San Cristobal Riparian Project 16-11

Pre-treatment Monitoring Report

2016

Prepared by
Kathryn R Mahan, Ecological Monitoring Specialist & Daniel Hernandez, Ecological Monitoring Technician, New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute
for the Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance

Santa Fe-Pojoaque SWCD

Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym, Abbreviation, or Term	Explanation or Definition as used by NMFWRI
AGL	above ground level; GIS term
BBIRD plots	Breeding Biology Research and Monitoring Database, larger circular plot types
BEMP plots	Bosque Ecosystem Monitoring Program, small rectangular plot types
FEAT	Fire Ecology Assessment Tool
FFI	FEAT/ FIREMON Integrated
FIREMON	Fire Effects Monitoring and Inventory System
FSA	Farm Service Agency, a department of the USDA
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GRGWA	Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance
LIDAR	Light detecting and ranging, a remote sensing technique using light to gather elevation data
NAIP	National Agriculture Imagery Program (aerial imagery)
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index; GIS term for a band ratio of the visible red and the near infrared spectral bands and is calculated using the following formula: (NIR – Red)/(NIR+Red)
NHNM	Natural Heritage New Mexico
NMDGF	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
NMED SWQB	New Mexico Environment Department Surface Water Quality Bureau
NMFWRI	New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute
NMHU	New Mexico Highlands University
NMRAM	New Mexico Rapid Assessment Method, version 2.0
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
PC	Plot center
RGIS	Resource Geographic Information System
SWCD	Soil and Water Conservation District
TIFF	Tagged image file format
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WQCC	Water Quality Control Commission
WSS	Web Soil Survey, a soils database of the NRCS

Purpose of Report

This report covers the low-intensity pre-treatment vegetation monitoring assessment performed on a non-native phreatophyte removal project submitted for the San Cristobal drainage to the Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance in 2016. Following a discussion of the ecological context, and our monitoring methods, we present pertinent background, observations, and assessment results for the project.

Ecological Context of Bosque Restoration

Neither the challenges nor the importance of working in the bosque and other riparian areas in New Mexico today should be underestimated. According to the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish Conservation Division, wetlands and riparian areas comprise approximately 0.6 percent of all land in New Mexico (2012). Despite this small percentage, estimates of New Mexican vertebrate species depending on wetland and riparian habitat for their survival ranges from 55% (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish Conservation Services Division, 2012) to 80% (Audubon New Mexico, 2013). These areas also provide flood mitigation, filtration of sediment and pollutants, and water for a variety of purposes including groundwater recharge (Audubon New Mexico, 2013). In addition, native vegetation such as cottonwoods have cultural significance to many communities.

As much as these areas are disproportionately important to ecosystems and human communities, they are equally disproportionately impacted by disturbance. Anthropogenic impacts with major consequences for our riparian areas include dams, reservoirs, levees, channelization, acequias and ditches, jetty jacks, riprap and Gabion baskets, urbanization, removal of native phreatophytes, grazing by domestic livestock, excessive grazing pressure by native ungulate populations absent natural predation cycles, beaver removal, logging, mining, recreation, transportation, introduction and spread of invasive exotic species, groundwater extraction, altered fire and flood regimes drought and climate change (Committee on Riparian Zone Functioning and Strategies for Management, et al., 2002). Statewide, it is estimated that as much as 90% of New Mexico's historical riparian areas have been lost (Audubon New Mexico, 2013), and approximately 39% of our remaining perennial stream miles are impaired (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish Conservation Services Division, 2012).

New Mexico *is* fortunate enough to have the Middle Rio Grande Bosque, the largest remaining bosque in the Southwest (USDA USFS, 1996). However, over the past two decades, the number of fires in the bosque has been increasing. Historically, the primary disturbance regime in the bosque has been flooding, not fire, which means the system is not fire-adapted. In fact, native species like cottonwood resprout from their roots after floods and need wet soils to germinate from seed. Flooding also promotes decomposition of organic material and keeps the soil moist which reduces the likelihood of fire. Today, overbank flow is uncommon in many areas of the Rio Grande due to the heavy alteration of the channel and flow regimes (two obvious examples are the structures defining the upper and lower extent of the Middle Rio Grande: Cochiti Dam and Elephant Butte Reservoir). This has led to low fuel moisture content and high fuel loads, as well as increased human presence in the riparian area. As a result, bosque fires are more common and more severe: they kill cottonwoods and other native species, creating spaces which are filled by non-native species such as salt cedar, Russian olive, Siberian elm, and Tree-of-Heaven. We are constantly learning more about how these species can exploit and encourage a riparian fire regime, in addition to many other changes they bring to ecosystems.

