

**A Study of Agricultural Drainage in the Puget Sound Lowlands
to Determine Practices which Minimize Detrimental
Effects on Salmonids:**

Final Report

Prepared by:

Washington State University¹ and the University of Washington²

¹ Center for Sustainable Agriculture, WSU, Puyallup, WA

¹ State of Washington Water Research Center, WSU, Pullman, WA

¹ Biological Systems Engineering, WSU, Pullman, WA

¹ Natural Resource Sciences, WSU, Pullman, WA

¹ Statistic, WSU, Pullman, WA

² Center for Horticulture, UW, Seattle, WA

for

**King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
Water and Land Resources Division
201 S. Jackson Street
Suite 600
Seattle, Washington 98104**

September 5, 2008

Acknowledgements

This report is a compilation of a five and a half year study conducted by numerous researchers from Washington State University and the University of Washington. The study was awarded to the WSU Center for Sustainable Agriculture and managed through the State of Washington Water Research Center. Numerous authors contributed to the sections contained in this report. In recognition of this effort, a brief summary acknowledging their contributions is provided below.

Section	Task No.	Authors	Senior Investigators
Chapter 2	1	Tom Cichosz	Michael Barber
Chapter 3	2	Tom Cichosz	Michael Barber
Chapter 4	3	Tom Cichosz	Michael Barber
Chapter 5	4	Tom Cichosz	Michael Barber
Chapter 6	5	Elizabeth Milburn	Michael Barber
Chapter 7	6	Mark Stone	Michael Barber
Chapter 8	7	Tom Cichosz Dana Catts	Michael Barber
Chapter 9	8	Dawn Shepard	Shulin Chen Jim Dobrowolski
Chapter 10	9	Lizbeth Seebacher	Sarah Reichard
Chapter 11	10	Bingchen Zhoa Yuzhou Luo	Shulin Chen
Chapter 12	11	Bingchen Zhoa Yuzhou Luo	Shulin Chen
Chapter 13	12	Elizabeth Milburn	Michael Barber

In addition, numerous others contributed along the way including Craig Rabe, Anne Davidson, Brad Goalach, Darrin Saul, Chris Feise, and Hao Zhang. Thanks also to Barry Green for reviewing the final version of the document.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xiv
Executive Summary	xxi
1.1 Introduction to Study	1-1
1.2 Overview of Study Goals.....	1-4
1.3 Project Data Files.....	1-7
1.4 References.....	1-8
2.1 Introduction to Salmonid Density Hypothesis (Goal 1)	2-1
2.2 Study Area	2-3
2.3 Methods	2-13
2.3.1 Site Selection	2-13
2.3.2 Fish Collection.....	2-13
2.3.3 Fish Biology.....	2-14
2.3.4 Data Analysis	2-15
2.4 Results.....	2-17
2.4.1 Species Characterizations	2-17
2.4.2 Age and Growth of Key Salmonids.....	2-23
2.4.2.1 Coho Salmon	2-23
2.4.2.2 Chinook Salmon	2-25
2.4.3 Temporal, Spatial, and Habitat Distribution of Key Salmonids.....	2-28
2.4.3.1 General Characterization	2-28
2.4.3.2 Statistical Characterization	2-30
2.5 Discussion.....	2-39
2.5.1 Life History Characteristics	2-39
2.5.2 Temporal, Spatial, Habitat and Flow Distribution of Key Salmonids.....	2-41
2.5.2.1 Temporal.....	2-43
2.5.2.2 Spatial	2-44
2.5.2.3 Habitat Characteristics.....	2-45
2.5.2.4 Flow Characteristics	2-46
2.6 Conclusions and Recommendations	2-47
2.7 References.....	2-49
3.1 Introduction to Abundance Index Development (Goal 2)	3-1
3.2 Study Area	3-2
3.3 Methods	3-8
3.3.1 Data Collection	3-8
3.3.1.1 Late Summer 2004 and Winter 2005.....	3-9
3.3.1.2 Late Summer 2005.....	3-10
3.3.2 Data Analysis	3-10
3.4 Results.....	3-12

3.5	Discussion.....	3-18
3.6	Conclusions and Recommendations	3-22
3.7	References.....	3-23
4.1	Introduction to Safe ‘Defishing’ Method(s) (Goal 3).....	4-1
4.2	Methods	4-2
	4.2.1 Site Selection	4-2
	4.2.2 Fish Collection and Processing.....	4-3
	4.2.3 Data Analysis.....	4-4
4.3	Results.....	4-6
	4.3.1 Preliminary Analyses.....	4-6
	4.3.2 Sampling Efficiency	4-8
	4.3.3 Sampling Mortality.....	4-13
4.4	Discussion.....	4-16
	4.4.1 Sampling Efficiency	4-16
	4.4.2 Sampling Mortality or ‘Safety’	4-19
4.5	Conclusions and Recommendations	4-21
4.6	References.....	4-22
5.1	Introduction to Woody Debris Use by Salmonids (Goal 4)	5-1
5.2	Study Area	5-2
5.3	Methods	5-4
	5.3.1 Site Selection	5-4
	5.3.2 Data Collection	5-4
	5.3.3 Data Analysis.....	5-5
5.4	Results.....	5-6
5.5	Discussion.....	5-9
5.6	Conclusions and Recommendations	5-12
5.7	References.....	5-13
6.1	Introduction to Dissolved Oxygen Levels in Agricultural and non-agricultural Waterways (Goal 5).....	6-1
6.2	Physical System	6-2
	6.2.1 Overview.....	6-2
	6.2.2 Dissolved Oxygen.....	6-4
	6.2.3 SOD	6-6
6.3	Methods.....	6-8
	6.3.1 Dissolved Oxygen (DO) Data Collection	6-8
	6.3.2 Sediment Oxygen Demand (SOD) Data Collection	6-9
6.4	Data Analysis	6-11
	6.4.1 Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	6-11
	6.4.1.1 Model Description	6-11
	6.4.1.2 Dissolved Oxygen Equations.....	6-12
	6.4.1.3 Calibration Method.....	6-13
	6.4.2 Sediment Oxygen Demand (SOD)	6-17
	6.4.2.1 Lab set-up	6-17

