

Schueler 1994

Impervious cover is a powerful indicator of future stream quality

The Importance of Imperviousness

The emerging field of urban watershed protection often lacks a unifying theme to guide the efforts of its many participants—planners, engineers, landscape architects, scientists, and local officials. The lack of a common theme has often made it difficult to achieve a consistent result at either the individual development site or cumulatively, at the watershed scale.

In this article a unifying theme is proposed based on a physically defined unit—imperviousness. Imperviousness here is defined as the sum of roads, parking lots, sidewalks, rooftops, and other impermeable sur-

faces of the urban landscape. This variable can be easily measured at all scales of development, as the percentage of area that is not "green".

Imperviousness is a very useful indicator with which to measure the impacts of land development on aquatic systems. Reviewed here is the

scientific evidence that relates imperviousness to specific changes in the hydrology, habitat structure, water quality and biodiversity of aquatic systems. This research, conducted in many geographic areas, concentrating on many different variables, and employing widely different methods, has yielded a surprisingly similar conclusion—stream degradation occurs at relatively low levels of imperviousness (10-20%). Most importantly, imperviousness is one of the few variables that can be explicitly quantified, managed and controlled at each stage of land development. The remainder of this paper examines in detail the relationship between imperviousness and stream quality.

The Components of Imperviousness

Imperviousness represents the imprint of land development on the landscape. It is composed of two primary components—the *rooftops* under which we live, work and shop, and the *transport* system (roads, driveways, and parking lots) that we use to get from one roof to another. As it happens, the transport component now often exceeds the rooftop component in terms of total impervious area created. For example, transport-related imperviousness comprised 63% to 70% of total impervious cover at the site in 11 residential, multifamily and commercial areas where it had actually been measured.⁶ This phenomenon is observed most often in suburban areas and reflects the recent ascendancy of the automobile in both our culture and landscape. The sharp increases in per capita vehicle ownership, trips taken, and miles travelled

have forced local planners to increase the relative size of the transport component over the last two decades.

Traditional zoning has strongly emphasized and regulated the first component (rooftops) and largely neglected the transport component. While the rooftop component is largely fixed in density zoning, the transport component is not. As an example, nearly all zoning codes set the maximum density for an area, based on dwelling units (rooftops). Thus, in a given area, no more than one single family home can be located on each acre of land, and so forth.

Thus a wide range in impervious cover is often seen for the same zoning category. For example, impervious area associated with medium density single family homes can range from 25% to nearly 60%, depending on the layout of streets and parking. This suggests that significant opportunities exist to reduce the share of imperviousness from the transport component.

Imperviousness and runoff

The relationship between imperviousness and runoff may be widely understood, but it is not always fully appreciated. Figure 1 illustrates the increase in the site runoff coefficient as a result of site imperviousness, developed from over 40 runoff monitoring sites across the nation. The runoff coefficient ranges from zero to one and expresses the fraction of rainfall volume that is actually converted into storm runoff volume. As can be seen, the runoff coefficient closely tracks percent impervious cover, except at low levels where soils and slope factors also become important. In practical terms this means that the total runoff volume for a one-acre parking lot ($R_v = 0.95$) is about 16 times that produced by an undeveloped meadow ($R_v = 0.06$).

To put this in more understandable terms, consider the runoff from a one-inch rainstorm (see Table 1). The total runoff from a one-acre meadow would fill a standard size office to a depth of about two feet (218 cubic feet). By way of comparison, if that same acre was completely paved, a one-inch rainstorm would completely fill your office, as well as the *two* next to it. The peak discharge, velocity and time of concentration of stormwater runoff also exhibit a striking increase after a meadow is replaced by a parking lot (Table 1).


Because infiltration is reduced in impervious areas, one would expect groundwater recharge to be proportionately reduced. This, in turn, should translate into lower dry weather stream flows. Actual data, however, that demonstrate this effect is rare. Indeed, Evett et al.⁸ could not find any statistical difference in low stream

This research has yielded a surprisingly similar conclusion—stream degradation occurs at relatively low levels of imperviousness (10-20%).

Imperviousness (%)	Runoff Coefficient (Rv)
0.0	0.06
10.0	0.15
20.0	0.25
30.0	0.35
40.0	0.45
50.0	0.55
60.0	0.65
70.0	0.75
80.0	0.85
90.0	0.95
100.0	1.00

runoff from a one-inch rainstorm (see Table 1). The total runoff from a one-acre meadow would fill a standard size office to a depth of about two feet (218 cubic feet). By way of comparison, if that same acre was completely paved, a one-inch rainstorm would completely fill your office, as well as the two next to it.

