			ACM-2			ACM-3			ACM-4			ACM-5		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	15	9	55	37	24	14	37	29	13	28	19	17	34	26	12
EPT Taxa	4	2	49	16	10	11	20	17	3	13	9	22	15	12	13
Ephemeroptera Taxa	3	2	50	8	7	9	11	9	0	9	6	24	6	5	11
Plecoptera Taxa	0	0		3	2	69	3	3	0	0	0		4	3	22
Trichoptera Taxa	1	0		5	2	50	6	5	12	4	3	57	5	4	16
EPT Index	6	6	58	36	36	24	60	60	5	26	26	22	18	18	30
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	1	1	92	25	25	19	30	30	19	15	15	34	8	9	52
Shannon Diversity	1.2	1.0	28	2.3	2.2	8	2.8	2.7	4	2.2	2.1	11	2.5	2.4	9
Tolerance Value	6.1	6.1	14	4.3	4.3	11	3.5	3.5	8	5.1	5.1	9	4.9	4.9	5
Percent Intolerant Organisms	1	1	92	25	25	21	29	29	13	15	15	34	9	10	49
Percent Tolerant Organisms	35	35	85	13	13	71	5	5	57	25	25	26	7	7	21
Percent Hydropsychidae	0	0		1	1	99	1	1	79	1	1	58	3	3	59
Percent Baetidae	6	6	67	6	6	69	11	11	47	7	7	47	1	1	17
Percent Dominant Taxon	52	65	5	25	26	16	18	19	25	26	30	4	26	31	24
Percent Collectors	91	91	6	58	58	17	36	36	6	66	67	14	58	58	21
Percent Filterers	1	1	173	2	2	46	3	3	52	2	2	76	11	11	36
Percent Grazers	6	6	55	34	34	24	43	43	8	26	26	28	16	15	46
Percent Predators	1	1	104	5	5	30	6	6	8	5	5	69	13	14	27
Percent Shredders	0	0		1	1	44	11	11	18	1	1	99	2	2	40
Abundance															
(organisms per sample X 1000)		4.3	39		1.9	68		1.8	12		1.1	27		0.85	80

Table 9. Dominant macroinvertebrate taxa and their percent contribution () by reach from samples collected September 1999 and April 2000 within the Corte Madera watershed.

Reach		Dominant Taxa				
		1	2	3	4	5
CM1	F 99	Planariidae 91 (30%)	Oligochaeta 45 (15%)	*Baetis sp.* 33 (11%)	Orthocladiinae 29 (10%)	Acari 15 (6%)
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 221 (74%)	Oligochaeta 39 (13%)	Acari 9 (3%)	Simuliidae 6 (2%)	Chironomini 5 (2%)
CM2	F 99	Acari 61 (28%)	Tanypodinae 42 (19%)-	Tanytarsini 31 (14%)	Oligochaeta 21 (10%)	Planorbidae 8 (4%)-
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 135 (48%)	*Baetis sp.* 35 (12%)	Acari 35 (12%)	Oligochaeta 31 (11%)	*Tanypodinae 13 (5%)*
CM3	F 99	-	-	-	-	-
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 110 (37%)	Simuliidae 44 (15%)	*Baetis sp.* 35 (12%)	Tanytarsini 23 (8%)	*Paraleptophlebia sp.* 20 (7%)
CM3b	F 99	-	-	-	-	-
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 67 (23%)	*Baetis sp.* 44 (15%)	*Calineuria Californica* 30 (10%)	*Paraleptophlebia sp.* 22 (7%)	*Amphinemura/Malenka sp.* 15 (5%)
CM4	F 99	-	-	-	-	
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 158 (53%)	Simuliidae 30 (10%)	*Baetis sp.* 24 (8%)	Oligochaeta 24 (8%)	Acari 19 (6%)
CM5	F 99	-	-	-	-	
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 132 (43%)	Oligochaeta 66 (21%)	Simuliidae 57 (19%)	Tanytarsini 21 (7%)	*Baetis sp.* 20 (7%)
CM6	F 99	-	-	-	-	-
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 185 (52%)	Tanytarsini 45 (15%)	Simuliidae 26 (8%)	*Baetis sp.* 23 (8%)	Oligochaeta 19 (6%)
CM7	F 99	-	-	-	-	-
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 192 (64%)	Tanytarsini 23 (8%)	*Baetis sp.* 22 (7%)	Oligochaeta 16 (5%)	Ameletus sp. 14 (5%)
CM7b	F 99	-	-	-	-	-
	Sp 00	*Baetis sp.* 108 (36%)	*Paraleptophlebia sp.* 62 (21%)	Ameletus sp. 44 (15%)	Orthocladiinae 30 (10%)	*Amphinemura/Malenka sp.* 17 (6%)
CM8	F 99 A	Orthocladiinae 129 (42%)	Chironomini 51 (17%)	Lepidostoma sp 22 (7%)	Acari 22 (7%)	Tanytarsini 15 (5%)
	B	Orthocladiinae 155 (52%)	Lepidostoma sp 41 (14%)	Chironomini 35 (12%)	Tanytarsini 27 (9%)	Acari 14 (5%)
	Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 68 (30%)	Oligochaeta 28 (12%)	Tanytarsini 27 (12%)	Lepidostoma sp 24 (11%)	*Baetis sp.* 17 (7%)
CM9	F 99	-	-	-	-	-
	Sp 00	Suwallia sp. 78 (28%)	Lepidostoma sp. 76 (27%)	Orthocladiinae 31 (11%)	Serratella sp. 20 (9%)	*Drunella sp.* 16 (7%)
CM10	F 99	Lepidostoma sp. 123 (42%)	Eubrianax sp. 25 (9%)	Chironomini 24 (8%)	Tanypodinae 15 (5%)	Paraleptophlebia sp 13 (4%)
	Sp 00	Baetis sp 48 (17%)	Orthocladiinae 36 (13%)	Suwallia sp. 33 (12%)	Hexatoma sp 28 (10%)	Serratella sp. 15 (5%)

Table 10. IBI scores by reach from samples collected September 1999 and April 2000 within the Corte Madera watershed.

