



Arundo donax
Distribution and Impact Report

March 2011

**Agreement No. 06-374-559-0
State Water Resources Control Board**

***Prepared by:* California Invasive Plant Council**

***Arundo donax* (giant reed): Distribution and Impact Report**
March 2011

Agreement: No. 06-374-559-0

Submitted to: State Water Resources Control Board

Submitted by: California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC)

Authors:

Jason Giessow, Dendra Inc. (Chapters 2, 4.2, 5.2, 6-10)

Jason Casanova, Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council
(Chapters 3, 5.2)

Rene Leclerc, Robert MacArthur, Northwest Hydraulic Consultants (Chapter 5.1)

Genie Fleming, Consultant (Chapter 4.1)

Jesse Giessow (Else), Dendra Inc. (Chapter 1)

With contributions by:

Elizabeth Brusati, Cal-IPC

John Tangenberg, Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council

Brad Roth, Consultant

Doug Johnson, Cal-IPC

**This report and spatial data set (GIS geo-database) are available for
download at:**

<http://www.cal-ipc.org/ip/research/arundo/index.php>

or

<http://www.cal-ipc.org/ip/mapping/arundo/index.php>

The spatial data set is also viewable at the DFG BIOS web site:

<http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/>

BIOS project data sets are named:

Invasive Plants (Species) - Central_So. Cal Coastal Watersheds [ds645]

Invasive Plants (Prct Cover) - Central_So. Cal Coastal Watersheds [ds646]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</i>	1
<i>1.0 INTRODUCTION</i>	4
<i>2.0 ARUNDO BIOLOGY</i>	5
2.1 Physiology.....	5
2.2 Genetic variation.....	5
2.3 Physical Structure	5
2.4 Biomass and Cane Density	21
2.5 Growth Rate	23
2.6 Reproduction and Spread.....	24
2.6.1 <i>Within Stand Spread</i>	24
2.6.2 <i>Spread Within A Watershed</i>	25
2.6.3 <i>Historic Air photo Analysis: Stand Growth Rates and Spread Within Watershed</i>	26
2.6.4 <i>Spread Between Watersheds</i>	26
2.7 Ecological Function: Abiotic and Biotic.....	26
2.7.1 <i>Abiotic</i>	26
2.7.2 <i>Biotic</i>	27
2.7.2.1 <i>Vegetation</i>	27
2.7.2.2 <i>Arthropods</i>	27
2.7.2.3 <i>Wildlife</i>	28
2.8 <i>Arundo Biology: Conclusions</i>	29
<i>3.0 SPATIAL DATA SET: The Distribution and Abundance of Arundo from Monterey to Mexico</i>	30
3.1 Methodology.....	30
3.1.1 <i>Step-by-Step Process</i>	30
3.1.2 <i>Data Quality</i>	34
3.2 Results: Acreage by Watershed and Region.....	37
3.3 Conclusions: Distribution and Abundance	38
<i>4.0 IMPACTS OF ARUNDO: Arundo Water Use and Stand Transpiration</i>	40
4.1 Determining Arundo Water Use (Stand transpiration).....	40
4.1.1 <i>Background:</i>	40
4.1.2 <i>Methods</i>	40
4.1.3 <i>Results and Discussion</i>	46
4.2 <i>Arundo Water Use Across Study Area</i>	47
<i>5.0 IMPACTS OF ARUNDO: Hydrology, Geomorphology and Flooding</i>	50
5.1 Hydraulics, Sediment Transport, Geomorphology	50
5.1.1 <i>Introduction</i>	50
5.1.2 <i>Arundo and River Morphology</i>	51
5.1.2.1 <i>Arundo in the River Environment</i>	51