6.4.2.2 Key Equations	6-18
6.5 Results	6-20
6.5.1 DO Monitoring	6-20
6.5.2 Model Calibration Results	6-24
6.5.3 Sediment Oxygen Demand (SOD)	6-27
6.6 Discussion/Conclusions	6-32
6.6.1 SOD Accuracy	6-32
6.6.2 SOD Results.....	6-32
6.6.3 Case Study	6-33
6.6.4 DO Results.....	6-34
6.6.5 Final Recommendation.....	6-35
6.7 References.....	6-37
7.1 Introduction to Hydraulic Diversity Study (Goal 6).....	7-1
7.2 Study Background.....	7-2
7.2.1 Problem Description	7-2
7.2.2 Large Woody Debris.....	7-2
7.2.3 Hydraulic Diversity.....	7-3
7.2.4 Objective.....	7-4
7.3 Methods	7-4
7.3.1 Field Observations	7-4
7.3.2 Numerical Modeling.....	7-5
7.4 Results.....	7-12
7.4.1 Field Observations	7-12
7.4.2 Numerical Simulation Results	7-18
7.5 Discussion and Recommendations	7-22
7.6 References.....	7-25
8.1 Introduction to Vegetative Regime Impacts (Goal 7).....	8-1
8.2 Methods	8-3
8.2.1 Site Selection	8-3
8.2.2 Fish Collection and Processing.....	8-3
8.2.3 Macroinvertebrate Collection and Processing.....	8-3
8.2.4 Data Analysis.....	8-5
8.2.4.1 Fish Condition Data.....	8-5
8.2.4.2 Macroinvertebrate and Fish Stomach Data.....	8-6
8.3 Results.....	8-7
8.3.1 Fish Condition	8-7
8.3.1.1 Coho Salmon	8-9
8.3.1.2 Chinook Salmon	8-11
8.3.2 Macroinvertebrates	8-13
8.3.2.1 2003 Macroinvertebrate Collections.....	8-13
8.3.2.2 2004 Macroinvertebrate Collections.....	8-15
8.3.3 Salmonid Diet Evaluation.....	8-16
8.4 Discussion.....	8-21
8.5 Conclusions and Recommendations	8-25

8.6	References.....	8-28
9.1	Introduction to Water Temperature Prediction (Goal 8)	9-1
	9.1.1 Goals and Objectives	9-2
9.2	Study Background.....	9-4
	9.2.1 Literature Review	9-4
	9.2.2 Stream Temperature Models.....	9-7
	9.2.2.1 TEMP86.....	9-7
	9.2.2.2 HSPF and the Model SHADE	9-7
	9.2.2.3 Heat Source.....	9-9
	9.2.2.4 SSTEMP	9-9
	9.2.2.5 QUAL2E.....	9-10
	9.2.3 Environmental Factors Driving Stream Temperature.....	9-10
	9.2.4 Review of the Selected Water Temperature Model: Heat Source	9-11
	9.2.4.1 Rationale for Heat Source Selection.....	9-11
	9.2.4.2 Short Wave Solar Radiation	9-15
	9.2.4.3 Long Wave (Thermal)	9-18
	9.2.4.4 Stream Bed Conduction.....	9-20
	9.2.4.5 Flow Model.....	9-20
9.3	Study Area	9-22
9.4	Methods	9-23
	9.4.1 Site Selection and Field Data Collection	9-23
	9.4.2 Field Data Limitations	9-28
	9.4.3 Adaptations to the Model Heat Source.....	9-28
	9.4.3.1 General Model Modifications.....	9-28
	9.4.3.2 Short Wave Solar Radiation	9-30
	9.4.3.3 Long Wave (Thermal)	9-33
	9.4.3.4 Stream Bed Conduction.....	9-35
	9.4.3.5 Flow Model.....	9-37
9.5	Results.....	9-38
	9.5.1 Model Validation	9-38
	9.5.2 Sensitivity Analysis of Major Design and Management Parameters	9-42
	9.5.2.1 Flow Depth	9-46
	9.5.2.2 Effective Shade.....	9-46
	9.5.2.3 Channel Incision	9-47
	9.5.2.4 Bottom Width	9-48
	9.5.2.5 Air Temperature.....	9-49
	9.5.2.6 Sediment Depth	9-50
	9.5.2.7 Impact of Channel Morphology on Effective Shade	9-51
	9.5.2.8 Effective Shade from Vegetation.....	9-54
	9.5.2.9 Air Temperature and Sediment Sensitivity.....	9-55
	9.5.2.10 Incision Depth.....	9-55
	9.5.2.11 Sensitivity Analysis Discussion.....	9-55
	9.5.3 Management Scenarios.....	9-55
	9.5.3.1 Management Scenario 1	9-56
	9.5.3.2 Management Scenario 2	9-56

9.5.3.3 Management Scenario 3	9-57
9.5.3.4 Management Scenario 4	9-57
9.5.3.5 Management Scenario 5	9-57
9.6 Conclusions and Recommendations	9-58
9.7 References.....	9-61
10.1 Introduction to RCG Control and Restoration (Goal 9)	10-1
10.2 Study Background.....	10-2
10.2.1 Reed Canarygrass Biology and History.....	10-2
10.2.2 Objectives	10-5
10.3 Pilot Project.....	10-6
10.3.1 Pilot Project Rationale	10-6
10.3.2 Pilot Project Methodology	10-7
10.3.3 Conclusions from Pilot Project.....	10-11
10.4 Principal Project.....	10-12
10.4.1 Principal Project Rationale	10-12
10.4.2 Principal Project Methodology	10-13
10.5 Competition Experiment Objectives.....	10-17
10.5.1 Rationale for Competition Experiment.....	10-17
10.5.2 Experimental Design of Competition Study.....	10-18
10.5.3 Treatments	10-19
10.6 Phalaris arundinacea Carbohydrate Reserves Objectives	10-21
10.6.1 Introduction.....	10-21
10.6.2 Phalaris arundinacea carbohydrate storage.....	10-21
10.6.3 Carbohydrate reserve methods.....	10-22
10.7 Project Results	10-23
10.7.1 Field Project.....	10-23
10.7.2 Allelopathy Test Results.....	10-32
10.7.3 Competition Experiment Results	10-34
10.7.4 Carbohydrate reserve project results.....	10-37
10.8 Discussion and Recommendations	10-40
10.8.1 Field Experiment.....	10-40
10.8.2 Competition Experiment.....	10-42
10.8.3 Carbohydrate depletion experiment.....	10-44
10.8.4 Overall recommendations	10-46
10.8 References.....	10-49
11.1 Introduction to Sediment Mobilization (Goal 10)	11-1
11.2 Study Area	11-3
11.3 Methods	11-5
11.3.1 Measurement of sediment.....	11-5
11.3.2 Erosion control treatments	11-7
11.3.2.1 Experimental design at the site of Watercress Creek	11-7
11.3.2.2 Experimental design at the Ray Ewing site	11-9
11.3.2.3 Experimental design at the site of 124 th Street	11-11
11.4 Results.....	11-13

11.5	Conclusions.....	11-15
11.6	References.....	11-19
12.1	Introduction to Extended Maintenance Cycles (Goal 11)	12-1
12.2	Methods	12-2
	12.2.1 Test Procedures.....	12-2
	12.2.2 Erosion Control Treatments.....	12-4
	12.2.3 Experimental Sites	12-6
	12.2.3.1 Experimental design at the site of Watercress Creek	12-10
	12.2.3.2 Experimental design at the Ray Ewing site	12-11
	12.2.3.3 Experimental design at the 124th Street site.....	12-13
12.3	Results.....	12-15
12.4	Conclusion	12-23
12.5	References.....	12-24
13.1	Introduction to Characteristic Indicators of Improved Drainage after Excavation (Goal 12).....	13-1
13.2	Summary of Relevant Research.....	13-2
13.3	Methods	13-4
	13.3.1 Site Selection	13-4
	13.3.2 Field Measurements	13-11
	13.3.3 Observations	13-11
	13.3.4 Numerical Analysis.....	13-11
13.4	Results.....	13-13
	13.4.1 Surveying	13-13
	13.4.1.1 Big Spring Creek	13-13
	13.4.1.2 Mullen Slough	13-14
	13.4.2 Flow Data.....	13-17
	13.4.2.1 Big Spring Creek	13-17
	13.4.2.2 Mullen Slough	13-17
	13.4.3 HEC-RAS Analysis	13-18
	13.4.4 Anecdotal Observations.....	13-19
13.5	Discussion.....	13-20
13.6	Conclusions and Recommendations	13-22
13.7	References.....	13-24
14.1	Final Recommendations.....	14-1