Figure 1: Watershed imperviousness and the storm runoff coefficient



flow between urban and rural watersheds after analyzing 16 North Carolina watersheds. Simmons and Reynolds²⁶ did note that dry weather flows dropped 20 to 85% after development in several urban watersheds in Long Island, New York.

It should be noted that transport-related imperviousness often exerts a greater hydrological impact than the rooftop-related imperviousness. In residential areas, runoff from rooftops can be spread out over pervious areas, such as backyards, and rooftops are not always directly connected to the storm drain system. This may allow for additional infiltration of runoff. Roads and parking lots, on the other hand, are usually directly connected to the storm drain system.

Imperviousness and the Shape of Streams

Confronted by more severe and more frequent floods, stream channels must respond. They typically do so by increasing their cross-sectional area to accommodate the higher flows. This is done either through widening of the stream banks, downcutting of the stream bed, or frequently, both. This phase of channel instability, in turn, triggers a cycle of streambank erosion and habitat degradation.

The critical question is at what level of development does this cycle begin? Recent research models developed in the Pacific Northwest suggest that a threshold for urban stream stability exists at about 10% imperviousness^{3,4} (Figure 2). Watershed development beyond this threshold consistently resulted in unstable and eroding channels. The rate and severity of channel instability appears to be a function of sub-bankfull

floods, whose frequency can increase by a factor of 10 even at relatively low levels of imperviousness.^{14,19,23}

A major expression of channel instability is the loss of instream habitat structures, such as the loss of pool and riffle sequences and overhead cover, a reduction in the wetted perimeter of the stream and the like. A number of methods have been developed to measure the structure and quality of instream habitat in recent

Table 1: Comparison of one acre of parking lot versus one acre of meadow in good condition


Runoff or Water Quality Parameter	Parking Lot	Meadow
Curve number (CN)	98	58
Runoff coefficient	0.95	0.06
Time of concentration (minutes)	4.8	14.4
Peak discharge rate (cfs), 2 yr., 24 hr. storm	4.3	0.4
Peak discharge rate (cfs), 100 yr. storm	12.6	3.1
Runoff volume from one-inch storm (cubic feet)	3450	218
Runoff velocity @ 2 yr. storm (feet/second)	8	1.8
Annual phosphorus load (lbs/ac./yr.)	2	0.50
Annual nitrogen load (lbs/ac./yr.)	15.4	2.0
Annual zinc load (lbs/ac./yr.)	0.30	ND

Key Assumptions:

Parking lot is 100% impervious with 3% slope, 200 feet flow length, Type 2 Storm, 2 yr. 24 hr. storm = 3.1 inches, 100 yr. storm = 8.9 inches, hydraulic radius = 0.3, concrete channel, and suburban Washington 'C' values.

Meadow is 1% impervious with 3% slope, 200 foot flow length, good vegetative condition, B soils, and earthen channel.

Figure 2: Channel stability as a function of imperviousness
(Booth and Reinekt, 1993)



years.^{10,13,21} Where these tools have been applied to urban streams, they have consistently demonstrated that a sharp threshold in habitat quality exists at approximately 10 to 15% imperviousness.^{4,11,25} Beyond this threshold, urban stream habitat quality is consistently classified as poor.

Imperviousness and water quality

Impervious surfaces collect and accumulate pollutants deposited from the atmosphere, leaked from vehicles or derived from other sources. During storms, accumulated pollutants are quickly washed off and rapidly delivered to aquatic systems.

Monitoring and modeling studies have consistently indicated that urban pollutant loads are directly related to watershed imperviousness. Indeed, imperviousness is the key predictive

variable in most simulation and empirical models used to estimate pollutant loads. For example, the Simple Method assumes that pollutant loads are a direct function of watershed imperviousness²³, as imperviousness is the key independent variable in the equation.

Threshold limits for maintaining background pollutant loads

Suppose that watershed runoff drains into a lake that is phosphorus-limited. Also assume that the present background load of phosphorus from a rural land use amounts to 0.5 lbs/ac/yr. The Simple Method predicts that the postdevelopment phosphorus load will exceed background loads once watershed imperviousness (I) exceeds 20 to 25% (Figure 3), thereby increasing the risk of nutrient overenrichment in the lake.