General Characteristics	51
Dispersal & Establishment.....	52
Rates of Spread	52
Erosion of <i>Arundo</i> Stands by Floods	52
5.1.2.2 Observed Effects on Rivers	53
Introduction and Context	53
Long-term Historical Studies.....	53
General Observations.....	53
Trends in Width and Planform.....	54
Vertical Adjustments of the Bed and Floodplain.....	54
Lateral Migration and Bank Erosion.....	55
5.1.2.3 Observed Effects on Hydraulics and Sediment Transport.....	55
Response to <i>Arundo</i> Removal or Eradication.....	56
5.1.2.4 Summary of Understanding	56
5.1.3 <i>Southern California Study Streams</i>	57
5.1.3.1 Introduction.....	57
5.1.3.2 Study Streams	57
5.1.3.3 CAL-IPC GIS Analysis.....	57
5.1.3.4 Study Stream Characteristics	58
General Morphology.....	58
<i>Arundo</i> Characteristics.....	59
5.1.4. <i>Santa Margarita River Case Study</i>	63
5.1.4.1 Introduction.....	63
5.1.4.2 Santa Margarita Watershed.....	63
5.1.4.3 Climate and Hydrology.....	63
5.1.4.4 Lower Santa Margarita River.....	64
5.1.4.5 Historical Changes in the Project Reach.....	68
Planform.....	68
Bed Profiles.....	68
Floodplain Vegetation.....	69
<i>Arundo</i> Eradication Programs.....	69
5.1.4.6 Project Reach Hydraulics.....	69
HEC-RAS Model	69
Model Calibration	70
Model Scenarios.....	71
Peak Flows	72
Hydraulic Model Results for the 4 Scenarios	72
Design Water Surface Profiles.....	73
Channel and Floodplain Velocities.....	74
Results by Sub-Reach	75
5.1.4.7 Project Reach Sediment Budget.....	76
Introduction and Context	76
Sediment Budget Considerations.....	76
Santa Margarita River Sediment Loads	76
Sediment Capture by <i>Arundo</i>	76
Erosion in the Main Channel from <i>Arundo</i> Growth	77
Project Reach Sediment Budget Summary.....	77
5.1.4.8 Project Reach Sediment Transport Capacity	78
Introduction and Context	78

Approach to Transport Capacity	78
Stream Power for Different Scenarios	79
Stream Power by Sub-Reach	80
5.1.4.9 Case Study Summary	81
5.1.5. <i>Study Stream Arundo Responses</i>	83
5.1.5.1 Introduction	83
5.1.5.2 <i>Arundo</i> Impact Scoring System	83
Width Ratio Score	83
<i>Arundo</i> Coverage Score	84
Changes in Floodplain Width and Bed Slope Scores	84
Other Features	85
5.1.5.3 Santa Margarita River	85
5.1.5.4 San Luis Rey River	86
5.1.5.5 Santa Ana River	87
5.1.5.6 Application of Scoring System	88
5.1.6. <i>Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	88
5.2 Geomorphology and Hydrology: Spatial Analysis	90
5.2.1 <i>Arundo's Distribution Within Geomorphic Forms</i>	90
5.2.1.1 Methods	90
5.2.1.2 Results	91
5.2.1.3 Discussion	101
5.2.2 <i>Geomorphology Historic Analysis</i>	101
5.2.2.1 Methods	102
5.2.2.2 Results	106
5.2.2.3 Conclusions	107
5.2.3 <i>Vegetation Cover Historic Analysis</i>	111
5.2.3.1 Methods	111
5.2.3.2 Results	111
5.2.3.3 Conclusions	111
5.2.4 <i>Geomorphology and Hydrologic Modification by Arundo</i>	118
5.2.5 <i>Infrastructure Impacts: Roads, Bridges, Levees, Sewer/Water Transfer, Beaches</i>	119
5.2.5.1 <i>Bridges & Levees</i>	119
5.2.5.2 Biomass on Beaches	120
5.2.5.3 Conclusions: Impacts to Infrastructure	122
6.0 <i>IMPACTS OF ARUNDO: Fire</i>	123
6.1 Fuel Load	123
6.2 Fire Intensity	124
6.3 Ignition Sources	127
6.3.1 <i>Human Ignition Sources:</i>	127
6.3.2 <i>Wildland Fire As An Ignition Source:</i>	132
6.4 Spatial Distribution and Frequency of <i>Arundo</i> Fires	132
6.4.1 <i>Fires Starting in Arundo</i>	132
6.4.1.1 San Luis Rey Watershed Case Study	133
6.4.1.2 Summary of Fire Impacts: Fires Initiated in <i>Arundo</i> Stands	137
6.4.1.3 Fires That Started Within <i>Arundo</i> Stands: Other Watersheds	138
6.4.2 <i>Wildland Fires That Burn Arundo Stands</i>	139