Appendices:

Appendix 2-A: Coho salmon seasonal length frequency graphs	2-53
Appendix 2-B: Chinook salmon seasonal length frequency graphs	2-60
Appendix 3-A: Salmonid density, catch and CPUE data by site and sampling event	3-24
Appendix 3-B: Comparative regression plots of salmonid density and CPUE.	3-27
Appendix 4-A: Locator maps of sampling sites.....	4-24
Appendix 4-B: Salmonid density, catch and CPUE data by site and sampling event.	4-35
Appendix 6-A: SOD Sampling Site Maps.	6-39
Appendix 6-B: DOE Water Quality Standards.	6-42
Appendix 7-A: Survey data.....	7-29
Appendix 7-B: HEC-RAS simulation.....	7-32
Appendix 7-C: Turbulence data.....	7-33
Appendix 8-A: Locator maps of sampling sites.....	8-32
Appendix 8-B: Macroinvertebrate data from 2004 collections.	8-42
Appendix 8-C: Summary of seasonal fish collections between October, 2002 and April, 2006.	8-53
Appendix 9-A: List of variables.....	9-67
Appendix 10-A: Pilot and principal Quigley project layouts.....	10-54
Appendix 10-B: Principal Calhoon project layout.....	10-55
Appendix 10-C: Principal Olney project layout	10-56

List of Tables

Table 1-1.	Scope of Work as defined by contract	1-5
Table 2-1.	Factor levels evaluated for their influence on salmonid catch rates using ANOVA.....	2-16
Table 2-2.	Summary of fish and other taxa collected by electrofishing during 2002-2006 quarterly monitoring surveys of agricultural watercourses within King County APDs	2-18
Table 2-3.	Summary of seasonal fish collections between October, 2002 and April, 2006. Shading represents that sampling occurred; ‘X’ indicate salmonids were collected; ‘x’ indicates that only non-salmonid fishes were collected.....	2-19
Table 2-4.	Seasonal summary of electrofishing effort and salmonid catch	2-21
Table 2-5.	Numbers of coho salmon collected by age and season from agricultural waterways in King County.....	2-23
Table 2-6.	Seasonal, age specific average length of various cohorts of coho salmon collected from agricultural waterways within King County.....	2-24
Table 2-7.	Seasonal, age specific weekly instantaneous growth rates of various cohorts of coho salmon collected from agricultural waterways within King County.	2-25
Table 2-8.	Numbers of Chinook salmon collected, by age and season, from agricultural waterways in King County.....	2-26
Table 2-9.	Seasonal, age specific average length of various cohorts of Chinook salmon collected from agricultural waterways within King County.....	2-26
Table 2-10.	Seasonal, age specific estimates of weekly instantaneous growth rates of various cohorts of Chinook salmon collected from agricultural waterways within King County.....	2-27
Table 2-11.	Summary of habitat and flow conditions in which various juvenile life stages of Chinook and coho salmon were observed in quarterly monitoring surveys.	2-29
Table 2-12.	ANOVA results for evaluations related to combined salmonid catch.	2-35
Table 2-13.	Summary of significant ($p \leq 0.10$) Tukey Kramer post-hoc evaluations for factors significant in describing catch rates of all salmonids and coho salmon.	2-36
Table 2-14.	ANOVA results for evaluations related to coho salmon.	2-36
Table 2-15.	ANOVA results for evaluations related to Chinook salmon.	2-38
Table 2-16.	Comparison of findings from Chi-square and ANOVA analysis for coho salmon, Chinook salmon, and all salmonids combined.....	2-42
Table 3-1.	Characterization of timing and location of sampling efficiency and bias surveys (shaded blocks). Salmonid species collected are listed; Bold print indicates that estimation of a population size was possible for a given species	3-13
Table 3-2.	Salmonid population, density, catch and CPUE data summary for sampled sites where population estimates were feasible during August, 2004 surveys	3-14

Table 3-3.	Salmonid population, density, catch and CPUE data summary for sampled sites where population estimates were feasible during January, 2005 surveys	3-15
Table 3-4.	Salmonid population, density, catch and CPUE data summary for sampled sites where population estimates were feasible during September, 2005 surveys	3-16
Table 3-5.	Summary of regression parameters relating electrofishing CPUE and salmonid density across various combinations of vegetative habitats.....	3-18
Table 4-1.	Characterization of timing and location of sampling efficiency and bias surveys (shaded blocks). Salmonid species collected are listed; Bold print indicates that estimation of a population size was possible for a given species.	4-8
Table 4-2.	Summary of salmonid population, catch, mortality, and sampling efficiency for sampled sites where population estimates were feasible during August, 2004.....	4-9
Table 4-3.	Summary of salmonid population, catch, mortality, and sampling efficiency for sampled sites where population estimates were feasible during September, 2005	4-11
Table 4-4.	ANOVA results for evaluations of differences in sampling efficiency by sampling technique, habitat type, or the interaction of those factors.....	4-12
Table 4-5.	Least square summary statistics for, and results of pairwise comparisons between, sampling efficiency at various factor levels.	4-12
Table 4-6.	ANOVA results for evaluations of differences in sampling mortality by sampling technique, habitat type, or the interaction of those factors.....	4-14
Table 4-7.	Least square summary statistics for, and results of pairwise comparisons between, sampling mortality at various factor levels.....	4-15
Table 4-8.	Estimated percent of fish removed following a given number of sampling events at representative sampling efficiencies. Bold and shaded cells indicate when fish removal of 75 or 90 percent, respectively, would be achieved.	4-17
Table 5-1.	Summary of salmonid catch and CPUE for study reaches with and without LWD installed.	5-6
Table 5-2.	Results of paired T-tests performed to evaluate differences in catch rates of salmonid species between sub-reaches with and without LWD installed.....	5-9
Table 6-1.	Duvall Sampling Sites.....	6-5
Table 6-2.	Mullen Slough Sampling Sites.....	6-6
Table 6-3.	Upstream boundary conditions used in pre-dredged calibrated QUAL2Kw model.....	6-15
Table 6-4.	Measured target data for pre-dredged QUAL2Kw model	6-15
Table 6-5.	Upstream boundary conditions used in post-dredged calibrated QUAL2Kw model.....	6-16
Table 6-6.	Measured target data for post-dredged QUAL2Kw model.....	6-16