Urban phosphorus loads can be reduced when urban best management practices (BMPs) are installed, such as stormwater ponds, wetlands, filters or infiltration practices. Performance monitoring data indicates that BMPs can reduce phosphorus loads by as much as 40 to 60%, depending on the practice selected. The impact of this pollutant reduction on the postdevelopment phosphorus loading rate from the site is shown in Figure 3. The net effect is to raise the phosphorus threshold to about 35%–60% imperviousness, depending on the performance of the BMP we install. Therefore, even when effective practices are widely applied, we eventually cross a threshold of imperviousness, beyond which we cannot maintain predevelopment water quality.

Imperviousness and stream warming

Impervious surfaces both absorb and reflect heat. During the summer months, impervious areas can have local air and ground temperatures that are 10 to 12 degrees warmer than the fields and forests that they replace. In addition, the trees that could have provided shade to offset the effects of solar radiation are absent.

Water temperature in headwater streams is strongly influenced by local air temperatures. Galli⁹ reported that stream temperatures throughout the summer are increased in urban watersheds, and the degree of warming appears to be directly related to the imperviousness of the contributing watershed. He monitored five headwater streams in the Maryland Piedmont over a six-month period, the streams having differing levels of impervious cover (Figure 4). Each of the urban streams had mean temperatures that were consistently warmer than a forested reference stream, and the size of the increase (referred to as the delta-T) appeared to be a direct function of watershed imperviousness. Other factors, such as lack of riparian cover and ponds, were also demonstrated to amplify stream warming, but the primary contributing factor appeared to be watershed impervious cover.⁹

Imperviousness and stream biodiversity

The health of the aquatic ecosystem is a strong environmental indicator of watershed quality. A number of research studies have recently examined the links between imperviousness and the biological diversity in streams. Some of the key findings are summarized in Table 2.

Aquatic insects

The diversity, richness and composition of the benthic or streambed community has frequently been used to evaluate the quality of urban streams. Not only are aquatic insects a useful environmental indicator, but they also form the base of the stream food chain in most regions of the country.

Habitat assessment tools have consistently demonstrated that a sharp threshold in habitat quality exists at approximately 10 to 15% imperviousness.

Figure 3: The effect of impervious cover on urban phosphorus load under several scenarios, as computed by the Simple Method






Figure 4: The effect of impervious cover on stream temperature (Galli, 1991)



Delta-t is the difference in mean or max stream temperature from a developed stream, compared to an undisturbed stream.

Figure 5: Impacts of imperviousness on macroinvertebrate communities in the headwater streams of the Anacostia River (Schueler and Galli, 1992)



Metric Values are based upon the sum of scores assigned for the following categories: EPTC balance, EPT Index, Average Generic Diversity, Chironomid Abundance, Taxonomic Richness (Family and Generic)

Klein¹⁶ was one of the first to note that macroinvertebrate diversity drops sharply in urban streams in Maryland. Diversity consistently became poor when watershed imperviousness exceeded 10 to 15 percent. The same basic threshold has been reported by all other research studies that have looked at macroinvertebrate diversity in urban streams (Table 2).

In each study, sensitive macroinvertebrates were replaced by ones that were more tolerant of pollution and hydrologic stress. Species such as stoneflies, mayflies, and caddisflies largely disappeared and were replaced by chironomids, tubificid worms, amphipods, and snails. Species that employ specialized feeding strategies—shredding leaf litter, grazing rock surfaces, filtering organic matter that flows by, and preying on other insects—were lost.

A typical example of the relationship between imperviousness and macroinvertebrate diversity is shown in Figure 5. The graph summarizes diversity trend for 23 sampling stations in headwater streams of the Anacostia watershed.²⁴ While good to fair diversity was noted in all headwater streams with less than 10% imperviousness, nearly all stations with 12% or more impervious cover recorded poor diversity. The same sharp drop in macroinvertebrate diversity at around 12

to 15% imperviousness was also observed in streams in the coastal plain and piedmont of Delaware.²⁵

Other studies have utilized other indicators to measure the impacts of urbanization on stream insect communities. For example, Jones and Clark¹⁵ monitored 22 stations in Northern Virginia and concluded that benthic insect diversity composition changed markedly after watershed population density exceeded four or more individuals per acre. The population density roughly translates to half-acre or one acre lot residential use, or perhaps 10 to 20 percent imperviousness.

Steedman²⁷ evaluated 208 Ontario stream sites, and concluded that benthic diversity shifted from fair to poor at about 35% urban land use. Since "urban land" includes both pervious and impervious areas, the actual threshold in the Ontario study may well be closer to 7 to 10% imperviousness.⁴ Steedman also reported that urban streams with intact riparian forests had higher diversity than those that did not, for the same level of urbanization.