6.5	Fire Impacts	143
6.5.1	Type Conversion to Arundo-Dominated Habitat	143
6.5.2	Impacts to Fauna,	146
6.5.3	Impacts from Emergency Acts	149
6.6	Conclusions: Fire Impacts.....	149
7.0	IMPACTS OF ARUNDO: Federally Endangered and Threatened Species.....	151
7.1	Examination and Characterization of Arundo Impacts on Flora and Fauna.....	151
7.1.1	Determine Arundo Impact Score	151
7.1.2	Determine Arundo and Federally Listed Species 'Overlap Score'	152
7.1.3	Calculate 'Cumulative Arundo Impact Scores'	153
7.2	Species Descriptions and Arundo Impacts Elucidated	153
7.2.1	California Tiger Salamander (<i>Ambystoma californiense</i>).....	154
7.2.2	Arroyo Toad (<i>Bufo californicus</i>)	155
7.2.3	California Red-Legged Frog (<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>)	158
7.2.4	Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog (<i>Rana muscosa</i>)	160
7.2.5	Western Snowy Plover (<i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>).....	162
7.2.6	Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo (<i>Coccyzus americanus</i>)	164
7.2.7	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (<i>Empidonax trailii extimus</i>).....	166
7.2.8	Belding's Savannah Sparrow (<i>Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi</i>)	168
7.2.9	Coastal California Gnatcatcher (<i>Polioptila californica californica</i>)	169
7.2.10	Light Footed Clapper Rail (<i>Rallus longirostris levipes</i>).....	171
7.2.11	California Least Tern (<i>Sterna antillarum browni</i>).....	172
7.2.12	Least Bell's Vireo (<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>).....	174
7.2.13	Tidewater Goby (<i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>).....	176
7.2.14	Unarmored Three Spine Stickleback (<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni</i>).....	178
7.2.15	Southern Steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>).....	180
7.2.16	Santa Ana Sucker (<i>Catostomus santaanae</i>).....	182
7.2.17	San Joaquin Kit Fox (<i>Vulpes macrotis mutica</i>)	184
7.2.18	San Diego Ambrosia (<i>Ambrosia pumila</i>).....	185
7.2.19	Marsh Sandwort (<i>Arenaria paludicola</i>).....	187
7.2.20	San Jacinto Valley Crownscale (<i>Atriplex coronata</i> var. <i>notatior</i>).....	188
7.2.21	Nevin's Barberry (<i>Berberis nevinii</i>).....	189
7.2.22	Spreading Navarretia (<i>Navarretia fossalis</i>)	190
7.3	Results.....	195
7.3.1	Summary by Species and Group	195
7.3.1.1	Impact Scores.....	195
7.3.1.2	Overlap or Spatial Interaction Scores	196
7.3.1.3	Cumulative Impact Scores	196
7.3.2	Discussion	197
8.0	COST TO BENEFIT ANALYSIS	200
8.1	Cost	200
8.2	Benefit.....	204
8.2.1	Reduced Fire Impacts (Benefit)	204
8.2.2	Reduced Water Use (Benefit).....	205
8.2.3	Reduced Sediment Trapping (Benefit)	207
8.2.4	Reduced Flood Damage: Bridges (Benefit).....	209

8.2.5 <i>Habitat Enhancement (Benefit)</i>	209
8.2.6 <i>Reduced Beach Debris</i>	211
8.2.7 <i>Total Benefit</i>	211
8.3 <i>Benefit to Cost Ratio</i>	212
9.0 <i>WATERSHED BASED ARUNDO CONTROL PROGRAMS: RECOMMENDATIONS, STATUS, AND PRIORITIZATION</i>	215
9.1 <i>Recommendations and Status of Watershed Based Arundo Control Programs</i>	215
9.1.1 <i>Entity/Group Leading Watershed Based Work</i>	216
9.1.2 <i>Status of Permitting Allowing Work to Occur</i>	216
9.1.3 <i>Work Completed to Date</i>	219
9.1.4 <i>Future Program Work</i>	220
9.2 <i>Priority Ranking of Watershed-Based Arundo Control</i>	221
9.2.1 <i>Factors Considered in Ranking: Impacts and Capacity</i>	221
9.2.2 <i>Control Priority</i>	221
10.0 <i>SUMMARY OF DATA FOR ARUNDO: PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS, DISTRIBUTION, ABUNDANCE, IMPACTS, AND WATERHSHED CONTROL PROGRAMS' STATUS AND PRIORITY</i>	224
11.0 <i>LITERATURE CITED</i>	230
APPENDIX A. <i>Detailed Maps of Arundo Distribution Within the Study Area</i>	239
APPENDIX B. <i>Occurrence Data and Critical Habitat Areas for Federally Listed Species and Distribution of Arundo</i>	240