Table 6-7.	Calibration fitness outputs from using the root mean squared error method for temperature and DO QUAL2Kw predicted values vs. known inputs with changes in reaeration and SOD input values of ± 10 and 50 %, respectively.....	6-26
Table 6-8.	Average moisture content of sediment cores taken from four sites	6-28
Table 6-9.	Summary of lab measurement results for four sites with two sets of duplicates each run two to four times.	6-31
Table 8-1.	Seasonal summary of electrofishing effort and salmonid catch	8-8
Table 8-2.	Weight-length relationship parameters for coho salmon >2.0 grams in weight collected from agricultural watercourses in King County by season and vegetative regime.	8-9
Table 8-3.	Comparison of relative condition (Kn) summary statistics for coho salmon collected from various vegetative habitat regimes in King County's agricultural waterways.	8-10
Table 8-4.	Weight-length relationship parameters for Chinook salmon >2.0 grams in weight collected from agricultural watercourses in King County by season and vegetative regime.	8-12
Table 8-5.	Comparison of relative condition (Kn) summary statistics for Chinook salmon collected from various vegetative habitat regimes in King County's agricultural waterways.	8-12
Table 8-6.	Macroinvertebrates collected from a channel dominated by RCG habitat during summer, 2003.	8-13
Table 8-7.	Macroinvertebrates collected from channel dominated by mixed vegetation during summer, 2003.	8-14
Table 8-8.	Macroinvertebrates collected from a channel dominated by natural vegetation during summer, 2003.....	8-15
Table 8-9.	B-IBI metrics scores for benthic macroinvertebrate samples taken from three vegetative regimes in July 2004.....	8-17
Table 8-10.	B-IBI values for benthic macroinvertebrate samples taken from three vegetative regimes in July 2004.....	8-17
Table 8-11.	Diet composition observed for salmonids collected from within a natural vegetative regime during July, 2003.	8-19
Table 8-12.	Diet composition observed for salmonids collected from natural and mixed vegetative regimes during July, 2004.	8-20
Table 8-13.	Summary of relative benefit of vegetative regime to salmonid food base (macroinvertebrates), relative condition (Kn), and growth pattern.....	8-22
Table 9-1.	Baseline 1 parameters for sensitivity analysis	9-43
Table 9-2.	Sensitivity coefficients for Baseline 1 modified Heat Source	9-44
Table 9-3.	Baseline 1 Sensitivity Analysis Results Modified Heat Source.....	9-45
Table 9-4.	Sensitivity analysis input parameters for Baseline 2 modified Heat Source	9-52
Table 9-5.	Sensitivity analysis results for Baseline scenario 2.....	9-53
Table 9-6.	Sensitivity coefficients for Baseline 2 sensitivity analysis results modified Heat Source model	9-54
Table 9-7.	Management scenario results	9-56
Table 9-8.	Stream buffer widths suggested by Oregon	9-60

Table 10-1. Treatment design	10-10
Table 10-2. Planting schedule for the treatment plots	10-10
Table 10-3. Competition under various nutrient and soil moisture regimes	10-20
Table 10-4. Two-way ANOVA results	10-25
Table 10-5. Post-hoc multiple comparison results	10-26
Table 10-6. Cost of the recommended treatments for one mile of watercourse.....	10-48
Table 11-1. Experimental design for testing soil erosion resulting after excavation	11-3
Table 11-2. Data sheet for measurements of the sediment after excavation at Watercress ...	11-14
Table 11-3. Cost evaluation for various treatment practices in this study	11-15
Table 12-1. Parameters and combinations of experimental design for erosion control	12-5
Table 12-2. Cumulative sediment at the Watercress Creek site, starting from August 2004.....	12-15
Table 12-3. Cumulative sediment at the site of Ray Ewing property, starting from October 2004.....	12-18
Table 12-4. Sediment measurements at the 124 th Street site in Duvall from August 2004 to August 2005 (Measurements taken from the South to the North)	12-20
Table 13-1. Results summary for Manning's n and energy grade slopes	13-18

List of Figures

Figure 1-1.	Locator map for Agricultural Productions Districts (APDs) within King County	1-3
Figure 2-1.	Agricultural Production Districts and incorporated areas within King County	2-4
Figure 2-2.	Overview of study sites and sampling locations in the North Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	2-5
Figure 2-3.	Detail of study sites and sampling locations in the northern portions of the North Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	2-6
Figure 2-4.	Detail of study sites and sampling locations in the central portions of the North Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	2-7
Figure 2-5.	Detail of study sites and sampling locations in the southern portions of the North Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	2-8
Figure 2-6.	Detail of study sites and sampling locations in the South Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	2-9
Figure 2-7.	Overview of study sites and sampling locations in the Enumclaw Agricultural Production District.....	2-10
Figure 2-8.	Detail of study sites and sampling locations in the Enumclaw Agricultural Production District.....	2-21
Figure 2-9.	Study sites and sampling locations in the Lower Green Agricultural Production District.....	2-12
Figure 2-10.	Seasonal CPUE of commonly collected salmonid species.....	2-22
Figure 2-11.	Comparison of seasonal weighted average length and inter-seasonal weekly instantaneous growth rates of coho salmon collected from agricultural waterways within King County.....	2-24
Figure 2-12.	Comparison of seasonal weighted average length and inter-seasonal weekly instantaneous growth rates of juvenile Chinook salmon collected from agricultural waterways within King County.....	2-27
Figure 2-13.	Count of total salmonid zero and non-zero catch observations by season, distance, habitat, and flow type	2-31
Figure 2-14.	Count of coho salmon zero and non-zero catch observations by season, distance, habitat, and flow type	2-32
Figure 2-15.	Count of Chinook salmon zero and non-zero catch observations by season, distance, habitat, and flow type	2-34
Figure 2-16	Depiction of mean non-zero CPUE for combined salmonids, coho salmon and Chinook salmon across seasons, distance classes, vegetative habitats and flow classes. Error bars are \pm one standard deviation	2-37
Figure 3-1.	Locator map for Agricultural Production Districts within King County	3-3
Figure 3-2.	Locator of study sights and sampling locations in the northern portions of the North Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	3-4
Figure 3-3.	Detail of study sites and sampling locations in the northern portions of the North Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	3-5