Efforts geared toward the removal of these nonnative species can help to reduce fire risk, preserve native vegetation, and be part of a larger effort to restore the bosque and the watershed as a whole to a more natural and functional ecosystem. The Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance (GRGWA) has been working on these issues with a variety of collaborating organizations and agencies within the Rio Grande basin for several years. Since 2013, the New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute (NMFWRI) has been working with GRGWA and the Claunch-Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) to begin construction of a geodatabase for all of GRGWA's non-native phreatophyte removal projects as well as to perform the formal pre- and post-treatment monitoring, utilizing the field methods explained below as well as LIDAR analysis where appropriate and available.

Monitoring and Field Methods

Low intensity Field Methods

Low intensity pre-treatment vegetation monitoring was done using an adapted version of the biotic portion of the New Mexico Rapid Assessment Method (NMRAM), v 2.1, updating recommendations made in the Field Manual for Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance (GRGWA) Riparian Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring and the GRGWA Monitoring Plan, developed by Lightfoot & Stropki of SWCA Environmental Consultants in 2012. (For a brief overview of both low and high intensity monitoring methods used by the NMFWRI on GRGWA projects, please see Appendix III.)

For those not familiar, NMRAM was developed by the New Mexico Environment Department Surface Water Quality Bureau Wetlands Program and Natural Heritage New Mexico as a "cost effective, yet consistent and meaningful tool" (Muldavin, 2011) for wetland ecological condition assessment in terms of anthropogenic disturbance as negatively correlated with quality and functionality. The portions of NMRAM we utilized are Level 2 "semi-quantitative" field measurements taken at less detail than plot level (Muldavin, 2011).

Measurements taken included relative native plant community composition, vegetation horizontal patch structure, vegetation vertical structure, native riparian tree regeneration, and invasive exotic plant species cover. The underlying method for these biotic assessments was a version of the 1984 Hink and Ohmart vertical structure classification system, modified for use in the NMRAM for Montane Riverine Wetlands version 2.0 (see Appendix IV). First, vegetation communities were mapped out by patch (polyon) according to the Hink and Ohmart system. Next, the presence of (state-listed) invasives, wetland species, and the two dominant species in each strata ("tree" >15 ft, "shrub" 4.5-15 ft, and "herbaceous" <4.5 ft) were recorded for each plant community. The native/exotic ratio in each of the patches was scored and weighted based on the percent of the project area each patch comprised. These scores were then combined with the additional biotic metrics of vertical and horizontal diversity, native tree regeneration, and overall (listed) invasive presence. The NMRAM rating system is based, on all levels, on a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 is considered excellent condition, 3 good, 2 fair, and 1 poor.

We also assessed soil surface condition, which is a metric typically included in the abiotic section of the NMRAM, as well as the presence of surface fuels, which is not part of the NMRAM. Unlike the other 6 metrics we used, surface fuels were recorded on a rating scale from 0 to 1.0 where 1.0 is a continuous fuel matrix.

Photopoints were established to capture images where vegetation shifts were observed and/or at representative locations throughout the site. Waypoints were marked with a Garmin GPS unit and named sequentially by site. Photos were taken facing the direction that best captured the vegetation community(ies).

Prior to entering the field, we created a map with the project boundaries as provided by GRGWA. We combined these polygons with recent aerial imagery and identified relevant roads and other landscape features. Once on the ground, the vegetation community polygons (as determined by the modified Hink and Ohmart classification system) were hand-drawn onto this map and served as the basis for other biotic metric assessments. Upon return to the office, this polygon map and the photopoints were digitized by the monitoring technician and/or specialist.

High-intensity Field Methods

High-intensity monitoring was also done, in part, on this site. We used an adapted Bosque Ecosystem Monitoring Program (BEMP) style plot. These are 16 x 98-foot rectangles, placed approximately parallel to the river. Within these plots, we measure canopy and species, and vegetation and ground cover. We also used Brown's transects to measure surface fuels.