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1. <i>Arundo</i> sampling locations in southern California.	6
Figure 2-2. Illustration of <i>Arundo</i> structure for first year and 2+ year old stems.	7
Figure 2-3. First year and >1yr year old <i>Arundo</i> canes, showing leaf and branching structure.	8
Figure 2-4. A single older cane with all secondary branches (25), leader, and main stem.	8
Figure 2-5. New first year canes often protrude from the <i>Arundo</i> canopy.	9
Figure 2-6. First year <i>Arundo</i> canes at full height (6+ m).	9
Figure 2-7. Dense rhizome and root network of an <i>Arundo</i> clump that was scoured during a flow event, removing the upper soil matrix and canes.	12
Figure 2-8. Close up of rhizomes showing emerging canes and roots.	13
Figure 2-9. Rhizome network arising from a single growth point.	13
Figure 2-10. Close-up of slightly desiccated <i>Arundo</i> rhizome.	14
Figure 2-11. Rhizome network showing root length of up to 80 cm.	14
Figure 2-12. Draping effect of <i>Arundo</i> on the edge of the stand and gaps between clumps within a stand.	17
Figure 2-13. A mature <i>Arundo</i> stand showing draping of <i>Arundo</i> canes along an edge.	18
Figure 2-14. Oblique aerial photo showing patchiness of <i>Arundo</i> stands, particularly farther from the low-flow channel.	18
Figure 2-15. View from bridge over San Luis Rey River showing the top of a mature <i>Arundo</i> stand.	19
Figure 2-16. <i>Arundo</i> stand being prepared for foliar herbicide treatment.	19
Figure 2-17. A cut <i>Arundo</i> clump showing uneven cane density.	20
Figure 2-18. Cane density and dead leaf litter within a dense <i>Arundo</i> stand.	21
Figure 3-1. Distribution of <i>Arundo</i> mapped within the study area from Monterey to San Diego, CA.	31
Figure 3-2. In-office surveys using a dual-monitor workstation.	32
Figure 3-3. Field surveys with ruggedized tablet PCs and integrated GPS.	33
Figure 3-4. Digital sketch mapping.	34
Figure 3-5. DFG BIOS data viewer with invasive plant data set active.	36
Figure 3-6. Cal-IPC web site project page for <i>Arundo</i> mapping downloads.	37
Figure 4-1. Secondary branch leaf area to length relationship.	43
Figure 5-1.1. Santa Margarita River study reaches, with yellow denoting extent of mapped floodplain.	60
Figure 5-1.2. Santa Ana River study reaches with extent of mapped floodplain denoted in yellow.	61
Figure 5-1.3 San Luis Rey River study reaches with extent of mapped floodplain denoted in yellow.	62
Figure 5-1.4. Annual peak discharges recorded at USGS stream gage 11046000 on Santa Margarita River near Ysidora.	64
Figure 5-1.5. Flow duration curves plotted by decade at the Ysidora gage (11046000).	65
Figure 5-1.6. Sub-reaches (numbers 1 through 6) in the lower Santa Margarita River project reach.	65
Figure 5-1.7. View of the Santa Margarita River in Sub-Reaches 2 & 3 (view is upstream) taken on May 16, 1995.	66
Figure 5-1.8. Comparison of 1970 (left) and 2008 (right) air photos of Sub-reach 3.	68
Figure 5-1.9. Location of HEC-RAS model cross-sections (in yellow) (NHC 2001).	70
Figure 5-1.10. Photographs of floodplain vegetation on the Santa Margarita River (1/4/1999).	71
Figure 5-1.11. Project reach water surface profiles for scenarios 1 to 4: 100-year peak flow.	74
Figure 5-1.12. Generalized illustration of the effects of floodplain roughness (dense vegetation) on velocity across the section for Scenarios 1, 2, and 3.	74