Figure 3-4.	Detail of study sites and sampling locations in the central portions of the North Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	3-6
Figure 3-5.	Detail of study sites and sampling locations in the southern portions of the North Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District.....	3-7
Figure 3-6.	Observed relationship between electrofishing (shocking) CPUE and estimated salmonid density in agricultural waterways.....	3-17
Figure 3-7.	Observed relationship between trap CPUE and estimated salmonid density in agricultural waterways.....	3-17
Figure 4-1.	Mean sampling efficiency by habitat and sampling method; Error bars are \pm one standard deviation.....	4-7
Figure 4-2.	Mean sampling mortality by habitat and sampling method; Error bars are \pm one standard deviation.....	4-7
Figure 5-1.	Schematic of study site used to assess salmonid preference of LWD.....	5-3
Figure 5-2.	Comparison of CPUE of Chinook (top), coho (middle and all salmonids (bottom) captured from comparable reaches with and without LWD installed.....	5-7
Figure 6-1.	Mullen Slough study site location in Lower Green APD.....	6-3
Figure 6-2.	Pre-dredge Mullen Slough showing dense RCG and restricted flow path.....	6-4
Figure 6-3.	Mullen Slough post hand-cleaned conditions showing thick sediment layer.....	6-7
Figure 6-4.	Example of Big Spring Creek vegetation.....	6-7
Figure 6-5.	Deer Creek inflow into Pickering/Olney drainage watercourse.....	6-8
Figure 6-6.	Sediment sampling at BSC site.....	6-9
Figure 6-7.	Sediment sampling chamber inserted into sediment-water interface prior to capping.....	6-10
Figure 6-8.	Freshly sampled sediment cores with their caps in place.....	6-10
Figure 6-9.	Lab set-up with probes, paddles, and aerating tubes installed.....	6-17
Figure 6-10.	Luminescent DO probe.....	6-18
Figure 6-11.	Pre- and Post- Dredge DO levels in Mullen Slough.....	6-20
Figure 6-12.	DO levels prior to upstream dredge operation's completion.....	6-21
Figure 6-13.	DO levels following upstream dredging operation's completion.....	6-21
Figure 6-14.	Diel DO levels upstream and downstream from a non-agricultural inflow.....	6-22
Figure 6-15.	Summer stab readings at three points at Duvall site averaged to illustrate elevated DO levels in non-agricultural adjacent reaches.....	6-22
Figure 6-16.	Stab DO measurements for seven Duvall sampling sites listed upstream to downstream respectively, illustrating difference between non-agricultural inflow and agricultural DO levels.....	6-23
Figure 6-17.	Percentage of DO Saturation of measurements for seven Duvall sampling sites listed upstream to downstream respectively, illustrating difference between non-agricultural inflow and agricultural DO levels.....	6-23
Figure 6-18.	Summer stab readings at three points at Mullen Slough site averaged to illustrate elevated DO levels in non-agricultural adjacent reaches.....	6-24
Figure 6-19.	Diel plot of DO at points upstream and downstream from a non-agricultural inflow at the Mullen Slough site.....	6-24

Figure 6-20.	QUAL2Kw output graph of DO for calibrated pre-dredged conditions. Lines represent simulated results while blocks represent known values.	6-25
Figure 6-21.	QUAL2Kw output graph of DO for calibrated post-dredged conditions. Lines represent simulated results while blocks represent known values.	6-25
Figure 6-22.	Predicted diel temperature comparison between Heat Source model and QUAL2K	6-27
Figure 6-23.	Predicted longitudinal temperature comparison between Heat Source model and QUAL2K	6-27
Figure 6-24.	DO decreasing with time in a sealed SOD chamber with sediment from a dredged site, SOD measurements were performed four times.	6-28
Figure 6-25.	Total Sediment oxygen demand at a dredged site plotted against hourly DO intervals.	6-29
Figure 6-26.	Averaged total SOD at a DO of 5 mg/l for four sites with two duplicates per site	6-29
Figure 6-27.	Individual contributions of biological and chemical sediment oxygen demand processes to total SOD.....	6-30
Figure 6-28.	SOD at selected DO values (2, 5, 10, mg/l) for each site.....	6-31
Figure 6-29.	QUAL2Kw post-dredge results for a 10% reduction in SOD over current hand-cleaned levels	6-33
Figure 6-30.	QUAL2Kw post-dredge results for a 50% reduction in SOD over current hand-cleaned levels	6-34
Figure 7-1.	Map of the Seattle metropolitan region including the sampling sites near the Snoqualmie River	7-6
Figure 7-2.	Aerial photograph of the Site 1 (Pickering) sampling reach and sampling point.....	7-6
Figure 7-3.	Site 1 (Pickering) sample location.....	7-7
Figure 7-4.	Aerial photograph of the Site 2 (Nelson) sampling reach and sampling point.....	7-8
Figure 7-5.	Site 2 (Nelson) sample location.....	7-9
Figure 7-6.	ADV positioned in the wake of the LWD at Site 1 (Pickering).....	7-10
Figure 7-7.	ADV positioned in the wake of the LWD at Site 2 (Nelson).....	7-10
Figure 7-8.	Schematic of velocity measurement.....	7-11
Figure 7-9.	Velocity transects upstream and in the wake of the log obstructions at Site 1 (Pickering)	7-13
Figure 7-10.	Velocity transects upstream and in the wake of the root wad obstructions at Site 1 (Pickering).....	7-14
Figure 7-11.	Velocity transects upstream and in the wake of the log obstructions at Site 2 (Nelson)	7-15
Figure 7-12.	TKE transects upstream and in the wake of the log obstructions at Site 1 (Pickering)	7-15
Figure 7-13.	TKE transects upstream and in the wake of the root wad obstructions at Site 1 (Pickering).....	7-16
Figure 7-14.	TKE transects upstream and in the wake of the log obstructions at Site 2 (Nelson)	7-16

Figure 7-15.	Integral time scale transects upstream and in the wake of the log obstructions at Site 1 (Pickering)	7-17
Figure 7-16.	Integral time scale transects upstream and in the wake of the root wad obstructions at Site 1 (Pickering)	7-17
Figure 7-17.	Integral time scale transects upstream and in the wake of the log obstruction at Site 2 (Nelson).....	7-18
Figure 7-18.	Numerically simulated velocity magnitude distributions around the log at Site 1 (Pickering) for the measured discharge.....	7-19
Figure 7-19.	Numerically simulated velocity magnitude distributions around the log at Site 1 (Pickering) for bankfull discharge.....	7-19
Figure 7-20.	Numerically simulated TKE distributions around the log at Site 1 (Pickering) for the measured discharge	7-20
Figure 7-21.	Numerically simulated TKE distributions around the log at Site 1 (Pickering) for bankfull discharge	7-20
Figure 7-22.	Numerically simulated vorticity distributions around the log at Site 1 (Pickering) for the measured discharge.....	7-21
Figure 7-23.	Numerically simulated vorticity distributions around the log at Site 1 (Pickering) for bankfull discharge	7-21
Figure 9-1.	Conceptual differential volume used to illustrate the Beer-Lambert law.....	9-12
Figure 9-2.	Water column and channel cross-section dimensions for Manning’s flow model	9-21
Figure 9-3.	Map of King County Agricultural Production Districts (APD)	9-22
Figure 9-4.	Heat Source Model Validation Site 1 Map.....	9-26
Figure 9-5.	Modified Heat Source Model Validation Site 2 Map.....	9-27
Figure 9-6.	Modified Heat Source Model Validation and Development Site 3.....	9-27
Figure 9-7.	Water column and channel cross-section dimensions for Manning’s flow model	9-37
Figure 9-8.	Validation results for the modified Heat Source model with willow vegetation	9-39
Figure 9-9.	Validation results for the modified Heat Source model with reed canarygrass vegetation.....	9-40
Figure 9-10.	Validation results for the modified Heat Source model with no riparian vegetation	9-41
Figure 9-11.	Validation results for the modified Heat Source model with reed canarygrass vegetation.....	9-41
Figure 9-12.	Sensitivity of the maximum seven day average of daily maximum temperatures to flow depth	9-46
Figure 9-13.	Sensitivity of the maximum seven day average of daily maximum temperatures to effective shade	9-47
Figure 9-14.	Sensitivity of the maximum seven day average of daily maximum temperatures to change in incision depth	9-48
Figure 9-15.	Sensitivity of maximum seven day average of daily maximum temperatures to channel bottom width	9-49