Estimating Vegetation Cover using eCognition Software

Object based image classification systems, such as eCognition software, allows for a semi-automated analysis of high resolution images. This approach divides the image into meaningful homogenous regions, known as image objects. These image objects are groups of pixels that are adjacent to each other and are spectrally similar. Once image objects are created, they provide a great deal of information from which an image classification can be developed (Lizarazo and Elsner 2009). In large areas where more detailed vegetation surveys are cost prohibited, eCognition provides a means to characterize a landscape using readily available aerial photography.

For the San Cristobal Area LIDAR, light detecting and ranging elevation data, was not available. Instead, 2014 digital ortho-imagery from Santa Fe County was used to estimate vegetation areas. The 2014 imagery was acquired for the study area at 1 foot cell resolution and was obtained from Santa Fe County Offices. The 1 foot cell size was better to use to classify vegetation than the 1 meter USDA/FSA NAIP imagery which is available state wide. With the smaller cell size features were more easily identified.

The Santa Fe County imagery was collected in the spring 2014 with the near infrared (NIR) spectral band. The 4 band imagery (Red, Green, Blue, and NIR) is very useful for vegetation classification. Having the NIR band allows for a greater analysis of vegetation and the calculation of the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI). NDVI is a band ratio of the visible red and the near infrared spectral bands and

is calculated using the following formula: (NIR – Red)/(NIR+Red). This makes vegetation monitoring and analysis feasible over large areas.

To identify dominate vegetation types, the image was first classified to two classes; Vegetation and Bare Ground. Image properties of Hue, Saturation, and Intensity and NDVI values of the image objects were used to identify Vegetation and Bare Ground classes. The eCogntion classification was based on finding the right threshold values for each feature. To determine specific threshold values, information about each image object could be displayed and tested to determine if those values were appropriate for the given land cover feature.

After vegetation was separated from bare ground, existing field data was used to divide the vegetation into Type 1 (high structure forest no understory), Type 5 (Tall Shrubs), and Type 6s (Short shrub stands) vertical structure type. The classification was exported from eCogntion and then manually edited using Erdas Imagine software. Vertical structure types were interpreted using the imagery, photographs and field data collected on site. The resulting classification was used to determine acreage totals by vertical structure type according to the NMRAM definitions.

Personnel Involved

2016 New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute Monitoring Team:

- Kathryn R Mahan, Ecological Monitoring Specialist
- Dr Rob Strahan, Restoration Monitoring Program Manager
- Daniel Hernandez, Ecological Monitoring Technician

2016 New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute GIS Team:

- Patti Dappen, GIS Specialist

Other persons contacted:

- Fred Rossbach, Field Coordinator, Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance
- Grant Mitchell, San Cristobal Ranch Manager

San Cristobal Riparian Project

Project 16-11 is located on the San Cristobal Ranch, in the San Cristobal Drainage of the Galisteo Basin, San Cristobal Drainage, near Galisteo, NM, in Santa Fe County.

The nearby city of Santa Fe receives an average of 14.21 inches of precipitation per year. The average high temperature is 86° F in July and the average low is 17° F in December and January. (U.S. Climate Data, 2017) According to the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the project area is comprised of 95.3% Jaralosa-Chupe-Riverwash complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes, flooded, 3.7% Sena very fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, 0.4% Cumacho fine sandy loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes, 0.3% Sandoval-Badland complex, 15 to 45 percent slopes, and 0.2% Oelop-Charalito complex, 1 to 3 percent slopes. Rangeland ecological sites within this project include R035XA112NM Loamy, R035XA113NM Sandy, R035XG114NM Gravelly, R035XA126NM Salt Flats, and R035XA130NM Shale Hills; Forestland ecological site types include F036XA005NM Riverine Riparian (USDA NRCS, 2016).

The Loamy ecological site typically supports a grassland state dominated by blue grama, western wheatgrass, galleta, ring muhly, dropseeds, and/or threeawns. It can also be found in a piñon-juniper invaded state (dominated by piñon, juniper, and blue grama), a grass/succulent-mix state (dominated by blue grama, cholla and prickly pear), a shrub-dominated state (dominated by rabbitbrush or horsebrush and blue grama), as well as a bare state with sparse grass (USDA NRCS n.d.).