Figure 5-2.1. Location of the Area of Interest and cross-sections (northern watersheds).	93
Figure 5-2.2. Location of the Area of Interest and cross-sections (southern watersheds).	94
Figure 5-2.3. <i>Arundo</i> acreage as a percent of system acreage within the Area of Interest (AOI).	95
Figure 5-2.4. Percent of geomorphic form invaded by <i>Arundo</i> for the Area of Interest (AOI).	95
Figure 5-2.5. Acreage of geomorphic forms mapped within the Area of Interest (AOI).	96
Figure 5-2.6. Observed and expected even distribution of <i>Arundo</i> acreage on the San Luis Rey watershed by geomorphic class.	96
Figure 5-2.7. Observed and expected even distribution of <i>Arundo</i> acreage on the Santa Margarita watershed by geomorphic class.	97
Figure 5-2.8. Observed and expected even distribution of <i>Arundo</i> acreage on the Santa Ana watershed by geomorphic class.	97
Figure 5-2.9. Observed and expected even distribution of <i>Arundo</i> acreage on the Santa Clara watershed by geomorphic class.	98
Figure 5-2.10. Observed and expected even distribution of <i>Arundo</i> acreage on the Ventura watershed by geomorphic class.	98
Figure 5-2.11. Observed and expected even distribution of <i>Arundo</i> acreage on the Salinas watershed by geomorphic class.	99
Figure 5-2.12. Cross-section geomorphology using historic aerial imagery on the Salinas watershed from 1937 to 2006.	104
Figure 5-2.13. Historic photo analysis of geomorphic and hydrologic cross-sections on the San Luis Rey River from 1946 to 2010.	105
Figure 5-2.14. San Luis Rey geomorphic forms from 1938 to 2010.	108
Figure 5-2.15. Santa Margarita geomorphic forms from 1938 to 2010.	108
Figure 5-2.16. Santa Ana geomorphic forms from 1938 to 2006.	109
Figure 5-2.17. Ventura geomorphic forms from 1929 to 2006.	109
Figure 5-2.18. Santa Clara geomorphic forms from 1927 to 2006.	110
Figure 5-2.19. Salinas geomorphic forms from 1937 to 2006.	110
Figure 5-2.20. Aerial imagery showing floodplain and terrace areas with dense and open vegetation classes marked.	112
Figure 5-2.21. San Luis Rey open and dense vegetation classification on floodplain and lower terrace areas from 1938 to 2010.	113
Figure 5-2.22. Santa Margarita open and dense vegetation classification on floodplain and lower terrace areas from 1938 to 2010.	113
Figure 5-2.23. Santa Ana open and dense vegetation classification on floodplain and lower terrace areas from 1938 to 2006.	114
Figure 5-2.24. Ventura open and dense vegetation classification on floodplain and lower terrace areas from 1929 to 2006.	114
Figure 5-2.25. Santa Clara open and dense vegetation classification on floodplain and lower terrace areas from 1927 to 2006.	115
Figure 5-2.26. Salinas open and dense vegetation classification on floodplain and lower terrace areas from 1937 to 2006.	115
Figure 5-2.27. Trend graph of percent of the open vegetation category from 1927 to 2010 for four watersheds with the AOI.	117
Figure 5-2.28. Trend graph of percent of the open vegetation category from 1927 to 2010 for all watersheds with the AOI.	117
Figure 5-2.29. Floods stacked <i>Arundo</i> biomass against the River Road Bridge on the Santa Ana River, resulting in the bridge being pushed off its foundation in 2004.	120

Figure 5-2.30. In Santa Barbara County, <i>Arundo</i> washes down the Santa Clara River and accumulates on Rincon Beach, blocking access for beachgoers and increasing the cost of beach maintenance.	121
Figure 5-2.31. <i>Arundo</i> and other biomass washed onto the beach in Long Beach after a large flow event on the Los Angeles/San Gabriel River.....	121
Figure 6-1. Large amount of dead/dry <i>Arundo</i> fuel.....	125
Figure 6-2. This fire started in <i>Arundo</i> at night during a light rain in October 2006.	125
Figure 6-3. Burned <i>Arundo</i> stands on the San Luis Rey River (Fire SLR #6).	126
Figure 6-4. Burned <i>Arundo</i> stands on the San Luis Rey River (Fire SLR #6).	126
Figure 6-5. Camp on San Luis Rey River with <i>Arundo</i> folded over to make an enclosure.	127
Figure 6-6. Camp on San Luis Rey River in <i>Arundo</i> stands showing tent, tarp and fire ring. <i>Arundo</i> surrounds the camp.	128
Figure 6-7. Camp on San Luis Rey River within <i>Arundo</i> , showing multiple lighters, cooking area and burned <i>Arundo</i> canes.....	128
Figure 6-8. Camp on San Luis Rey River in <i>Arundo</i> showing tent and cooking area with a portable oven connected to propane.	129
Figure 6-9. Small methamphetamine lab on the San Luis Rey River within <i>Arundo</i> stands.	129
Figure 6-10. Open fire associated with workers of a cannabis plantation.	130
Figure 6-11. Location of <i>Arundo</i> fires for some southern California watersheds.	131
Figure 6-12. Fire events that started in <i>Arundo</i> stands on the San Luis Rey River from 2000 to 2007.	134
Figure 6-13. Footprint of fires # SLR 1-3 on the San Luis Rey River.	135
Figure 6-14. Location of fires # SLR 1-3 and fire containment cleared areas on the San Luis Rey River.	135
Figure 6-15. <i>Arundo</i> resprouting after a fire on the San Luis Rey River. Native trees are either dead, or still dormant (Fire SLR #5).....	136
Figure 6-16. Immediately after a fire that burned an <i>Arundo</i> stand on the San Luis Rey River, leaving only ash and very little unburned material (Fire SLR #6).	136
Figure 6-17. Shortly after a fire through <i>Arundo</i> -infested riparian habitat on the San Luis Rey River.	137
Figure 6-18. Location of wildland fires that burned <i>Arundo</i> stands within the project area from 1997 to 2008.....	141
Figure 6-19. Wildfire on the Santa Clara with points A, B, C and D marked.	142
Figure 6-20. <i>Arundo</i> one year after a fire, already 2-3 feet high, at the site of fire SLR #6.....	143
Figure 6-21. Fire events that started in <i>Arundo</i> stands on the San Luis Rey River showing sensitive species locations.....	148
Figure 7-1. Cumulative <i>Arundo</i> impact score by species for all watersheds.....	198
Figure 7-2. Cumulative <i>Arundo</i> impact scores by watershed for all federally listed species combined.	199