Reach	IBI						
	taxa richness	% dominance	EPT taxa	Modified EPT	Shannon	Tolerance value	SCORE
CM1 F 99	(17) 1	(36) 3	(3) 1	(1) 1	(2.0) 1	(5.5) 1	8, poor
Sp 00	(12) 1	(74) 1	(2) 1	(0) 1	(1) 1	(5.4) 1	6, poor
CM2 F 99	(17) 1	(34) 3	(4) 1	(7) 1	(2.0) 1	(5.6) 1	8, poor
Sp 00	(15) 1	(48) 1	(7) 1	(5) 1	(1.6) 1	(5.2) 1	6, poor
CM3 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(21) 1	(37) 3	(7) 1	(11) 1	(2.1) 1	(5.3) 1	8, poor
CM3b F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(30) 3	(23) 3	(18) 3	(44) 3	(2.6) 3	(3.7) 3	18, good
CM4 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sp 00	(20) 1	(53 1	(9) 1	(4) 1	(1.7) 1	(5.3) 1	6, poor
CM5 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sp 00	(11) 1	(43) 1	(2) 1	(1) 1	(1.5) 1	(5.3) 1	6, poor
CM6 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(9) 1	(61) 1	(2) 1	(1) 1	(1.2) 1	(5.4) 1	6, poor
CM7 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(17) 1	(64) 1	(9) 1	(11) 1	(1.5) 1	(4.8) 1	6, poor
CM7b F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(18) 1	(40) 1	(10) 1	(50) 5	(1.9) 1	(3.6) 3	12, fair
CM8 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(24) 1	(27) 3	(12) 3	(34) 3	(2.4) 3	(4.2) 1	14, fair
CM8b F99	(18) 1	(42) 1	(4) 1	(12) 1	(1.9) 1	(4.9) 1	6, poor
SP00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CM9 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(13) 1	(40) 1	(12) 3	(77) 5	(2.0) 1	(2.1) 5	16, fair
CM10 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(27) 3	(18) 3	(17) 3	(44) 3	(2.7) 3	(3.0) 5	20, good

Table 11. Habitat assessment results for reaches within Corte Madera Watershed, September 1999. Numbers in parentheses are ranges of ranks. (see Table 1 for a description of habitat parameters and ranking criteria)

Ranked Habitat Parameter	CM1 F 99	CM2 F 99	CM3 F 99	CM3b F 99	CM4 F 99	CM5 F 99	CM6 F 99	CM7 F 99	CM7b F 99	CM8 F 99	CM9 F 99	CM10 F99
1. Instream Cover (0 - 20)	8	7	dry	dry	dry	dry	dry	dry	dry	12	dry	12
2. Embeddedness (0 - 20)	12	12								14		18
3. Velocity/Depth Regime (0 - 20)	9	7								12		11
4. Sediment Deposition (0 - 20)	5	9								7		17
5. Channel Flow (0 - 20)	5	7								7		4
6. Channel Alteration (0 - 20)	11	6								14		20
7. Riffle Frequency (0 - 20)	8	3								14		18
8. Bank Stability (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	16	16								16		15
9. Vegetative Protection (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	17	9								14		15
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	13	6								14		18
Reach Total	104	82								124		148
condition	subopt imal	margi nal								subopt imal		subopti mal
Other Reach Descriptions												
Vegetative Canopy Cover Estimate (%)	32	78								53		90
Water Temperature (° F)	16	15								15		14
Specific Conductance (µS/cm at 25°C)	not colect ed	not colect ed								not colect ed		not collecte d

Ranked Habitat Parameter	CM1 F 99	CM2 F 99	CM3 F 99	CM3b F 99	CM4 F 99	CM5 F 99	CM6 F 99	CM7 F 99	CM7b F 99	CM8 F 99	CM9 F 99	CM10 F99
Comments										sculpin in r-4. many yoy fingerling		spotsampled due to possible steelhead habitat

Table 12. Habitat assessment results for reaches within Corte Madera Watershed, April 2000. Numbers in parentheses are ranges of ranks. (see Table 1 for a description of habitat parameters and ranking criteria)

Ranked Habitat Parameter	CM1 SP00	CM2 SP00	CM3 SP00	CM3b SP00	CM4 SP00	CM5 SP00	CM6 SP00	CM7 SP00	CM7b SP00	CM8 SP00	CM9 SP00	CM10 SP00
1. Instream Cover (0 - 20)	8	10	17	14	15	15	13	15	8	9	16	17
2. Embeddedness (0 - 20)	11	12	12	18	14	13	12	12	12	17	16	17
3. Velocity/Depth Regime (0 - 20)	9	14	15	15	15	15	13	14	11	13	16	15
4. Sediment Deposition (0 - 20)	8	9	18	17	14	15	12	14	17	5	14	18
5. Channel Flow (0 - 20)	8	10	9	6	14	11	7	7	12	8	11	8
6. Channel Alteration (0 - 20)	14	6	20	20	15	15	9	10	19	12	17	19
7. Riffle Frequency (0 - 20)	14	5	17	17	6	14	11	11	17	15	14	16
8. Bank Stability (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	17	18	18	18	11	14	15	14	16	16	13	17
9. Vegetative Protection (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	16	10	16	18	13	16	13	15	19	16	16	18
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	13	6	19	20	7	10	6	9	14	10	11	19
Reach Total	116	100	161	163	124	138	111	121	145	121	144	164
condition	subopt imal	margi nal	optima l	optimal	subopt imal	subopt imal	subopt imal	subopt imal	subopti mal	subopt imal	subopt imal	optimal
Other Reach Descriptions												
Vegetative Canopy Cover Estimate (%)	43	63	72	77	42	48	60	47	37	47	63	77
Water Temperature (°C)	15	15	16	11	13	13	14	12	13	13	15	12.5
Specific Conductance (µS/cm at 25°C)	330	370	162	155	188	358	520	347	307	276	265	305

Ranked Habitat Parameter	CM1 SP00	CM2 SP00	CM3 SP00	CM3b SP00	CM4 SP00	CM5 SP00	CM6 SP00	CM7 SP00	CM7b SP00	CM8 SP00	CM9 SP00	CM10 SP00
Comments		r-2 under bridge abutmen t	reach may be missing sand substrate	Pacific giant salamande r	sculpin. stromdra in under u/s r-3		low water. filament ous algae. 4 stromdar ins in reach. r-3 under house		algae. minimal flow. wild bamboo. scotch/fren ch broom.	heavy sediment behind dam. yoy trout. sculpin. riffle sculpin.		