The Sandy ecological site typically supports plant communities composed of fourwing saltbush, winterfat, and sagebrush at the shrub layer, and at the herbaceous layer, Rocky Mountain bee plant, blue grama, western wheatgrass, threeawns, galleta, dropseed, Indian ricegrass, needle-and-thread, squirreltail, and New Mexico feathergrass. This may also support a shrub-dominated state (dominated by sagebrush, rabbitbrush with a blue-grama/threeawn/dropseed/muhly understory), as well as a juniper-dominated state (with a patchy grass understory of blue grama, dropseeds, galleta, Indian ricegrass and threeawn) (USDA NRCS n.d.).

The Gravelly ecological site type typically supports grassland with minor shrub and piñon-juniper components. Common dominant grass species include blue, black and sideoats grama, little bluestem, spike muhly, Western wheatgrass, New Mexico feathergrass, Indian ricegrass, and squirreltail. Common shrubs include fourwing saltbush, winterfat, Apache plume, rabbitbrush, soapweed yucca, sagebrush and broom snakeweed. The site can also be found in a shrub-encroached state dominated by rabbitbrush and blue grama; erosion is more common in this state (USDA NRCS n.d.).

The Salt Flats ecological site type is typically dominated by alkali sacaton along with western wheatgrass, blue grama, vinemesquite grass, galleta, inland saltgrass, and spike muhly. Dominance of grass species is determined by salt; salty sites are dominated by alkali sacaton while areas with less salt tend to have more blue grama and galleta. Shrubs include fourwing saltbush, shadscale, and greasewood and are typically scattered when grass is dominant. However, a shrub-dominated state is possible with overgrazing and/or drought. A gullied state is also possible as a site deteriorates and changes in cover lead to changes in hydrology resulting in increasing surfaces salts and downcutting. In this state, shrubs and salt-tolerant forbs are dominant while grasses are absent (USDA NRCS n.d.).

The Shale Hills ecological site type is dominated by alkali sacaton and galleta in its reference state. Other common grasses include blue grama, black grama, and sideoats grama. Although grass cover is patchy due to the amount of rock fragments, grasses account for 80-90% of total annual vegetation production. Shrubs and a few juniper and piñon are scattered across this site type. Typical shrubs include fourwing saltbush, broom snakeweed, and sacahuista. With overgrazing and fire suppression, bare interspaces increase, grasses decrease and piñon becomes dominant. Continued overgrazing, fire suppression, prolonged drought and/or beetle kill leads to a state where juniper is the dominant species, followed by piñon; cacti is a significant portion of the community in this state, and large bare areas are present (USDA NRCS n.d.).

The Riverine Riparian ecological site is made up of sediments adjacent to perennial streams and vegetation is determined largely by local hydrology. Examples of typical species at different strata include Fremont cottonwood, sandbar willow, Western wheatgrass, and Nebraska sedge (USDA NRCS n.d.).

Monitoring was conducted at this 47-acre site on September 14, 2016 as part of a restoration project targeting non-native phreatophytes scheduled for 2016-2017. The project is located on the San Cristobal

Ranch in the San Cristobal Drainage in Santa Fe County. The project is accessed through private ranch roads and is approximately ½ miles off NM Hwy 41. The Santa Fe-Pojoaque Soil and Water Conservation District (SFPSWCD) sponsored the project. The project is an initial treatment of heavy to medium density salt cedar, Russian olive and Siberian elm in an intermittent stream riparian zone. Planned treatment include extraction and mastication; half of the mid-story willows and juniper will be masticated as well to create a more open understory. Large Siberian elms will be left as shade for livestock. Restoration goals include increasing forage for wildlife and grazing, reducing channelization and soil erosion in the drainage, promoting natural hydraulic processes including an increase in overland water flow, and an overall increase in ecosystem function and health.



Figure 1. Project 16-11 in geographic context.



Figure 2. 16-11 Ojo Caliente project outline.

Exotic species observed during the site visit included Russian olive and salt cedar. Native plants observed included Rio Grande cottonwood, coyote willow, wild licorice, sedges, rushes, and blue grama. The field crew also noted the popularity of the dense willows with the local mosquito population.

Table 1. NMRAM Scores for 16-11.