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2- 1. Summary of <i>Arundo</i> cane data from the fourteen locations sampled for this study. _____	10
Table 2- 2. Length and width of leaves of <i>Arundo</i> sampled in this study, by age and location. _____	11
Table 2- 3. Density of leaves on <i>Arundo</i> stems sampled for this study, by class. _____	12
Table 2-4. Summary of <i>Arundo</i> cane density measurements from this study and others. _____	20
Table 2-5. <i>Arundo</i> aboveground biomass from various studies (wild and cultivated). _____	22
Table 2-6. Above and below ground biomass values for <i>Arundo</i> , using relationship from Sharma 1998 (22.5% of biomass is below ground). _____	23
Table 2-7. Typical biomass values for different vegetation types. _____	23
Table 3-1. Data dictionary used for plant mapping. _____	32
Table 3-2. <i>Arundo</i> acreage in central and southern California by hydrologic unit. _____	39
Table 4-1. Structural characteristics measured on <i>Arundo</i> canes collected from 14 sites in southern California study area.	42
Table 4-2. <i>Arundo</i> cane densities and leaf area indices (LAI) for 13 of the 14 study sites.	44
Table 4-3. Summary of <i>Arundo</i> transpiration (E) and evapotranspiration (ET) reported in literature or calculated as described in the text.	45
Table 5-1.1. Santa Margarita River summary of GIS analysis.	60
Table 5-1.2. Santa Ana River summary of GIS analysis.	61
Table 5-1.3. San Luis Rey River summary of GIS analysis.	62
Table 5-1.4. Description of the lower Santa Margarita project sub-reaches.	67
Table 5-1.5. Peak flows adopted for the project reach (USACE 1994).	72
Table 5-1.6. Differences in hydraulic characteristics between scenarios.	72
Table 5-1.7. Extent of <i>Arundo</i> by sub-reach as of 1997.	73
Table 5-1.8. Depths and Velocities in Sub-reach 3 (wide floodplain) and Sub-reach 5 (narrow floodplain) for the 100-year peak flow.	75
Table 5-1.9. Summary of relative differences in stream power by scenario for entire study area, (S2: native is baseline).	80
Table 5-1.10. Differences in relative stream power for sub-reaches 3 and 5.	81
Table 5-1.11. Width ratio score.	83
Table 5-1.12. <i>Arundo</i> coverage score.	84
Table 5-1.13. Floodplain width score.	85
Table 5-1.14. Bed slope score.	85
Table 5-1.15. Santa Margarita River <i>Arundo</i> impact scores.	86
Table 5-1.16. San Luis Rey <i>Arundo</i> impact scores.	87
Table 5-1.17. Santa Ana River <i>Arundo</i> impact scores.	88
Table 5-2.1. <i>Arundo</i> and geomorphic acreage within the Area of Interest (AOI) for six selected watersheds.	99
Table 5-2.2. <i>Arundo</i> and geomorphic class acreage within the AOI of six selected watersheds.	100
Table 5-2.3. <i>Arundo</i> and geomorphic class acreage for the entire AOI (all seven watersheds).	101
Table 5-2.4. Summary of geomorphic changes by watersheds.	107
Table 5-2.5. Open and dense vegetation by year for four watersheds.	116
Table 5-2.6. Acreage of geomorphic forms within a portion of the Santa Margarita River in 1997 and 2010.	118