Figure 9-16.	Sensitivity of maximum seven day average of daily maximum temperatures to air temperature	9-50
Figure 9-17.	Sensitivity of seven day average of daily maximum temperatures to sediment depth.....	9-51
Figure 10-1.	Overview of study area.....	10-8
Figure 10-2.	Aerial photograph of Woodinville horticultural (Quigley) and livestock (Calhoon) farm study location.	10-9
Figure 10-3.	Pilot project results from 2003	10-11
Figure 10-4.	Aerial photograph of Duvall study location.	10-14
Figure 10-5.	Spacing and design for each “mat” treatment plot	10-15
Figure 10-6.	Examples of treatments used in study	10-17
Figure 10-7.	An example of the eight treatments within one of the ten blocks	10-19
Figure 10-8.	RCG final stem count from the three sites grouped by treatment	10-24
Figure 10-9.	Stem count for each treatment at each site	10-24
Figure 10-10.	RCG stem count versus treatment methodology at the horticultural site	10-27
Figure 10-11.	RCG stem count versus treatment methodology at the livestock site	10-27
Figure 10-12.	RCG stem count versus treatment methodology at the natural site.....	10-28
Figure 10-13.	Vegetative cover at horticultural site.....	10-29
Figure 10-14.	Vegetative cover at livestock site	10-30
Figure 10-15.	Vegetative cover at natural site	10-31
Figure 10-16.	Germination of lettuce seeds using fresh water versus hogfuel tea.....	10-32
Figure 10-17.	Radicle length of lettuce using fresh water versus hogfuel tea	10-33
Figure 10-18.	RCG rhizome regrowth using fresh water versus hogfuel tea.....	10-33
Figure 10-19.	Total RCG dry weight grown with Scirpus microcarpus	10-34
Figure 10-20.	RCG above and below ground dry weight for each treatment	10-35
Figure 10-21.	SFB above and below ground dry weight for each treatment	10-36
Figure 10-22.	Average Percent Fructosan level for three, six and nine months	10-37
Figure 10-23.	Percent Rhizome Fructosan levels for three, six and nine months.....	10-38
Figure 10-24.	Percent Rhizome Fructosan levels for three, six and nine months.....	10-39
Figure 10-25.	Mean RCG Fructosan levels after removing negative data point.....	10-39
Figure 10-26.	An adult willow borer (Cryptorhynchus lapathi) on an impacted willow stem at the livestock site.....	10-41
Figure 10-27.	SFB planted at the livestock (A) and agriculture (B) sites	10-44
Figure 10-28.	SFB planted at the livestock site	10-44
Figure 10-29.	Percent Rhizomes retrieved and analyzed versus original sample.....	10-46
Figure 11-1.	Impact of bank slope on erosion potential (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, 2004).....	11-2
Figure 11-2.	Geographic location of the experiment sites (Detailed GPS locations are specified in the site maps below).....	11-4
Figure 11-3.	Installation of Petri dishes and steel rods at Watercress Creek on August 08, 2004	11-5
Figure 11-4.	Typical installation of Petri dishes and steel rods	11-6
Figure 11-5.	Petri dishes placement at Watercress Creek site	11-8
Figure 11-6.	Petri dishes placement at Ray Ewing site.....	11-10

Figure 11-7.	Petri dishes placement at 124 th street site	11-12
Figure 11-8.	Long-term sediment after excavation along the watercourse in Watercress Creek site, during August 8, 2004 through October 13, 2004.....	11-13
Figure 11-9.	Sod (treatment plot #5) was undamaged while woodchips (treatment #4) were washed out at the 124 th Street site.....	11-16
Figure 11-10.	RCG breaking through coir mat at the 124 th Street site	11-17
Figure 11-11.	No rill formation in the treated bank at the 124 th Street site	11-18
Figure 12-1.	Structure of steel rods for measuring cumulative sediment	12-3
Figure 12-2.	Typical installation of Petri dishes and steel rods	12-4
Figure 12-3.	Geographic location of the experiment sites (See site diagrams for GPS location information)	12-7
Figure 12-4.	Detailed map of Enumclaw study sites	12-8
Figure 12-5.	Detailed map of 124 th Street site	12-9
Figure 12-6.	Steel rods placement at Watercress Creek site	12-10
Figure 12-7.	Steel rods placement at the Ray Ewing site.....	12-12
Figure 12-8.	Steel rod placements at 124 th Street site	12-14
Figure 12-9.	Cumulative sediment at the Watercress Creek site, starting from August 2004	12-15
Figure 12-10.	High water flow washed away the previously deposited sediment at the 124 th Street site as depicted in this photograph taken on January 28, 2005	12-16
Figure 12-11.	Example of sediment deposited near the watercourse outlet at the Ray Ewing property on January 28, 2005.....	12-17
Figure 12-12.	Sediment depths at the site of Ray Ewing property	12-17
Figure 12-13.	Sediment depths at the site of the 124 th Street.....	12-19
Figure 12-14.	No rill formation in the treated bank at the 124 th Street site, (a) treatment (1) peat moss, and (b) treatment (2) Coir mat	12-21
Figure 12-15.	Visual evidence of erosion control provided by Coir fiber mat	12-22
Figure 13-1.	Mullen Slough study site location in Lower Green APD	13-5
Figure 13-2.	Pre-maintained Mullen Slough agricultural waterway	13-6
Figure 13-3.	Smith Brothers Dairy property April 8, 2004.....	13-7
Figure 13-4.	Smith Brothers' Dairy channel on August 15, 2005 prior to mitigation	13-7
Figure 13-5.	Waterway along Boscolo, Vilog, and Primero properties on April 4, 2003	13-8
Figure 13-6.	Boscolo, Vilog, and Primero waterway on September 26, 2005	13-8
Figure 13-7.	Big Spring Creek study site location	13-9
Figure 13-8.	RCG vegetation growing in Big Spring Creek on June 21, 2005	13-10
Figure 13-9.	Big Spring Creek on September 26, 2006 post-maintenance	13-10
Figure 13-10.	Typical HEC-RAS data frame window	13-12
Figure 13-11.	Characteristic upstream cross-section of Big Spring Creek	13-13
Figure 13-12.	Characteristic downstream cross-section of Big Spring Creek (Big Spring Creek location is seen in Figure 13-7).....	13-14
Figure 13-13.	Typical post-cleaned conditions at Mullen Slough (Figure 13-1, Mullen Slough C).....	13-15
Figure 13-14.	Characteristic pre-cleaned upstream cross-section of Mullen Slough	13-16
Figure 13-15.	Characteristic post-cleaned downstream cross section of Mullen Slough	13-16

Figure 13-16. Stream gauging location on Big Spring Creek 13-17

Figure 13-17. Longitudinal profile of Big Spring Creek showing a highly variable flow gradient throughout the un-maintained reach 13-18

Figure 13-18. Longitudinal profile of Mullen Slough illustrating altered flow gradient as a result of cleaning operations 13-19

Figure 13-19. Typical example of mechanically excavated removal of sediment and vegetation 13-21

Executive Summary

A multidisciplinary team of researchers from Washington State University and the University of Washington conducted a 5-year investigation of various practices related to agricultural watercourse maintenance. The primary focus of the investigation was related to how maintenance practices affect salmonid utilization in King County drainage systems. Four broad areas of study (fish biology, instream habitat, riparian, and sediment) were identified by KCDNPR staff during initial contract negotiations. Within each of these areas, two to four research questions were developed with methodologies and quality assurance procedures approved by King County in the project Sample Analysis Plan. Consequently, a total of twelve specific questions were addressed in this study.