Metric 16.11 September 14, 2016	**Score**
Relative Native Plant Community Composition	2
Vegetation Horizontal Patch Structure	2
Vegetation Vertical Structure	4
Native Riparian Tree Regeneration	4
Exotic Invasive Plant Species Cover	1
Project Biotic Score (based on above ratings)	2.4
Project Biotic Rating	C/Fair
Soil Surface Condition	3
Surface Fuels	0.85

The lowest scores for this project came in the Exotic Invasive Plant Species Cover metrics, due to the high percentage of invasive plants. The project scored best in the vegetation vertical structure metric, because of the dominance of overstory structure, and in the riparian tree regeneration metric, because of the presence of young cottonwoods. Vegetation polygons are represented by structure type in the maps in Figure 3 and Figure 4, as well as in the NAIP vegetation classification maps, Figure 5 and Figure 6. Overall, this site scored a 2.4 out of 4 overall, which is a “C” or “Fair” biotic rating.

This site also had one plot established (location shown on map below). At this plot, we collected data on vegetation cover and fuel loading using Submethods 1 and 2 outlined in Appendix III, the BEMP plots and the Brown’s transects.



Figure 3. 16-11 San Cristobal Riparian project vegetation polygons – eastern portion.



Figure 4. 16-11 San Cristobal riparian project vegetation polygons – western section.



Figure 5. NAIP vegetation classification for 16-11 – eastern portion.



Figure 6. NAIP vegetation classification for 16-11 – western portion.

Table 2. 16-11 Average surface fuels from 2 transects on plot.

Fuel	Average tons/acre
1-hr	0.02
10-hr	0.04
100-hr	0
1000-hr	0
All woody fuels	0.06
Fuel	Avg depth (inches)
Duff	0
Litter	0.08
Total	0.08



Figure 7. Percent Vegetative Cover for plot on 16-11.



Figure 8. Percent Vegetative Cover for plot on 16-11.



Figure 9. Percent ground cover for plot on 16-11.



Figure 10. Percent ground cover for plot on 16-11.

Discussion

We would like to clarify that we are adapting these NMRAM metrics for our own purposes. That is, we are using them both inside and outside their intended site ranges, including on larger sites (NMRAM is designed to handle a site around 100 x 200 meters), sites further from the river (NMRAM is currently in use primarily for assessing riverine wetlands), and sites defined by exotic vegetation presence rather than hydrologic boundaries and upland vegetation indicators/apparent wetland extent. Site delineation and size is likely to be variable for a number of other reasons, including landowner participation, available funds, proposals received from contractors, etc – many of which cannot be directly correlated to site disturbance or ecological function. For this reason, we do not use the entire NMRAM assessment, or place confidence in the weighted score roll-ups that are typically part of an NMRAM report. Should one be interested, rationale for the weighting in the NMRAM score roll-up can be found in the yet-to-be-published field manual for version 2.1. For more information, contact Maryann McGraw of the NMED or NMFWRI.

While we provide a biotic site score and rating for your reference, we recommend comparisons be done with individual metrics from pre-treatment and post-treatment assessment from the same site, rather than across multiple sites. Also of note is that statistical analysis is not appropriate for NMRAM, or other low intensity, rapid field methods.

Please note that should the project area change significantly from what was originally proposed and monitored, all metrics will lose some amount of confidence on comparison as it is impractical to re-examine the original site assessment scores using new boundaries. This is an issue of concern of which GRGWA should be aware. We recommend that GRGWA attempt to minimize alterations in project boundaries once pre-treatment monitoring data has been approved for collection. Another, somewhat alternative, recommendation is that the initial monitoring regime include high-intensity modified BEMP-type plots which could be repeated in their exact initial locations, allowing collection of comparable data regardless of boundary change. We recognize that this is not always practical: boundaries change for a number of reasons and time and cost constraints can necessitate the sole use of a rapid assessment method for monitoring. We have reason to hope our outlined assessment method will still be a satisfactory indicator for site function improvement or degradation primarily because metrics in rapid assessment methods such as this are set up to have relatively low sensitivities (i.e. for a change to be reflected in the metrics, either positive or negative, disturbance on site has to be significantly altered).

From here on out, the goal of the GRGWA/ NMFWRI is that all sites will be revisited for post-treatment monitoring in 5-year intervals. It is our intention and expectation that the data collected in these intervals will reflect any significant changes in disturbance and ecological function of the site.