Table 5-2.7. Amount of <i>Arundo</i> biomass on beaches of Long Beach and clean-up costs for a ten-year period.	122
Table 5-2.8. Estimate of the amount of <i>Arundo</i> biomass on beaches in North San Diego County, Long Beach and Ventura, and the clean-up costs for a ten-year period.	122
Table 6-1. <i>Arundo</i> energy levels per unit of dry biomass.	123
Table 6-2. Encampments found within <i>Arundo</i> stands on the San Luis Rey River.	132
Table 6-3. San Luis Rey Watershed: Data on fire events fires that started in <i>Arundo</i> between 2000 and 2007.	133
Table 6-4. San Luis Rey Watershed: Acreage summary of impacted vegetation for fires started within <i>Arundo</i> stands over an eight-year period (2000 to 2007).	137
Table 6-5. San Luis Rey Watershed: Acreage of <i>Arundo</i> that burned in fires started within <i>Arundo</i> stands over an eight-year period (2000-2007).	138
Table 6-6. Acreage of <i>Arundo</i> by watershed that burned during documented wildfires over a ten-year period.	140
Table 6-7. Burned <i>Arundo</i> acreage from fires that start in <i>Arundo</i> and wildfires that burn <i>Arundo</i> (for one year and ten-year periods).	145
Table 6-8. Summary of acreage impacted by burning and fire suppression from fires that start in <i>Arundo</i>	147
Table 6-9. Summary of San Luis Rey River <i>Arundo</i> fire impacts on federally endangered species.	149
Table 7-1. <i>Arundo</i> Impact Score for each sensitive species.	152
Table 7-2. Definition of overlap scores that are assigned to federally listed species.	153
Table 7-3. Examination of <i>Arundo</i> impacts on federally listed species by watershed.	192
Table 7-4. Cumulative impact scores for <i>Arundo</i> impacts on threatened and endangered species by watershed.	193
Table 7-5. Cumulative <i>Arundo</i> impact score for each species for all watersheds combined, and sum and average for each taxa group.	194
Table 8-1. Existing program costs used to generate cost basis for <i>Arundo</i> control by watershed within the study area.	202
Table 8-2. Estimated control costs by watershed within the study area for peak <i>Arundo</i> levels and current <i>Arundo</i> levels.	203
Table 8-3. Estimated reduction of fire impacts (benefit).	206
Table 8-4. Estimated reduction of water use by <i>Arundo</i> (benefit).	207
Table 8-5. Estimated reduction of sediment trapping (benefit).	208
Table 8-6. Estimated reduction of bridge losses (benefit) by watershed at peak and current <i>Arundo</i> levels.	210
Table 8-7. Estimated habitat enhancement (benefit) by watershed at peak and current <i>Arundo</i> levels.	211
Table 8-8. Estimated benefits at the peak level of <i>Arundo</i> distribution.	213
Table 8-9. Estimated benefits at current levels of <i>Arundo</i>	214
Table 9-1. <i>Arundo</i> control programs within the study area: program leads, status of permitting and work completed on each watershed.	217
Table 9-2. <i>Arundo</i> treatment priority ranking by watershed. Based on <i>Arundo</i> impacts and program capacity.	223

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Arundo donax (giant reed, giant cane) is a large non-native grass found in many coastal watersheds in central and southern California. It is an extremely problematic invasive plant characterized by extensive infestations and a range of severe impacts to both ecosystem and human infrastructure. Even with a significant increase in research and studies on *Arundo* over the past ten years, no large-scale mapping efforts have been completed and no comprehensive analysis of impacts has occurred. This report set out to accomplish these goals within the study area (Monterey to San Diego), as well as to examine watershed-based capacity to implement control programs. Over \$70 million dollars have been spent to date controlling *Arundo* within the study area. It is important to document where this work has occurred and assess the resulting reduction in impacts.

Arundo was mapped at a fine scale using high-resolution aerial imagery and field verification across the study area. *Arundo* acreage prior to the initiation of control programs was 8,907 acres (gross). This is a significant area, but is much less than had been speculated by many in the field. Over 34% of this acreage (>3,000 acres) has been treated to date, with two highly invaded watersheds achieving over 90% control. Many other watersheds have more than 50% control. This indicates that watershed-based control is a realistic objective.

Mapping data show that *Arundo* is most abundant in large low-gradient river areas, where it averages 13% cover. Within specific reaches, there are sections greater than a half-mile in length that have over 40% *Arundo* cover.

This study carried out additional field work to characterize *Arundo* stands and infestations. This work verifies relationships explored by other studies, as well as generating new findings. *Arundo* within the study area was taller (average 6.5 m, maximum 9.9 m) than many previous studies reported. Biomass was confirmed as being extremely high per meter (15.5 kg/m²). Leaf area was extremely high at 15.8 m²/m² (LAI), which is consistent with other studies in California, but higher than reported in Texas where stands are shorter. Mature stands comprise most of the *Arundo* mapped in the study area. The leaf area of secondary branches is the majority of the leaf area in mature *Arundo* stands, based on leaf area and cane density of new and old canes.