In Chapter 1, a summary of the project rationale, over-arching study objective, and structure of the final report is presented. An overview of how to access project data files using GIS technology is also included.

Chapter 2 discusses the investigation regarding whether or not King County's agricultural watercourses serve as habitat for Chinook and other salmonids. Fish data collected seasonally (January/February, April, July and October) from the fall of 2002 through the spring of 2006 were analyzed for this study component. Based on statistical analysis of samples collected by electrofishing and trapping, results of this study suggest that in relation to the tested hypothesis, salmonid density (as indexed by capture frequency and/or catch rates) does vary temporally, spatially, and in relation to physical factors such as surrounding vegetative regime and flow type in King County's agricultural waterways. Specifics of that variation differ by species considered and are described in detail. General trends are also summarized in the conclusion section. Overall, the findings of this study directly support the continued application of King County public rule 21A-24 sub-sections 374, 375, and 383(b) regarding maintenance timing, fish removal prior to, and mitigation planting activities following maintenance activity.

Chapter 3 reports on the study component designed to evaluate and compare the utility of various fish collection methods for effective indexing of salmonid abundance in agricultural waterways. Electrofishing and trapping were considered the most effective methods for sampling juvenile salmonids within agricultural waterways. Monitoring methods selected for this study therefore included backpack electrofishing and four trap configurations (empty, baited, lighted, and baited/lighted). Catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) observed at each site during each sampling event was used for regression analyses. Results of this study suggest that electrofishing CPUE provides a meaningful index of salmonid abundance across the range of habitat conditions commonly observed in agricultural waterways. Utility of electrofishing CPUE as an index of salmonid abundance can be maximized if the six recommendations made in the conclusions are practiced.

Chapter 4 discusses the study component related to determining a method for the safe and effective removal of fish prior to excavation maintenance activities, an activity commonly referred to as "defishing." Findings of this study largely support continuation of the existing King County protocol for effective removal of salmonids from agricultural waterways prior to maintenance activities in agricultural waterways. We recommend the continued use of multiple sampling methods (trapping and electrofishing) for such fish removal, with a minimum of 6-8

fish removal or sampling events prior to any maintenance activity. It is also recommended that water quality considerations be taken into account when employing traps as mortality can occur overnight due to low dissolved oxygen concentrations in some waterways.

Chapter 5 investigates the efficacy of King County ordinance requiring consideration be given to the utilization of large or small woody debris (LWD or SWD, respectively) as mitigation for impacts to in-channel cover and complexity incurred during in-channel maintenance activities. The specific roles of woody debris in low gradient, agricultural waterways may differ from those in natural streams, and has not been as thoroughly investigated to date. This study evaluated the hypothesis that the mean difference in catch rates between sub-reaches with and without installed LWD was zero. Statistically, no significant difference ($\alpha = 0.10$) in catch rates was noted between sub-reaches with and without LWD installed for Chinook or coho salmon or for all salmonids combined. The mean difference in catch rates between sub-reaches with and without LWD was lowest and statistically most relevant (0.065 fish/100 seconds of electrofishing; $p=0.111$) for Chinook salmon, although the observed count in both sub-reaches was most frequently zero. For coho salmon and all salmonids combined, the mean differences in catch rates between sub-reaches with and without LWD installed were slightly greater (0.097 and 0.104 fish/100 seconds of electrofishing, respectively) but not statistically relevant ($p>0.35$).

Based on this study, it is largely unclear if salmonid distribution in agricultural waterways is preferentially associated with installed LWD. Although statistical analyses indicate that no significant differences exist ($p > 0.10$) between salmonid abundance in reaches with and without LWD installed, numerous factors contribute to uncertainty of the statistical results. Further study at additional sights is recommended to provide a clearer picture of the potential preference of LWD by juvenile salmonids rearing in low gradient agricultural waterways.

Chapter 6 details a combination of water quality monitoring and modeling used to draw comparisons between dissolved oxygen (DO) levels in maintained vs. un-maintained agricultural waterways, and to note any differences between reaches flowing through agricultural and similar un-farmed areas. Researchers tailored an existing Washington Department of Ecology water quality model (Qual2Kw) to fit the project's unique characteristics. This model will facilitate the County's development of management strategies for targeted waterways. Results discussed in this chapter are focused on DO levels and a limited number of other significant variables to be used for model calibration verification. Sediment oxygen demand (SOD) was monitored and analyzed in relation to the DO balance and to facilitate in model calibration. In addition, reaeration rates were used as a key calibration variable for the model and were evaluated for both pre and post-maintenance scenarios.

Results illustrate that DO levels in agricultural waterways differ significantly from those in adjacent non-agricultural reaches, and demonstrate that maintenance activities contribute to improved DO levels in the water column. However, high SOD following maintenance activity inhibits improvement of DO to levels meeting EPA standards; Based on this study it is unclear if the observed SOD increase is a short or long-term effect of maintenance activities. It is this report's recommendation to continue with hand-removal of vegetation but to consider mechanical dredging to increase sustainable habitat and elevate dissolved oxygen concentrations to even higher levels. While the downstream movement of sediment within watercourse systems

may reduce the benefit of mechanical dredging, the overall net benefit of removing sediment from the agricultural waterways is undisputable.

Chapter 7 evaluates study results related to the question of whether large woody debris (LWD) as installed in agricultural drainage ditches by King County provides hydraulic diversity for fish. In this study, the influence of installed LWD on the flow field was investigated in two King County drainage ditches. This was accomplished through a combination of field observations and numerical simulations. High resolution turbulence measurements were made in the wake of installed LWD in two ditches using an Acoustic Doppler Velocimeter. It was found that installed LWD had a very minor influence on measured distributions of velocity magnitude, turbulent kinetic energy, and integral time scales. The observed region of influence depended on the investigated parameter and measured obstructions. However, the region of influence did not extend beyond 45 cm downstream from the installed LWD. The numerical simulation allowed for an investigation of flow parameters over a broader spatial extent and for higher flows than the observed value. The numerical simulation results agreed well with measured values. It was concluded that the installed LWD does not effectively increase the hydraulic diversity of the low-gradient drainage ditches, although it may provide instream cover for fish (Chapter 5).