While the exact point at which stream insect diversity shifts from fair to poor is not known with absolute precision, it is clear that few, if any, urban streams can support diverse benthic communities at moderate to high levels of imperviousness (25% or more). Four different studies all failed to find stream insect communities with good or excellent diversity in any highly urban stream.^{1,2,3,12}

It is clear that few, if any, urban streams can support diverse benthic communities at moderate to high levels of imperviousness (25% or more).

Table 2: Review of key findings of urban stream studies examining the relationship of urbanization on stream quality

Ref.	Year	Location	Biological Parameter	Key Finding
3	1991	Seattle	Fish habitat/ channel stability	Channel stability and fish habitat quality declined rapidly after 10% imperv.
11	1994	Maryland	Brown trout	Abundance and recruitment of brown trout declines sharply at 10-15% imperv.
1	1981	Atlanta	Aquatic insects	Negative relationship between number of insect species and urbanization in 21 streams
15	1987	Northern Virginia	Aquatic insects	Urban streams had sharply lower diversity of aquatic insects when human population density exceeded 4 persons/acre. (estimated 15-25% imperv. cover)
17	1990	New York	Fish spawning	Resident and anadromous fish eggs and larvae declined sharply in 16 tributary streams greater than 10% imperv.
25	1994	Delaware	Aquatic insects	Insect diversity at 19 stream sites dropped sharply at 8 to 15% imperv.
25	1994	Delaware	Habitat quality	Strong relationship between insect diversity and habitat quality; majority of 53 urban streams had poor habitat
24	1992	Maryland	Fish	Fish diversity declined sharply with increasing imperv., loss in diversity began at 10-12% imperv.
24	1992	Maryland	Aquatic insects	Insect diversity metrics in 24 subwatersheds shifted from good to poor over 15% imperv.
2	1994	Maryland	Fish/insects	Fish, insect and habitat scores were all ranked as poor in 5 subwatersheds that were greater than 30% imperv.
16	1979	Maryland	Aquatic insects/fish	Macroinvertebrate and fish diversity declines rapidly after 10% imperv.
18	1993	Seattle	Fish	Marked shift from less tolerant coho salmon to more tolerant cutthroat trout populations noted at 10-15% imperv. at 9 sites
27	1988	Ontario	Aquatic insects	Strong negative relationship between biotic integrity and increasing urban land use/riparian condition at 209 stream sites. Degradation begins at about 10% imperv.
20	1986	Seattle	Aquatic insects	Macroinvertebrate community shifted to chironomid, oligochaetes and amphipod species tolerant of unstable conditions.
28	1983	Seattle	Salmon	Marked reduction in coho salmon populations noted at 10-15% imperv. at 9 sites
29	1993	Seattle	Wetland plants/ amphibians	Mean annual water fluctuation was inversely correlated to plant and amphibian density in urban wetlands. Sharp declines noted over 10% imperv.
12	1986	New Jersey	Aquatic insects	Drop in insect taxa from 13 to 4 noted in urban streams
30	1991	Ohio	Aquatic insects/ fish	100% of 40 urban sites sampled had fair to very poor index of biotic integrity scores

Fish Surveys

The abundance and diversity of the fish community can also serve as an excellent environmental indicator. Surprisingly, relatively few studies have examined the influence of imperviousness on fish communities in headwater streams. The results of one study is illustrated in Figure 6. Four similar subwatersheds in the Maryland Piedmont were sampled for the number of fish species present. As the level of watershed imperviousness increased, the number of fish species collected dropped. Two sensitive species (trout and sculpin) were lost as imperviousness increased from 10 to 12% and four more were lost when impervious cover increased to 25%. Significantly, only two species remained in the fish community at 55% imperviousness. Sensitive species, defined as those with a strong dependence on the substrate for feeding and/or spawning, showed a more precipitous decline. Klein¹⁶ found a similar relationship between fish diversity and watershed imperviousness in several dozen headwater streams in the Maryland Piedmont.

Salmonid fish species (trout and salmon) and anadromous fish species appear to be most negatively impacted by imperviousness. Trout have stringent temperature and habitat requirements, and seldom are present in mid-Atlantic watersheds where imperviousness exceeds 15%.¹¹ Declines in trout spawning success are evident above 10% imperviousness.¹¹ In the Pacific Northwest, Luchetti and Feurstenburg¹⁸ sel-

dom found sensitive coho salmon in watersheds beyond 10 or 15% imperviousness. Booth and Reinelt⁴ noted that most urban stream reaches had poor quality fish habitat when imperviousness exceeded 8 to 12%.