References

Audubon New Mexico. (2013). Water Matters: Water for New Mexico Rivers. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Utton Transboundary Resources Center.

Brown, J. K. (1974). Handbook for Inventorying Downed Woody Material, USDA Forest Service General Technical report INT-16. *Handbook for Inventorying Downed Woody Material*. Ogden, Utah: USDA Forest Serivce Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Bureau of Land Management. (2006). *Grazing Management Processes and Strategies for Riparian-Wetland Areas, TR 1737-20 .*

Claunch-Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District on behalf of the Greater Rio Grande Watershed Aliance. (2015). *Request for Proposals for Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance Riparian Restoration Projects.* Mountainair, NM: Claunch-Pinto Soil and Water Conservation District.

Committee on Riparian Zone Functioning and Strategies for Management, et al. (2002). *Riparian Areas: Functions and Strategies for Management.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Lightfoot, D. &. (2012). *Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance Riparian Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring Plan.* Albuquerque, NM: SWCA Environmental Consultants.

Lightfoot, David & Stropki, C. (2012). *Field Manual for Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance Riparian Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring.* Albuquerque, NM: SWCA Environmental Consultants.

Muldavin, E. B. (2011). New Mexico Rapid Assessment Method: Montaine Riverine Wetlands. Version 1.1. Final report to the New Mexico Environment Department, Surface Water Quality Bureau. 90 pp. and appendices.

New Mexico Department of Cultural Affair Office of Archaeological Studies. (2014). *Pueblo San Cristóbal*. Retrieved from Galisteo Basin Archaeological Sites Protection Act: http://galisteo.nmarchaeology.org/sites/pueblo-san-cristobal.html

New Mexico Department of Game and Fish Conservation Services Division. (2012). *Bridge and Road Construction/Reconstruction Guidelines for Wetland and Riparian Areas.*

U.S. Climate Data. (2017). *Climate New Mexico*. Retrieved from U.S. Climate Data: http://www.usclimatedata.com/climate/new-mexico/united-states/3201

USDA NRCS. (2016, 8 10). *Web soil Survey.* Retrieved from https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm

USDA NRCS n.d. (n.d.). *Ecological Site Description Gravelly R035XG114NM .*

USDA NRCS n.d. (n.d.). *Ecological Site Description Riverine Riparian F036XA005NM .*

USDA NRCS n.d. (n.d.). *Ecological Site Description Loamy R035XA112NM .*

USDA NRCS n.d. (n.d.). *Ecological Site Description Salt Flats R035XA126NM.*

USDA NRCS n.d. (n.d.). *Ecological Site Description Sandy R035XA113NM .*

USDA NRCS n.d. (n.d.). *Ecological Site Description Shale Hills R035XA130NM .*

USDA USFS. (1996, September). Ecology, Diversity, and Sustainability of the Middle Rio Grande Basin, RM-GTR-268. (D. M. Finch, & J. A. Tainter, Eds.) Fort Collins, Colorado.

Appendix I - Photopoint Table

Name	Latitude	Longitude
16.11_1_134deg	35.3885	-105.8960
16.11_2_234deg	35.3885	-105.8950
16.11_3_140deg	35.3875	-105.9000
16.11_4_W	35.3845	-105.9300
16.11_PC_NESW	35.3827	-105.9340

Appendix II - Photos

16.11_134, taken inside of polygon 1, facing 134 degrees.

16.11_2_234, inside of Polygon 3, taken facing 234 degrees.

16.11_3_140 View of polygon 7, taken facing 140 degrees.

16.11_4_W. Taken outside of polygon 7, facing 270 degrees.

16-16 Plot Photos

N from PC

E from PC

S from PC

W from PC

Plot Center

Appendix III – Current monitoring methods available

Low-intensity methods

- Where: happens on all sites with GRGWA projects
- Method name: NMRAM (New Mexico Rapid Assessment Method v 2.1)
- Time required: 3 hours – half day/ site
- Repeat: done once pre-treatment and in 4-5 year intervals post-treatment
- Basics: mapping vegetation communities (by vertical and horizontal structure), recording dominant vegetation in each strata (trees, shrubs, herbaceous), assessing fuel load, noting soil surface condition and native/exotic ratio at all vegetation levels, photo points
- Any on-site impacts or materials: none