Table 13. Cumulative total, mean and coefficient of variation values of biological metrics by reach for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from the Corte Madera Creek drainage in September 1999, Marin County.

	Corte Madera Cr.			San Anselmo Cr.			San Anselmo Cr.			San Anselmo Cr.		
	CM-1			CM-2			CM-8a			CM-8b		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	27	17	9	25	17	10	28	18	6	30	19	9
EPT Taxa	6	3	33	5	4	16	6	4	43	9	5	40
Ephemeroptera Taxa	2	1	43	1	0	173	2	1	43	2	2	35
Plecoptera Taxa	0	0	-	0	0	-	2	1	100	2	1	87
Trichoptera Taxa	4	2	69	4	3	17	2	2	35	5	3	43
EPT Index	13	13	110	11	10	53	15	15	83	19	19	96
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	1	1	125	1	2	118	12	12	76	15	14	107
Shannon Diversity	2.3	2.0	17	2.2	2.0	14	2.0	1.9	17	2.0	1.8	12
Tolerance Value	5.5	5.5	6	5.7	5.6	7	4.9	4.9	5	4.7	4.7	14
Percent Intolerant Organisms	1	1	125	2	2	96	8	8	18	15	15	101
Percent Tolerant Organisms	22	22	50	13	11	78	4	4	52	2	2	28
Percent Hydropsychidae	0	0	-	1	1	34	0	0	-	0	0	-
Percent Baetidae	12	12	129	0.2	0.2	173	3	3	112	4	4	81
Percent Dominant Taxon	30	36	33	28	34	28	42	42	38	45	45	29
Percent Collectors	38	38	28	37	40	37	65	65	20	58	59	20
Percent Filterers	2	2	134	15	17	50	5	5	37	12	12	45
Percent Grazers	14	14	89	16	14	81	3	3	107	4	4	34
Percent Predators	44	44	36	30	27	36	14	14	17	10	10	23
Percent Shredders	1	1	132	1	2	118	12	12	76	16	15	102
Abundance												
(organisms per sample X 1000)	3.7	1.2	35	1.3	0.4	103	9.5	3.2	35	10	3.3	43
CRT: Cumulative Reach Total												
CV: Coefficient of Variation												

Table 14. Cumulative total, mean and coefficient of variation values of biological metrics by reach for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from the Corte Madera Creek drainage in Spring 2000, Marin County.

	Corte Madera Cr.						Ross Cr.			Bill Williams			San Anselmo			Sleepy Hollow		
	CM-1			CM-2			CM-3			CM-3b			CM-4			CM-5		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	17	12	5	23	15	21	32	21	6	45	30	2	32	20	6	18	11	22
EPT Taxa	2	2	35	11	7	29	10	7	14	23	18	6	14	9	24	3	2	69
Ephemeroptera Taxa	2	2	35	7	4	13	4	3	17	11	9	16	7	4	53	1	1	0
Plecoptera Taxa	0	0		1	0	173	2	1	43	4	3	17	4	3	43	0	0	
Trichoptera Taxa	0	0		3	2	49	4	2	25	8	5	11	3	2	35	2	1	173
EPT Index	2	2	43	18	18	26	23	23	34	64	64	7	12	12	17	7	7	36
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	1	1	89	5	5	44	4	4	47	31	31	21	3	3	15	0	0	173
Shannon Diversity	1.0	1.0	11	1.7	1.6	6	2.1	2.1	10	2.7	2.6	7	1.8	1.7	3	1.5	1.5	2
Tolerance Value	5.4	5.4	3	5.2	5.2	7	5.3	5.3	2	3.7	3.7	4	5.3	5.3	3	5.9	5.9	2
Percent Intolerant Organisms	1	1	89	5	5	51	4	4	40	32	32	20	4	4	11	0	0	173
Percent Tolerant Organisms	13	13	49	11	11	85	6	6	19	3	3	89	8	8	84	22	22	10
Percent Hydropsychidae	0	0		0	0		0	0		1	1	142	0	0		0	0	
Percent Baetidae	2	2	40	13	13	41	12	12	20	19	19	55	8	8	11	6	6	38
Percent Dominant Taxon	74	74	7	48	48	5	37	37	25	23	23	35	53	53	5	43	43	16
Percent Collectors	89	89	3	60	60	19	58	58	9	34	34	10	67	67	13	66	66	9
Percent Filterers	3	3	87	9	9	73	22	22	2	10	10	49	14	14	47	25	25	22
Percent Grazers	3	3	37	17	17	29	13	13	20	25	25	31	10	10	17	7	7	34
Percent Predators	4	4	34	13	13	88	3	3	29	20	20	43	9	9	4	1	1	25
Percent Shredders	0	0		1	1	25	3	3	61	10	10	28	1	1	65	0	0	
Abundance																		
(organisms per sample X 1000)		1.4	67		0.84	48		2.5	5		1.1	22		2.5	32		4.1	57

Table 14. (cont.) Cumulative total, mean and coefficient of variation values of biological metrics by reach for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from the Corte Madera Creek drainage in Spring 1999, Marin County.