Fish species that migrate from the ocean to spawn in freshwater creeks are also very susceptible to impacts of urbanization such as fish barriers, pollution, flow changes, and other factors. For example, Limburg and Schmidt¹⁷ discovered that the density of anadromous fish eggs and larvae declined sharply after a 10% imperviousness threshold was surpassed in 16 subwatersheds draining into the Hudson River.

The influence of imperviousness on other urban water resources

Several other studies point to the strong influence of imperviousness on other important aquatic systems such as shellfish beds and wetlands.

Even relatively low levels of urban development yield high levels of bacteria, derived from urban runoff or failing septic systems. These consistently high bacterial counts often result in the closure of shellfish beds in coastal waters and it is not surprising, that most closed shellfish beds are in close proximity to urban areas. Indeed, it may be difficult to prevent shellfish closure when more than one septic drain field is present per seven acres—a very low urban density.⁷ Although it is widely believed that urban runoff accounts for

Figure 6: Fish diversity as a function of watershed imperviousness in four subwatersheds in the Maryland Piedmont (Schueler and Galli, 1992)



Numbers in brackets represent levels of watershed imperviousness.

Sources: 1) MdDNR, 1983 2) MdDNR, 1986 3) ICPRB, 1989

many shellfish bed closures (now that most point sources have been controlled), no systematic attempt has yet been made to relate watershed imperviousness to the extent of shellfish bed closures.

Taylor²⁹ examined the effect of watershed development on 19 freshwater wetlands in King County, Washington, and concluded that the additional stormwater contributed to greater annual water level fluctuations (WLF). When the annual WLF exceeded about 8 inches, the richness of both the wetland plant and amphibian community dropped sharply. This increase in WLF began to occur consistently when upstream watersheds exceeded 10 to 15% imperviousness.

Implications at the Watershed Level

The many independent lines of research reviewed here converge toward a common conclusion—that it is extremely difficult to maintain predevelopment stream quality when watershed development exceeds 10 to 15% impervious cover. What implications might this apparent threshold have for watershed planning?

Should low density or high density development be encouraged?

At first glance, it would seem appropriate to limit watershed development to no more than 10% total impervious cover. While this approach may be wise for an individual "sensitive" watershed, it is probably not practical as a uniform standard. Only low density development would be feasible under a ten percent zoning scenario, perhaps one-acre lot residential zoning, with a few widely scattered commercial clusters. At the regional scale, development would thus be spread over a much wider geographic area than it would otherwise have been. At the same time, additional impervious area (in the form of roads) would be needed to link the community together.

Paradoxically, the best way to minimize the creation of additional impervious area at the regional scale is to concentrate it in high density clusters or centers. The corresponding impervious cover in these clusters is expected to be very high (25% to 100%), making it virtually impossible to maintain predevelopment stream quality. A watershed manager must then confront the fact that to save one stream's quality it may be necessary to degrade another.

A second troubling implication of the impervious/stream quality relationships involves the large expanses of urban areas that have already been densely developed. Will it be possible to fully restore stream quality in watersheds with high impervious cover? Some early watershed restoration work does suggest that biological diversity in urban streams can be partially restored, but only after extensive stormwater retrofit and habitat structures are installed. For ex-

ample, fish and macroinvertebrate diversity has been partially restored in one tributary of Sligo Creek, Maryland.¹¹ In other urban watersheds, however, comprehensive watershed restoration may not be feasible, due to a lack of space, feasible sites, or funding.

A proposed scheme for classifying urban stream quality potential

The thresholds provide a reasonable foundation for classifying the potential stream quality in a watershed based on the ultimate amount of impervious cover. One such scheme is outlined in Table 3. It divides urban streams into three management categories based on the general relationships between impervious cover and stream quality:

1. Stressed streams (1 to 10% impervious cover)
2. Impacted streams (11 to 25% impervious cover)
3. Degraded streams (26 to 100% impervious cover)

The resource objective and management strategies in each stream category differ to reflect the potential stream quality that can be achieved. The most protective category are "stressed streams" in which strict zoning, site impervious restrictions, stream buffers and BMPs are applied to maintain predevelopment stream quality. "Impacted streams" are above the threshold and can be expected to experience some degradation after development (i.e., less stable channels and some loss of diversity). The key resource objective for these streams is to mitigate these impacts to the greatest extent possible, using effective BMPs.

The last category, degraded streams, recognizes that predevelopment channel stability and biodiversity cannot be fully maintained, even when BMPs or retrofits are fully applied. The primary resource objective shifts to protect downstream water quality by removing urban pollutants. Efforts to protect or restore biological diversity in degraded streams are not abandoned; in some priority subwatersheds intensive stream restoration techniques are employed to attempt to partially restore some aspects of stream quality. In other subwatersheds, however, new development (and impervious cover) is encouraged to take place so as to protect stressed and impacted streams.