Chapter 8 presents results of the study component designed to determine if reed canarygrass (RCG) regimes provide positive, negative, or neutral value to salmonids when compared to reference systems with no vegetation or with intact riparian vegetation. To do so, this study investigated salmonid weight-length relationships and relative condition, benthic community composition, and salmonid diets across a range of vegetative regimes common to agricultural waterways within King County.

Study results suggested that surrounding vegetative regime does influence biotic integrity of and salmonid food base and salmonid growth and condition in agricultural waterways. The direction of that influence (positive or negative) appears to vary between trophic levels investigated (macroinvertebrates and fish) and between salmonid species. Results suggest a positive influence of RCG dominated habitats for coho salmon, and a positive influence of natural vegetative regimes for Chinook salmon in agricultural waterways. Calculated B-IBI scores indicate very poor biological condition for all vegetative regimes sampled. Differences in B-IBI scores were noted between vegetative regimes however with mixed > natural > RCG.

Chapter 9 examines the shade effectiveness of pre-maintenance existing vegetation versus mitigation plantings, and the impacts of riparian shade on water temperature were evaluated with a reach scale study. Short reaches with uniform vegetation and uniform channel morphology were studied during summer base-flow conditions. Water temperature monitored above and below the experimental reach was used to develop and validate a physically based temperature model. Direct solar radiation was measured in and out of the shade of riparian vegetation to calibrate vegetation density for willows, Himalayan Blackberry and reed canarygrass. The developed model was found to be accurate to within 0.5 °C. Calibrated densities for buffers with complete uniform willow vegetation were 93% for mature willows, and 80% for willows approximately two years after planting. Reed canarygrass and Himalayan Blackberry growing uniformly at maturity were found to have approximately 100% calibrated densities. The difference in density between vegetation types was not found to have a significant impact on

watercourse temperature. However, the presence of shade from riparian or topographic features was found to influence temperature. Narrow watercourses with vertical banks were found to be more sensitive to riparian vegetation characteristics, while wider watercourses with shallow side slopes were found to be more sensitive to air temperature. Temperature model results show that a steep incised bank increases the effectiveness of vegetation in providing riparian shade, and that shade cast by vegetation and the bank itself can decrease maximum 7-day average temperatures by approximately 0.7 °C.

Chapter 10 discusses the riparian vegetation enhancement section of this project related to finding a BMP protocol for the effective control/eradication of reed canary grass (RCG), and determining a method for providing native ground cover and woody riparian vegetation that is vigorous, shade producing and provides habitat for insects that constitute prey for salmonids. The study involved a pilot project, a principal project and a greenhouse investigation. The pilot project used small-scale treatment cells to investigate the use of Salal, clover, shade (old carpet), red cedar hog fuel (mulch), and steam in reducing RCG growth. Stem count data indicated that two treatments were particularly successful. The hogfuel and shade material treatments (whether used with or without steam) suppressed the reed canarygrass significantly when compared to the control plots and the other treatments.

The principal project was conducted at three field site locations. Eight types of vegetation were used in the RCG barrier treatment plots. The RCG barrier alone treatment was the least successful at reducing the returning RCG stem count at all three sites. The treatments involving the Hogfuel/Willow (HF/Willow) and the HF/RCG barrier were the most successful. The HF/Willow treatment was more successful at the agriculture site and the HF/RCG barrier treatment was more successful at the natural site. The HF/Willow and HF/RCG barrier treatments were not significantly different at the livestock site. Additionally, the livestock site had higher stem counts than the other two sites for the control and the other two treatments with the exception of the HF/RCG barrier treatment at the agriculture site.

Greenhouse experiments investigated the allelopathic tendencies of red cedar hogfuel on lettuce seed germination, seedling growth and RCG rhizome regrowth. The results indicate that the Red Cedar Hogfuel is allelopathic for lettuce seed germination and growth by significantly reducing the number of germinating seeds ($p = .005$) and radicle length ($p = .000$). The Red Cedar hogfuel tea also significantly reduced the RCG rhizome regrowth when comparing the stem count of the rhizomes grown with hogfuel tea versus those grown with water, with a p-value of .05 (t-Test for a paired two sample for means).

Chapter 11 investigates strategies to minimize sediment mobilization following excavation. Petri dishes were installed on the ditch bottoms to collect long-term cumulative sediments after excavation. The measurement of cumulative sediment was conducted after about two weeks of installing Petri dishes by measuring the total solids collected in Petri dishes. Temporary erosion and sediment control practices were applied at both the Watercress Creek and Ray Ewing properties. Among all tested temporary erosion and sediment control practices, hydro-seeding was suggested as the best mitigation plan. This was based on the considerations of the effectiveness and cost of hydro-seeding practice. The obvious advantage of hydro-seeding is that

before the grass is fully developed, the mulch or binder plays an important role in soil erosion control, while the mulch or binder decays as the grass becomes developed.

Chapter 12 examines techniques that could extend maintenance cycles so that disruptions in the local ecosystems would occur less often. This was accomplished by looking at various erosion control methods. Erosion control treatments used in the study included peat moss, CF-900 Coir mat, wood chip mulching, sod, hydro-seeding grass, and hand-seeding grass. Quarterly or annual cumulative sediments were measured after the maintenance, by counting the visible horizontal bars in steel rods placed in the channels. At the same time, erosion amounts from the treated banks of the watercourses were estimated based on observations of rill formation on the banks. Based on the experiments and observations, upstream erosion sources were the primary contributor on the deposited sediment at these agricultural watercourses. Controlling hillside erosion from natural and development sources is therefore the key to prolonging maintenance cycles. The rill erosion on the treated banks was immeasurable and insignificant compared to the amount of cumulative sediment on the ditch bottom. It was also concluded that increasing the existing standard seeding and mulching requirements by 50% would not affect bank erosion and there was no difference in rill formation on channel slopes that were hand-seeded compared to those that were hydro-seeded.

Chapter 13 describes the investigated methodologies aimed at predicting the benefits in improved drainage associated with excavation of sediment and RCG. Periodic cleaning of agricultural waterways was quantitatively and qualitatively shown to significantly reduce the negative aspects of farmland flooding and appear to improve the economics of agriculture in King County. Numerical modeling with HEC-RAS and roughness coefficients much greater than typical reported values has been shown to produce results that accurately match measured water surface elevations. Moreover, observed agricultural improvements at the Smith Brother's site indicated increased drainage due to hand cleaning and mechanical operations. This restoration of the land's agricultural purpose serves both the landowner and the surrounding community which has demonstrated an interest in maintaining agricultural activities in the valley.

Chapter 14 summarizes the combined impacts of the overall research project by briefly pointing out the most significant findings in research and then looking at them in collective. It also highlights the fact that ditch maintenance is an important process for drainage and providing juvenile salmonid rearing habitat in King County. Post-maintenance water quality testing found significant improvements in dissolved oxygen levels; the temperature model predicted of temperature improvements as riparian buffers grow; and visual reports of salmonids using much larger sections of the Mullen Slough/Boscolo complex all strongly suggest that maintenance activities benefit the fish. Furthermore, reports also support the assumption that better drainage help the farmers by allowing better use of their lands. By following the general processes discussed in this report, farming and salmonids should be able to successfully co-exist.