	Sleepy Hollow			Sleepy Hollow			Sleepy Hollow			San Anselmo			Cascade Cr.			Cascade Cr.		
	CM-6			CM-7			CM-7b			CM-8*			CM-9			CM-10		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	13	9	22	24	17	18	27	18	3	35	24	11	31	19	21	37	27	12
EPT Taxa	3	2	35	11	8	22	14	10	10	15	12	5	18	12	13	23	17	3
Ephemeroptera Taxa	2	1	43	3	3	0	6	5	20	6	5	11	10	7	16	11	9	7
Plecoptera Taxa	0	0		7	5	25	5	4	0	6	4	0	5	2	25	6	4	25
Trichoptera Taxa	1	0	173	1	0	173	3	1	100	3	2	25	3	2	50	6	5	12
EPT Index	8	8	35	18	18	31	86	86	4	37	42	36	80	80	5	64	64	16
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	0	0	173	10	10	38	30	30	19	28	31	36	73	73	6	39	39	10
Shannon Diversity	1.3	1.2	21	1.5	1.5	18	2.0	1.9	2	2.5	2.4	8	2.2	2.0	11	2.8	2.7	6
Tolerance Value	5.4	5.4	1	4.8	4.8	2	3.6	3.6	9	4.4	4.2	12	2.1	2.1	7	3.0	3.0	6
Percent Intolerant Organisms	0	0	173	10	11	42	30	30	17	27	30	31	73	73	7	47	48	8
Percent Tolerant Organisms	6	6	33	6	6	45	1	1	26	13	12	19	1	1	45	0	0	
Percent Hydropsychidae	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		1	1	48
Percent Baetidae	7	7	38	7	7	24	36	36	34	7	8	44	3	3	51	19	19	26
Percent Dominant Taxon	61	61	19	64	64	13	36	40	12	30	27	39	28	40	20	17	18	20
Percent Collectors	69	68	18	71	71	7	32	32	34	51	47	29	21	21	18	26	26	34
Percent Filterers	23	23	44	8	8	10	1	1	70	9	8	54	1	1	83	3	3	42
Percent Grazers	8	8	35	12	12	21	53	53	17	16	19	53	13	14	39	38	38	16
Percent Predators	1	1	133	9	9	37	8	8	17	13	14	29	37	37	41	29	29	9
Percent Shredders	0	0		1	1	68	7	7	48	12	13	43	27	27	59	4	4	28
Abundance (organisms per sample X 1000)		5.7	22		4.3	54		0.68	32		0.45	80		1.4	33		0.71	9

* excluded transects 4 and 5 from CRT, mean and CV calculations

Table 15. Dominant macroinvertebrate taxa and their percent contribution () by reach from samples collected April 1999 and September 2000 within the Miller Creek watershed.

Reach	Dominant Taxa				
	1	2	3	4	5
MC1 F 99 Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 57 (19%) Orthocladiinae 116 (39%)	Chironomini 56 (18%) *Baetis sp.* 82 (27%)	Oligochaeta 46 (15%) Oligochaeta 37 (12%)	Hydracarina 21 (7%) Tanytarsini 30 (10%)	*Baetis sp.* 21 (7%) Simuliidae 26 (9%)
MC2 F 99 Sp 00	**Chironomini 84 (28%) Orthocladiinae 163 (54%)**	**Orthocladiinae 37 (12%) *Baetis sp.* 44 (15%)**	**Oligochaeta 37 (12%) Tanytarsini 39 (13%)**	**Tanypodinae 14 (5%) Oligochaeta 26 (9%)**	***Baetis sp.* 14 (5%) Psychoda sp 18 (6%)**
MC3 F 99 Sp 00	**Chironomini 62 (21%) *Baetis sp.* 96 (327%)**	**Simuliidae 43 (14%) Orthocladiinae 63 (21%)**	**Orthocladiinae 40 (13%) Simuliidae 18 (6%)**	**Planariidae 13 (4%) Tanytarsini 18 (6%)**	**Argia sp. 12 (4%) Acari 8 (3%)**
MC4 F 99 Sp 00	**Chironomini 53 (17%) *Baetis sp.* 83 (28%)**	**Orthocladiinae 53 (17%) Orthocladiinae 81 (27%)**	**Argia 29 (10%) Tanytarsini 34 (11%)**	**Tanypodinae 27 (9%) *Serratella sp. 32 (11%)***	**Oligochaeta 23 (8%) Simuliidae 21 (7%)**
MC5 F 99 Sp 00	**- Orthocladiinae 169 (56%)**	**- *Serratella sp. 44 (15%)***	**- Tanytarsini 16 (5%)**	**- Tanypodinae 15 (5%)**	**- *Baetis sp.* 14 (5%)**
MC6 F 99 Sp 00	**- *Baetis sp.* 107 (36%)**	**- *Serratella sp. 62 (21%)***	**- Orthocladiinae 32 (11%)**	**- Drunella sp. 15 (5%)**	**- Tanypodinae 13 (4%)**

Table 16 IBI scores by reach from samples collected September 1999 and April 2000 within the Miller Creek watershed.

Reach	IBI						
	taxa richness	% dominance	EPT taxa	Modified EPT	Shannon	Tolerance value	SCORE
MC1 F 99	(19) 1	(28) 3	(5) 1	(15) 1	(2.2) 1	(5.2) 1	8, poor
Sp 00	(9) 1	(42) 1	(2) 1	(1) 1	(1.5) 1	(5.6) 1	6, poor
MC2 F 99	(19) 1	(29) 3	(4) 1	(19) 3	(2.1) 1	(5.0) 1	10, poor
Sp 00	(9) 1	(53) 1	(2) 1	(0) 1	(1.3) 1	(5.0) 1	6, poor
MC3 F 99	(19) 1	(30) 3	(5) 1	(16) 1	(2.3) 3	(5.0) 1	10, poor
Sp 00	(15) 1	(53) 1	(5) 1	(3) 1	(1.5) 1	(5.1) 1	6, poor
MC4 F 99	(23) 1	(27) 3	(8) 1	(11) 1	(2.5) 3	(5.4) 1	10, poor
Sp 00	(20) 1	(36) 3	(12) 3	(19) 3	(2.0) 1	(4.7) 1	12, fair
MC5 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(19) 1	(56) 1	(10) 1	(25) 3	(1.6) 1	(4.4) 3	10, poor
MC6 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(23) 1	(37) 3	(15) 3	(44) 3	(2.1) 1	(3.6) 3	14, fair

Table 17. **Habitat assessment results for reaches within Miller Creek*, September 1999 and April 2000. Numbers in parentheses are ranges of ranks. (see Table 1 for a description of habitat parameters and ranking criteria)**