Watershed-based zoning

Watershed-based zoning is based on the premise that impervious cover is a superior measure to gauge the impacts of growth, compared to population density, dwelling units or other factors. The key steps in

Paradoxically, the best way to minimize the creation of additional impervious area at the regional scale is to concentrate it in high density clusters.

Table 3: A possible scheme for classifying and managing for headwater urban streams based on ultimate imperviousness

Urban Stream Classification	Stressed (0-10% Imperv.)	Impacted (11-25% Imperv.)	Degraded (26-100% Imperv.)
Channel stability	Stable	Unstable	Highly Unstable
Water quality	Good	Fair	Fair-Poor
Stream biodiversity	Good-Excellent	Fair-Good	Poor
Resource objective	Protect biodiversity and channel stability	Maintain critical elements of stream quality	Minimize downstream pollutant loads
Water quality objectives	Sediment and temperature	Nutrient and metal loads	Control bacteria
BMP Selection Factors	Secondary environmental impacts	Removal efficiency	Removal efficiency
Land Use Controls	Watershed-wide imp. cover limits (ICLs), site ICLs	Site imp. cover limits (ICLs)	Additional infill and redevelopment encouraged
Monitoring and enforcement	GIS monitoring of imp. cover, biomonitoring	Same as "Stressed"	Pollutant load modeling
Development rights	Transferred out	None	Transferred in
Riparian buffers	Widest buffer network	Average bufferwidth	Greenways

watershed-based zoning are as follows. *First*, a community undertakes a comprehensive physical, chemical and biological monitoring program to assess the current quality of its entire inventory of streams. The data are used to identify the most sensitive stream systems and to refine impervious/stream quality relationships. *Next*, existing imperviousness is measured and mapped at the subwatershed level. Projections of future impervious cover due to forecasted growth are also made at this time.

The *third* step involves designating the future stream quality for each subwatershed based on some adaptation of the urban stream classification scheme presented earlier. The existing land use master plan is then modified to ensure that future growth (and impervious cover) is consistent with the designated stream classification for each subwatershed.

The *final* step in the watershed-based zoning process involves the adoption of specific resource objectives for each stream and subwatershed. Specific policies and practices on impervious cover limits, BMPs, and buffers are then instituted to meet the stream resource objective, and these practices directly applied to future development projects.

Watershed-based zoning should provide managers with greater confidence that resource protection objectives can be met in future development. It also forces local governments to make hard choices about which streams will be fully protected and which will become

at least partially degraded. Some environmentalists and regulators will be justifiably concerned about the streams whose quality is explicitly sacrificed under this scheme. The explicit stream quality decisions which are at the heart of watershed-based zoning, however, are preferable to the uninformed and random "non-decisions" that are made every day under the present zoning system.

A cautionary note

While the research on impervious cover and stream quality is compelling, it is doubtful whether it can serve as the sole foundation for legally defensible zoning and regulatory actions at the current time. One key reason is that the research has not been standardized. Different investigators, for example, have used different methods to define and measure imperviousness. Second, researchers have employed a wide number of techniques to measure stream quality characteristics that are not always comparable with each other. Third, most of the studies have been confined to few ecoregions in the country. Little research has been conducted in the Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, and semi-arid Western regions. Lastly, none of the studies has yet examined the effect of widespread application of BMPs on impervious cover/stream quality relationships. Until studies determine how much BMPs can "cheat" the impervious cover/stream quality relationship, it can be argued that structural practices alone can compensate for imperviousness effects.

On the positive side, it may be possible for a community to define the impervious cover/stream quality relationship in a short time and at relatively low cost. A suggested protocol for conducting a watershed monitoring study is presented in Table 4. The protocol emphasizes comparative sampling of a large population of urban subwatersheds of different increments of imperviousness (perhaps 20 to 50).

A rapid sampling program collects consistent data on hydrologic, morphologic, water quality, habitat and biodiversity variables within each subwatershed. For comparison purposes, series of undeveloped and undisturbed reference streams are also monitored. The sampling data are then statistically and graphically analyzed to determine the presence of imperviousness/stream quality relationships.

The protocol can be readily adapted to examine how BMPs can shift the stream quality/imperviousness relationship. This is done by adjusting the sampling protocol to select two groups of study subwatersheds—those that are effectively served by BMPs and those that are not.

Site designers can use a wide range of techniques to minimize impervious cover by 10 to 50%.