High-intensity methods

- Where: happens on select sites, in addition to low-intensity monitoring

Submethod name 1: BBIRD or BEMP vegetation plots (depends on treatment area size)

- Time required: approx. 2 hours/site
- Repeat: both pre-treatment and in 4-5 yr intervals post-treatment
- Basics: larger plots and transects documenting vegetation, photo points
- On-site impacts or materials: rebar and cap

Submethod name 2: Brown's transects

- Time required: 1-1.5 hours/site
- Repeat: both pre-treatment and in 4-5 yr intervals post-treatment
- Basics: transects to calculate fuel loading and fire behavior, photo points
- On-site impacts or materials: rebar and cap

Submethod name 3: BEMP-adapted Groundwater Well Monitoring

- Time required:
    - Initial installation: 1-2 hours/ well (ideally 2+ wells/site)
        - Repeat: maintenance as needed, should be minimal
    - Data offloading: 10-20 minutes/well
        - Repeat: at least annually (this is when we anticipate datalogger will be full and batteries will need to be changed)
- Basics: install a well with a sensor which records groundwater level and temperature once an hour year round; this will reflect changes due to seasonal variation, vegetation growth, irrigation, etc.
- On-site impacts or materials: shallow monitoring well (consists of capped PVC pipe extending into the ground about 3 feet below the water table and above ground approx. 2 feet (can be painted earth tones); well contains a datalogger (pressure transducer) suspended on a cable into the water); well should be protected from cattle grazing (so may require rebar around pvc visible above ground)

Appendix IV - Modified Hink and Ohmart categories, from NMRAM

The following is pages 39-41 in Muldavin et al.'s 2014 NMRAM for Montane Riverine Wetlands v 2.0 Manual (draft, not yet published)

Vegetation Vertical Structure Type Definitions for NMRAM

Multiple-Story Communities (Woodlands/Forests)

Type 1– High Structure Forest with a well-developed understory.

Tall mature to intermediate-aged trees (>5 m [>15 feet]) with canopy covering >25% of the area of the community (polygon)and understory layer (0-5 m [0-15 feet]) covering >25% of the area of the community (polygon). Substantial foliage is in all height layers. (This type incorporates Hink and Ohmart structure types 1 and 3.) Photograph on Gila River by Y. Chauvin, 2012.

Type 2 -Low Structure Forest with little or no understory.

Tall mature to intermediate-aged trees (>5 m [>15 feet]) with canopy covering >25% of the area of the community (polygon) and understory layer (1-5 m [3-15 feet]) covering <25% of the area of the community (polygon). Majority of foliage is over 5 m (15 feet) above the ground. (This type incorporates Hink and Ohmart structure types 2 and 4.) Photograph on Diamond Creek by Y. Chauvin, 2012.

Single-story Communities (Shrublands, Herbaceous and Bare Ground)

Type 5 -Tall Shrub Stands.

Young tree and shrub layer only (1.5-5 m [4.5-15 feet]) covering >25% of the area of the community (polygon). Stands dominated by tall shrubs and young trees, may include herbaceous vegetation underneath the woody vegetation. Photograph on San Francisco River by Y. Chauvin, 2012.



Type 6S-Short Shrub Stands.

Short stature shrubs or very young shrubs and trees (up to 1.5 m [up to 4.5 feet]) covering >10% of the area of the community (polygon). Stands dominated by short woody vegetation, may include herbaceous vegetation underneath the woody vegetation. Photograph on Lower Pecos River by E. Lindahl, 2008.

Type 6W-Herbaceous Wetland.

Herbaceous wetland vegetation covering >10% of the area of the community (polygon). Stands dominated by obligate wetland herbaceous species. Woody species absent, or <10% cover. Photograph of *Carex nebrascensis* meadow on upper Rio Santa Barbara by Y. Chauvin, 2009.



Type 6H-Herbaceous.

Herbaceous vegetation covering >10% of the area of the community (polygon). Stands dominated by herbaceous vegetation of any type except obligate wetland species. Woody species absent or <10% cover. Photograph on Diamond Creek by Y. Chauvin, 2012.

Type 7–Sparse Vegetation/Bare Ground.

Bare ground, may include sparse woody or herbaceous vegetation, but total vegetation cover <10%. May be natural in origin (cobble bars) or anthropogenic in origin (graded or plowed earth) Photograph on Lower Gila River by Y. Chauvin, 2012.