Ranked Habitat Parameter	MC1 F 99	MC1 SP00	MC2 F 99	MC2 SP00	MC3 F99	MC3 SP00	MC4 F99	MC4 SP00	MC5 F99	MC5 SP00	MC6 F99	MC6 7 SP00
1. Instream Cover (0 - 20)	12	13	14	18	13	15	17	19	dry	13	dry	13
2. Embeddedness (0 - 20)	14	14	13	15	14	11	16	14		12		17
3. Velocity/Depth Regime (0 - 20)	14	11	15	16	14	15	16	17		14		14
4. Sediment Deposition (0 - 20)	12	16	11	10	14	13	13	13		12		12
5. Channel Flow (0 - 20)	5	9	7	9	8	11	7	10		7		7
6. Channel Alteration (0 - 20)	19	17	18	18	18	18	20	19		19		18
7. Riffle Frequency (0 - 20)	15	16	15	17	15	12	17	18		16		18
8. Bank Stability (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	9/9	15	7/8	14	14	14	9/9	18		18		5
9. Vegetative Protection (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	8/8	13	8/8	14	7/7	14	9/10	20		14		8
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	6/8	15	8/6	14	8/7	16	8/10	18		16		14
Reach Total	139	139	138	145	139	139	161	166		141		126
condition	suboptimal	suboptimal	suboptimal	suoptimal	suboptimal	suboptimal	optimal	optimal		suboptimal		suboptimal
Other Reach Descriptions												
Vegetative Canopy Cover Estimate (%)	70	65	70	80	85	70	50	47		17		20
Water Temperature (° F)	62	13 c	62	14c	61	14c	60	15c		17c		13c
Specific Conductance (µS/cm at 25°C)	354	360	332	340	294	310	273	280		220		210
Comments	Storm drain between riffle 1 and 2; residence on left bank; minimal flow for sampling	storm dain r-2	Bridge abutments, residences and school within or near riparian zone; minimal flow for sampling	school nearby. storm drain d/s r-1	Storm drain on right bank upstream of riffle 1; trails within riparian zone	storm drain u/s r-5	Overall good quality site but minimal flow for sampling; samples collected under blackberry vines; recommend frog surveys for this site			stormdrain @ upper end reach		yoy trout. stream dry u/s of bridge @ top of riffle

Table 18. Biological metric values for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from Miller Creek in Fall 1999.

	MC1				MC2				MC3				MC4			
	T1	T2	T3	**CRT**	T1	T2	T3	**CRT**	T1	T2	T3	**CRT**	T1	T2	T3	**CRT**
Taxonomic Richness	20	19	18	**25**	19	20	19	**23**	21	18	17	**26**	27	24	19	**31**
EPT Taxa	7	6	3	**7**	4	5	4	**5**	4	5	5	**5**	10	9	6	**11**
Ephemeroptera Taxa	3	2	1	**3**	1	1	1	**1**	1	1	1	**1**	4	3	2	**5**
Plecoptera Taxa	1	1	0	**1**	0	1	0	**1**	0	1	1	**1**	1	1	1	**1**
Trichoptera Taxa	3	3	2	**3**	3	3	3	**3**	3	3	3	**3**	5	5	3	**5**
EPT Index	39	27	7	**24**	30	35	14	**26**	19	26	41	**29**	34	24	10	**23**
Sensitive EPT Index	29	12	3	**15**	26	21	6	**18**	13	6	16	**11**	14	6	5	**8.5**
Shannon Diversity	2.1	2.3	2.1	**2.4**	2.0	2.2	2.2	**2.3**	2.1	2.2	2.4	**2.4**	2.9	2.5	2.0	**2.7**
Tolerance Value	4.5	5.1	6.0	**5.2**	4.6	4.6	5.8	**5.0**	5.0	5.3	4.6	**5.0**	5.4	5.2	5.7	**5.4**
Percent Intolerant Organisms	29	12	2.9	**15**	26	21	6.4	**18**	13	6.4	16	**12**	11	5.2	5.2	**7**
Percent Tolerant Organisms	5.0	14	29	**16**	8.0	2.4	27	**13**	2.4	6.0	6.6	**5**	20	4.9	7.2	**11**
Percent Hydropsychidae*	0.3	5.6	0.0	**2**	0.3	5.4	1.0	**2**	3.4	11	11	**9**	6.0	8.4	2.0	**5**
Percent Baetidae*	8.6	9.2	3.9	**7**	2.7	6.8	5.0	**5**	2.4	2.3	5.9	**4**	11	6.8	3.3	**7**
Percent Dominant Taxon	28	29	27	**19**	28	32	27	**28**	35	36	19	**21**	14	26	40	**17**
Percent Collectors*	36	54	72	**54**	53	44	66	**54**	58	23	37	**39**	26	37	65	**43**
Percent Filterers*	1	8	4	**4**	4	9	6	**6**	9	48	17	**25**	12	22	7	**14**
Percent Grazers*	14	11	7	**11**	5	10	7	**7**	4	10	15	**10**	16	11	2	**10**
Percent Predators	21	15	14	**16**	13	16	14	**14**	15	12	16	**14**	29	23	19	**24**
Percent Shredders*	28	12	4	**15**	26	21	7	**18**	14	7	16	**12**	15	7	8	**10**
Abundance* (X1000)	3.2	6.8	3.3	**13**	5.6	2.7	3.9	**12**	3.2	2.3	1.8	**7.3**	2.3	1.1	1.9	**5.3**

CRT: Cumulative reach total

* Denotes metrics not used in the ranking score

Table 19 Biological Cumulative total, mean and coefficient of variation values of biological metrics by reach for benthic macroinvertebrates metric values for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from Miller Creek in Spring 200