Minimizing impervious cover

Reducing impervious cover can be an effective element of the overall BMP system for a development site. As noted earlier, imperviousness need not be a fixed quantity. A site designer can utilize a wide range of techniques to minimize impervious cover at development site (Table 5) that collectively can reduce imperviousness by 10 to 50%. (See *Technical Notes 38 and 39 in this issue.*)

Table 4: Proposed protocol for defining functional relationships between watershed imperviousness and stream quality

■ General study design

A systematic evaluation of stream quality for a population of 20 to 50 small subwatersheds that have different levels of watershed imperviousness. Selected field measurements are collected to represent key hydrological, morphological, water quality, habitat and biodiversity variables within each defined subwatershed. The population of subwatershed data is then statistically analyzed to define functional relationships between stream quality and imperviousness.

■ Defining reference streams

Up to 5 non-urban streams in same geo-hydrological region, preferably fully forested, or at least full riparian forest coverage along same length. Free of confounding NPS sources, imperviousness less than 5%, natural channel and good habitat structure.

■ Basic Subwatershed Variables

Watershed area, standard definition and method to calculate imperviousness, presence/absence of BMPs.

■ Selecting subwatersheds

Drainage areas from 100 to 500 acres, known level of imperviousness and age, free of confounding sources (active construction, mining, agriculture, or point sources). Select three random non-overlapping reaches (100 feet) for summer and winter sampling of selected variables in each of five key variables groups:

1. **Hydrology variables:** summer dry weather flow, wetted perimeter, cross-sectional area of stream, peak annual storm flow (if gaged).
2. **Channel morphology variables:** channel alteration, height, angle and extent of bank erosion, substrate embeddedness, sediment deposition, substrate quality.
3. **Water quality variables:** summer water temperature, turbidity, total dissolved solids, substrate fouling index, EP toxicity test, wet weather bacteria, wet weather hydrocarbon.
4. **Habitat Variables:** pool-riffle ratio, pool frequency, depth and substrate, habitat complexity, instream cover, riffle substrate quality, riparian vegetative cover, riffle embeddedness
5. **Ecological Variables:** fish diversity, macroinvertebrate diversity, index of biological integrity, EPA Rapid Bioassessment Protocol, fish barriers, leaf pack processing rate.

Table 5: Twenty-four strategies to minimize impervious area at the site level (adapted from City of Olympia, 1994; Schueler, 1995; and PZC, 1992)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Narrower residential road widths | 13. Vertical parking structures |
| 2. Reduced road lengths | 14. Two and three story buildings |
| 3. Hourglass streets | 15. Stream buffers |
| 4. Cluster development | 16. Grass swales rather than curb/gutters |
| 5. Shared driveways | 17. Open space requirements (residential) |
| 6. Angled parking with one way traffic flow | 18. Open space landscaping requirements (comm). |
| 7. Smaller parking stalls | 19. Sidewalks only on one-side of street |
| 8. Reduced parking space ratios for some uses | 20. Reduced side and rear yard setbacks |
| 9. Shared parking facilities in commercial areas | 21. Decrease distance between lots (frontage) |
| 10. Shorter residential driveways | 22. Hammerhead-shaped turnarounds |
| 11. Reduced cul-de-sac radii | 23. Rear yard grading to buffer |
| 12. Cul-de-sac donuts | 24. Permeable spillover parking areas |

Conclusion

Research has revealed that imperviousness is a powerful and important indicator of future stream quality and that significant degradation occurs at relatively low levels of development. The strong relationship between imperviousness and stream quality presents a serious challenge for urban watershed managers. It underscores the difficulty in maintaining urban stream quality in the face of development.

At the same time, imperviousness represents a common currency that can be measured and managed by planners, engineers and landscape architects alike. It links activities of the individual development site with its cumulative impact at the watershed scale. With further research, impervious cover can serve as an important foundation for more effective land use planning decisions.