	Corte Madera Cr.			San Anselmo Cr.			San Anselmo Cr.			San Anselmo Cr.		
	CM-1			CM-2			CM-8a			CM-8b		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	27	17	9	25	17	10	28	18	6	30	19	9
EPT Taxa	6	3	33	5	4	16	6	4	43	9	5	40
Ephemeroptera Taxa	2	1	43	1	0	173	2	1	43	2	2	35
Plecoptera Taxa	0	0	-	0	0	-	2	1	100	2	1	87
Trichoptera Taxa	4	2	69	4	3	17	2	2	35	5	3	43
EPT Index	13	13	110	11	10	53	15	15	83	19	19	96
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	1	1	125	1	2	118	12	12	76	15	14	107
Shannon Diversity	2.3	2.0	17	2.2	2.0	14	2.0	1.9	17	2.0	1.8	12
Tolerance Value	5.5	5.5	6	5.7	5.6	7	4.9	4.9	5	4.7	4.7	14
Percent Intolerant Organisms	1	1	125	2	2	96	8	8	18	15	15	101
Percent Tolerant Organisms	22	22	50	13	11	78	4	4	52	2	2	28
Percent Hydropsychidae	0	0	-	1	1	34	0	0	-	0	0	-
Percent Baetidae	12	12	129	0.2	0.2	173	3	3	112	4	4	81
Percent Dominant Taxon	30	36	33	28	34	28	42	42	38	45	45	29
Percent Collectors	38	38	28	37	40	37	65	65	20	58	59	20
Percent Filterers	2	2	134	15	17	50	5	5	37	12	12	45
Percent Grazers	14	14	89	16	14	81	3	3	107	4	4	34
Percent Predators	44	44	36	30	27	36	14	14	17	10	10	23
Percent Shredders	1	1	132	1	2	118	12	12	76	16	15	102
Abundance												
(organisms per sample X 1000)	3.7	1.2	35	1.3	0.4	103	9.5	3.2	35	10	3.3	43
CRT: Cumulative Reach Total												

Table 20 **Dominant macroinvertebrate taxa and their percent contribution () by reach from samples collected September 1999 and April 2000 within the Novato Creek watershed.**

Reach	Dominant Taxa				
	1	2	3	4	5
NC1 F 99 Sp 00	*Hydropsyche sp.* 81 (27%) Orthocladiinae 203 (67%)	Tricorythodes 53 (18%) Oligochaeta 42 (14%)	*Baetis sp.* 41 (14%) Diphetor sp. 19 (6%)	Hydroptilidae 16 (5%) Tanytarsini 13 (4%)	Chironomini 13 (4%) Drunella sp. 4 (1%)
NC2 F 99 Sp 00	*Hydropsyche sp.* 92 (31%) Orthocladiinae 114 (38%)	Tricorythodes 26 (9%) Oligochaeta 68 (23%)	Orthocladiinae 26 (9%) *Baetis sp.* 38 (13%)	Hydroptilidae 19 (6%) Tanytarsini 25 (8%)	*Baetis sp.* 16 (5%) *Drunella sp.* 20 (7%)
NC3 F 99 Sp 00	- *Baetis sp.* 78 (26%)	- Orthocladiinae 51 (17%)	- Oligochaeta 51(17%)	- *Serratella sp 29 (10%)*	- Tanytarsini 20 (7%)
NC4 F 99 Sp 00	*Hydropsyche sp.* 68 (22%) *Baetis sp.* 121 (40%)	*Baetis sp.* 37 (12%) Orthocladiinae 33 (11%)	Orthocladiinae 33 (11%) Tanytarsini 20 (7%)	Planariidae 31 (10%) *Tanypodidae 18 (6%)*	Diphetor sp. 19 (6%) *Serratella sp 17 (6%)*
NC5 F 99 Sp 00	*Hydropsyche sp.* 66 22%) Orthocladiinae 65 (22%)	*Baetis sp.* 39 (13%) *Baetis sp.* 54 (18%)	*Amphinemura sp. 23 (8%)* *Simuliidae 45 (15%)*	Orthocladiinae 21 (7%) Oligochaeta 42 (14%)	Tanypodinae 18 (6%) Tanytarsini 26 (9%)
NC6 F 99 Sp 00	- Suwallia sp. 83 (28%))	- *Baetis sp.* 66 (22%)	- Orthocladiinae 58 (19%)	- Agapetus sp. 15 (5%))	- Tanytarsini 12 (4%)
NC7 F 99 Sp 00	- Oligochaeta 68 (23%)	- Tanypodinae 60 (20%)	- Orthocladiinae 40 (13%)	- Ameletus sp. 14 (5%)	- Simuliidae 13 (4%)
NC8 F 99 Sp 00	Orthocladiinae 49 (16%) Oligochaeta 91 (30%)	hyaletta azteca 47 (15%) Simuliidae 90 (30%)	*Baetis sp.* 32 (10%) Orthocladiinae 78 (26%)	*Hydropsyche sp.* 30 (10%) Tanytarsini 29 (10%)	Simuliidae 26 (9%) *Baetis sp.* 6 (2%)

Table 21. IBI scores by reach from samples collected September 1999 and April 2000 within the Novato Creek watershed.

Reach	IBI						
	taxa richness	% dominance	EPT taxa	Modified EPT	Shannon	Tolerance value	SCORE
NC1 F 99	(22) 1	(31) 3	(67) 1	(25) 3	(2.3) 3	(4.9) 1	12, poor
Sp 00	(10) 1	(67) 1	(4) 1	(2) 1	(1.1) 1	(5.4) 1	6, poor
NC2 F 99	(23) 1	(33) 3	(6) 1	(20) 3	(2.4) 3	(4.9) 1	12, fair
Sp 00	(16) 1	(38) 3	(6) 1	(9) 1	(1.8) 1	(5.4) 1	8, poor
NC3 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(20) 1	(30) 3	(9) 1	(17) 3	(2.2) 1	(5.1) 1	10, poor
NC4 F 99	(21) 1	(24) 3	(8) 1	(21) 3	(2.4) 3	(4.5) 3	14, fair
Sp 00	(23) 1	(41) 1	(10) 1	(14) 1	(2.1) 1	(4.9) 1	6, poor
NC5 F 99	(24) 1	(22) 3	(10) 1	(20) 3	(2.5) 3	(4.6) 3	14, fair
Sp 00	(22) 1	(24) 3	(9) 1	(7) 1	(2.2) 1	(5.5) 1	8, poor
NC6 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sp 00	(17) 1	(29) 3	(9) 1	(39) 3	(2.0) 1	(3.6) 3	12, fair
NC7 F 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sp 00	(13) 1	(39) 3	(4) 1	(6) 1	(1.7) 1	(5.7) 1	8,poor
NC8 F 99	(19) 1	(28) 3	(4) 1	(6) 1	(2.1) 1	(5.8) 1	8, poor
Sp 00	(10) 1	(39) 3	(2) 1	(0) 1	(1.4) 1	(6.3) 1	8, poor

Table 22. **Habitat assessment results for reaches within Novato, Sptember 1999 and April 2000. Numbers in parentheses are ranges of ranks.**
(see Table 1 for a description of habitat parameters and ranking criteria)

Ranked Habitat Parameter	NC1 F 99	NC1 SP00	NC2 F 99	NC2 SP00	NC3 F99	NC3 SP00	NC4 F99	NC4 SP00	NC5 F99	NC5 SP00	NC6 F99	NC6 SP00	NC7 F99	NC7 SP00	NC8 F99
1. Instream Cover (0 - 20)	12	12	8	12	dry	16	15	13	13	11		14		11	10
2. Embeddedness (0 - 20)	12	15	12	12		12	14	14	12	11		14		12	6
3. Velocity/Depth Regime (0 - 20)	15	15	9	12		16	17	15	15	13		15		14	8
4. Sediment Deposition (0 - 20)	16	12	11	12		10	13	13	12	9		14		15	12
5. Channel Flow (0 - 20)	7	10	7	10		9	7	8	5	6		6		6	6
6. Channel Alteration (0 - 20)	20	16	20	16		18	20	20	20	20		20		17	7
7. Riffle Frequency (0 - 20)	15	14	12	16		12	18	18	16	16		16		17	10
8. Bank Stability (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	9/9	14	8/8	15		12	9/8	12	6/5	10		18		14	8/8 (see comment)
9. Vegetative Protection (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	8/8	17	8/7	16		14	8/8	16	6/6	12		18		14	6/6
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (LB: 0 - 10/RB: 0-10)	6/8	14	8/7	14		14	10/10	18	9/10	18		20		9	3/3
Reach Total	145	139	125	135		133	157	147	135	126		155		129	93
condition	suboptimal	suboptimal	suboptimal	suboptimal		suboptimal	optimal	suboptimal	suboptimal	suboptimal		optimal		suboptimal	marginal
Vegetative Canopy Cover Estimate (%)	50	64	70	77		62	60	75	70	72		33		57	30

Ranked Habitat Parameter	NC1 F 99	NC1 SP00	NC2 F 99	NC2 SP00	NC3 F99	NC3 SP00	NC4 F99	NC4 SP00	NC5 F99	NC5 SP00	NC6 F99	NC6 SP00	NC7 F99	NC7 SP00	NC8 F99
Water Temperature (˚ F)	57	12	57	13		14	59	14	64	15		16		15	63
Specific Conductance (µS/cm at 25°C)	440	440	420	460		420	330	410	290	520		350		490	580
Comments	Storm drain upstream of riffle 6. Low flow in reach	sheen on water surface. petroleum smell. storm drain u/s r-2	Sinola Environmental Club was doing a stream clenup during our sampling. Low flow in reach	outfall between r-1 & 2		stormdrain u/s of t-3 & d/s t-2. fish in pool.	Mitten crab found in reach; overall good quality reach except for low flow conditions		Low flow in reach	overall poor riffle habitat		SF garter snake on path		stormdrain u/s r-8	Substrate mostly hardpan clay; banks stabilized w/ concrete bags

Table 23. **Cumulative total, mean and coefificient of varaition values of biological metrics by each for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from the Novato Creek Watershed in Fall 1999, Marin County.**

	Novato Creek			Novato Creek			Novato Creek			Novato Creek			Warner Creek		
	NC1			NC2			NC4			NC5			NC8		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	28	22	1	27	23	1	27	21	3	34	24	4	26	19	2
EPT Taxa	7	6	1	7	6	1	9	8	1	12	10	2	7	4	1
Ephemeroptera Taxa	3	3	0	3	3	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	3	2	1
Plecoptera Taxa	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Trichoptera Taxa	3	3	1	3	3	0	4	3	1	7	5	2	4	2	2
EPT Index	67	67	6	57	57	12	61	61	13	58	58	20	26	26	23
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	1	1	1	5	5	2	7	7	5	10	10	3	0	0	0
Shannon Diversity	2.4	2.3	0.1	2.5	2.4	0.3	2.6	2.4	0.2	2.7	2.5	0.3	2.6	2.1	0.3
Tolerance Value	4.9	4.9	0.2	4.9	4.9	0.3	4.5	4.5	0.2	4.6	4.6	0.4	5.8	5.8	0.6
Percent Intolerant Organisms	1	1	1	5	5	2	8	8	6	12	12	3	0	0	1
Percent Tolerant Organisms	5	5	1	9	9	5	1	1	1	7	7	11	24	24	19
Percent Hydropsychidae	27	27	8	31	31	16	22	22	2	22	22	7	10	10	8
Percent Baetidae	15	15	5	6	6	4	17	18	16	16	16	11	10	10	14
Percent Dominant Taxon	27	31	4	31	33	12	22	24	1	22	22	7	16	28	13
Percent Collectors	32	32	9	27	27	16	25	25	4	23	23	14	46	46	26
Percent Filterers	30	30	9	34	34	17	28	28	4	28	28	7	22	22	16

Percent Grazers			25	25	3		21	21	9		19	19	11		18	18	10		13	13	14
Percent Predators			10	10	4		11	11	7		16	16	4		19	19	7		19	19	16
Percent Shredders			3	3	1		6	6	3		13	13	1		12	12	4		0	0	0
Abundance (organisms per sample X 1000)				2.6	0.5			2.0	0.7			3.4	0.9			3.1	0.8			2.7	1.4

*Novato Creek site NC4; organisms archived for use by citizen monitors
CRT: Cumulative Reach Total
CV: Coefficient of Variation

Table 24. **Cumulative total, mean and coefificient of varaition values of biological metrics by each for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from the Novato Creek Watershed in Spring 2000, Marin County.**