References

1. Benke, A. E. Willeke, F. Parrish and D. Stites. 1981. Effects of urbanization on stream ecosystems. Completion report Project No. A-055-GA. Office of Water Research and Technology. US Dept. of Interior.
2. Black and Veatch. 1994. Longwell Branch Restoration-feasibility study. Vol 1. Carroll County, MD Office of Environmental Services. 220 pp.
3. Booth, D. 1991. Urbanization and the natural drainage system-impacts, solutions and prognoses. Northwest Environmental Journal. 7(1): 93-118.
4. Booth, D. and L. Reinelt. 1993. Consequences of Urbanization on Aquatic Systems.— measured effects, degradation thresholds, and corrective strategies. pp. 545-550 in Proceedings Watershed '93 A National conference on Watershed Management. March 21-24, 1993. Alexandria, Virginia.
5. City of Olympia, 1994(a). Impervious Surface Reduction Study: Technical and Policy Analysis—Final Report. Public Works Department, Olympia, Washington. 83 pp.
6. City of Olympia, 1994(b). Impervious Surface Reduction Study. Draft Final Report. Public Works Department. City of Olympia, Washington. 183 pp.
7. Duda, A and K. Cromartie. 1982. Coastal pollution from septic tank drainfields. Journal of the Environmental Engineering Division (ASCE) 108 (EE6).
8. Evett et al. 1994. Effects of urbanization and land use changes on low stream flow. North Carolina Water Resources Research Institute, Report No. 284. 66 pp.
9. Galli, J. 1991. Thermal impacts associated with urbanization and stormwater management best management practices. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Maryland Department of Environment. Washington, D.C. 188 pp.
10. Galli, J. 1993. Rapid Stream Assessment Technique. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Washington, D.C.

11. Galli, J. 1994. Personal communication. Department of Environmental Programs. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Washington, DC.
12. Garie, H and A. McIntosh. 1986. Distribution of benthic macroinvertebrates in streams exposed to urban runoff. *Water Resources Bulletin* 22:447-458.
13. Gibson, G.,M. Barbour, J. Stribling and J. Karr. 1993. *Biological Criteria: Technical Guidance for Streams and Small Rivers*. US EPA Assessment and Watershed Protection Division, Washington, D.C.
14. Hollis, G. 1975. The effect of urbanization on floods of different recurrence intervals. *Water Resources Res.* 11(3): 431-435.
15. Jones, R. and C. Clark. 1987. Impact of Watershed Urbanization on Stream Insect Communities. American Water Resources Association. *Water Resources Bulletin*. 15(4)
16. Klein, R. 1979. Urbanization and stream quality impairment. American Water Resources Association. *Water Resources Bulletin*. 15(4).
17. Limburg, K and R. Schimdt. 1990. Patterns of fish spawning in Hudson river tributaries—response to an urban gradient? *Ecology* 71(4): 1231-1245.
18. Luchetti, G and R. Fuersteburg, 1993. Relative fish use in urban and non-urban streams. proceedings. Conference on Wild Salmon. Vancouver, British Columbia.
19. Macrae, C and J. Marsalek. 1992. The role of stormwater in sustainable urban development. Proceedings Canadian Hydrology Symposium: 1992-hydrology and its contribution to sustainable development, June 1992. Winnipeg, Canada.
20. Pedersen, E and M. Perkins. 1986. The use of benthic invertebrate data for evaluating impacts of urban runoff. *Hydrobiologia*. 139: 13-22.
21. Plafkin, J. M. Barbour, K. Porter, S. Gross and R. Hughes. 1989. Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for use in streams in rivers: benthic macroinvertebrates and fish. US EPA Office of Water. EPA-444(440)/4-3901. Washington, D.C.
22. Planning & Zoning Center, Inc. 1992. Grand Traverse Bay Region Development Guidebook, Lansing Michigan. 125 pp.
23. Schueler, T. 1987. Controlling urban runoff—a practical manual for planning and designing urban best management practices. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Washington, DC 240 pp.
24. Schueler, T. and John Galli. 1992. Environmental Impacts of Stormwater Ponds. in *Watershed Restoration SourceBook*. Anacostia Restoration Team. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Washington, DC. 242 pp.
25. Shaver, E., J. Maxted, G. Curtis and D. Carter. 1995. Watershed Protection Using an Integrated Approach. in *Stormwater NPDES Related Monitoring Needs*. Engineering Foundation. American Society of Civil Engineers. Crested Butte, CO. August 7-12, 1994.
26. Simmons, D and R. Reynolds. 1982. Effects of urbanization on baseflow of selected south-shore streams, Long Island, NY. *Water Resources Bulletin*. 18(5): 797-805.
27. Steedman, R. J. 1988. Modification and assessment of an index of biotic integrity to quantify stream quality in Southern Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 45:492-501.
28. Steward, C. 1983. Salmonid populations in an urban environment—Kelsey Creek., Washington. Masters thesis. University of Washington.
29. Taylor, B.L. 1993. the influences of wetland and watershed morphological characteristics and relationships to wetland vegetation communities. Master's thesis. Dept. of Civil Engineering. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
30. Yoder C., 1991. The integrated biosurvey as a tool for evaluation of aquatic life use attainment and impairment in Ohio surface waters. in *Biological Criteria: Research and Regulation*; 1991.