	Novato Creek NC1			Novato Creek NC2			Novato Creek NC3			Novato Creek NC4			Novato Creek NC5		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	13	10	10	23	16	13	27	20	0	31	23	13	29	22	12
EPT Taxa	5	4	16	9	6	24	14	10	12	13	10	10	12	9	24
Ephemeroptera Taxa	5	4	16	6	5	25	8	6	9	7	6	9	4	4	16
Plecoptera Taxa	0	0		1	1	87	1	1	0	2	2	35	4	3	43
Trichoptera Taxa	0	0		2	1	100	5	2	65	4	2	50	4	2	25
EPT Index	9	9	47	22	22	10	45	45	12	60	60	18	27	27	9
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	2	2	52	9	9	20	15	15	58	11	11	27	6	6	6
Shannon Diversity	1.2	1.1	29	1.9	1.8	1	2.3	2.2	5	2.3	2.1	19	2.3	2.2	3
Tolerance Value	5.4	5.4	5	5.4	5.4	7	5.1	5.1	12	4.8	4.8	1	5.5	5.5	4
Percent Intolerant Organisms	2	2	52	9	9	20	14	14	55	12	12	28	5	5	27
Percent Tolerant Organisms	14	14	66	23	23	46	17	17	76	4	4	77	15	15	45
Percent Hydropsychidae	0	0		0	0		0	0		1	1	101	0	0	
Percent Baetidae	7	7	45	13	13	13	28	28	32	45	45	34	20	20	10
Percent Dominant Taxon	67	67	19	38	38	20	26	30	25	41	41	46	22	24	5
Percent Collectors	82	82	9	63	63	3	46	46	23	25	25	32	39	39	22
Percent Filterers	9	9	44	11	11	9	11	11	39	11	11	14	28	28	20
Percent Grazers	8	8	42	20	20	6	33	32	26	46	46	37	21	21	12
Percent Predators	1	1	50	5	5	36	8	8	9	12	12	69	9	9	7
Percent Shredders	0	0		0	0		2	2	101	5	5	72	3	3	48
Abundance															
(organisms per sample X 1000)		1.8	53		0.42	43		1.9	54		0.8	39		1.8	34

Table 24. (Cont.) **Cumulative total, mean and coefificient of varaition values of biological metrics by each for benthic macroinvertebrates sampled from the Novato Creek Watershed in Spring 2000, Marin County.**

	Novato Creek			Warner Creek			Warner Creek		
	NC6			NC7			NC8		
	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV	CRT	Mean	CV
Taxonomic Richness	30	19	15	21	14	16	15	10	22
EPT Taxa	15	11	20	7	4	42	3	2	69
Ephemeroptera Taxa	5	4	0	3	2	50	2	1	43
Plecoptera Taxa	4	3	33	2	1	100	0	0	
Trichoptera Taxa	5	3	78	2	1	87	1	0	173
EPT Index	63	63	7	8	8	21	2	2	1
Sensitive EPT Index (TV<4)	39	39	11	6	6	55	0	0	
Shannon Diversity	2.1	2.1	5	1.7	1.7	1	1.5	1.4	4
Tolerance Value	3.5	3.5	4	5.7	5.7	2	6.3	6.3	3
Percent Intolerant Organisms	39	39	11	6	6	56	0	0	
Percent Tolerant Organisms	1	1	125	23	23	24	30	30	34
Percent Hydropsychidae	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Percent Baetidae	22	22	11	2	2	112	2	2	40
Percent Dominant Taxon	28	29	20	39	39	10	30	39	4
Percent Collectors	21	21	8	62	62	6	57	57	22
Percent Filterers	13	13	24	24	24	17	39	40	32
Percent Grazers	30	30	13	7	7	18	2	2	1
Percent Predators	36	36	22	6	6	29	2	2	33
Percent Shredders	1	1		0	0		0	0	

Abundance														
(organisms per sample X 1000)					1.9	24			3.4	21			8.2	40

Table 25. Overview of Physical/habitat scores, elevations, and selected metrics for Marin County watersheds.

ARROYO CORTE MADERA CREEK WATERSHED - SPRING 00					
SITE	**ELEVATION**	**Phys/Hab.**	**IBI**	**Cum. TAXA**	**EPT**
ACM3	353 ft	156	18	37	20
ACM5	172 ft	153	14	34	15
ACM4	93 ft	136	7	28	13
ACM2		114	12	37	16
ACM1	26 ft	118	6	15	4
CORTE MADERA CREEK WATERSHED - SPRING 00					
CM3b	325 ft	163	18	45	23
CM10	303	164	20	37	23
CM3	~ 275 ft	161	8	32	10
CM7b	~ 253 ft	145	12	27	14
CM7	247 ft	121	6	24	11
CM9	132 ft	144	16	31	18
CM8	97 ft	121	14	35	15
CM6	96 ft	111	6	13	3
CM5	63 ft	138	6	18	3
CM2	63 ft	100		23	11
CM4	60 ft	124	6	32	14
CM1	19 ft	116	6	17	2
MILLER CREEK WATERSHED - SPRING 00					
MC6	~220 ft	126	14	32	18
MC5	200 ft	141	10	26	12
MC4	134 ft	166	12	26	16
MC3	62 ft	139	6	20	9
MC2	38 ft	145	6	14	4
MC1	22 ft	139	6	15	4

NOVATO CREEK WATERSHED - SPRING 00					
NC6	186 ft	155	12	30	15
NC5	122 ft	126	8	29	12
NC7	101 ft	129	8	21	7
NC4	76 ft	147	6	31	13
NC3	73 ft	133	10	27	14
NC8	44 ft		8	15	3
NC2	43 ft	135	8	23	9
NC1	25 ft	139	6	13	5



Figure 2. Relationship between cumulative Taxa Richness and elevation for all sites sampled in the four Marin County watersheds sampled during fall 1999 and spring 2000.



Figure 3. Relationship between cumulative EPT Taxa and elevation for all sites sampled in the four Marin County watersheds sampled during fall 1999 and spring 2000.



Figure 4. Relationship between Index of Biological Integrity (IBI) and elevation for all sites sampled in the four Marin County watersheds sampled during fall 1999 and spring 2000.



Figure 5. Relationship between cumulative Physical/Habitat Quality and elevation for all sites sampled in the four Marin County watersheds sampled during fall 1999 and spring 2000.