This abundance of growth and cover generates many abiotic and biotic impacts. Mapping *Arundo* at high resolution allows examination and quantification of a number of these specific impacts, including water use, fluvial processes, fire, and listed species.

Spatial data, used in conjunction with stand leaf area measurements and published leaf transpiration rates, generated an *Arundo* stand-based water use value that was extremely high (40 mm/day) compared to most other plants. There are very few studies that have measured *Arundo* water use. Our results agree with one paper (from a study in California, 41.1 mm/day) and are higher than a study in Texas on the Rio Grande (9.1 mm/day). When translated into potential water savings per year from restoration, net savings of 20 ac-ft/yr was estimated. This estimate includes adjustments for replacement vegetation, as well as a reduction of *Arundo* water use to bring it into alignment with other forms of vegetation that consume large amounts of water. This is a large potential water use reduction that could have significant implications for both the ecosystem and human water use.

This study expended significant effort in broadening the understanding of how *Arundo* is impacting geomorphic and fluvial processes. These abiotic processes are particularly significant because they regulate the entire riparian ecosystem. Any changes to fluvial processes have the potential for system-wide ramifications. Large stands of *Arundo* were found to functionally increase bed elevations by five feet (based on field investigation and model re-calibrations following flood events in 1998). In addition to this *Arundo* stand-based modification of elevation, a high roughness coefficient for flows higher than

five feet was supported. This results in a significant reduction in flow capacity and represents an alteration of how *Arundo* stand function is characterized during flow events. New modeling was carried out for this study under four scenarios. Results indicated that *Arundo* stands constrain flows to the low-flow and bar-channel portions of the river profile. Over time this results in a deepening of the channel and a transformation of the system from a braided unstable channel form to a laterally stable single-thread channel form. Mapping of geomorphic forms on the larger systems documented that *Arundo* stands occur predominantly in the floodplain and terrace forms, and are nearly absent from the low-flow and active channel forms. Additional modeling using stream power indicated that over-vegetated floodplains and narrow, stable deep channels result in modifications of sediment transport during flow events. Sediment appears to be lost (removed) in channel areas and gained (aggregated) on floodplains/terraces with *Arundo* stands on them. These impacts to riverine fluvial processes change vegetation succession following flow events, sediment transport budgets, and the geomorphic structure of the habitat, all of which alter the ecosystem in a un-natural way. Such alterations are usually negative for native species that are adapted to pre-invaded ecosystem function. One system has had extensive *Arundo* control since the late 1990's, allowing examination of post-control system response. Active channel areas widened and portions of the floodplain with active flows increased. These are important post-control responses to flood events, indicating a 'normalization' of fluvial processing is occurring.

A historic review of large riparian systems using spatial mapping indicated that floodplain and low terrace forms have become much more vegetated on most systems over the last eighty years. This transformation has been observed in other systems, such as the Rio Grande, and is a result of water importation and a 'compression' of riverine systems. This dense vegetation is both native woody vegetation and *Arundo*. Mature *Arundo* stands, however, have much higher stem density and biomass per unit area, generating the observed flow reduction effects noted above. The historic analysis also showed a significant decline in acreage over time, on most systems, of the active channel area (low-flow and bar-channel areas with little vegetation). Most riverine systems have also become significantly compressed (narrower) over time as terrace and floodplain forms have been permanently separated from the river system by levees that protect both urbanization and agricultural land use. *Arundo* impacts to bridges, levees, and beaches were also described and documented. These impacts are from *Arundo* biomass and reduced flow capacity (*Arundo* stands and sediment trapping).

Impacts associated with fire were thoroughly explored with significant new findings. *Arundo*'s high biomass and stored energy were established based on field and published data. In addition to a high fuel load, *Arundo* stands have a tall, well ventilated fuel structure containing dry fuels throughout the year. This study specifically documented that transient encampments and highway overpasses are key ignition sources for fires that start in *Arundo*. This is a new class of fire events that are fully ascribed to *Arundo*. This study documented that fires are now starting in riparian areas, which did not occurred historically. Fire events were mapped over an eight year period on the San Luis Rey watershed. It was also demonstrated that *Arundo*-initiated fires are occurring on other watersheds. *Arundo*-initiated fires also burn un-invaded riparian habitat and fire suppression impacts were spatially quantified. Over a ten year period *Arundo*-initiated fires were estimated to impact 557 acres of *Arundo* and 732 acres of riparian habitat. Wildfires also burn *Arundo* stands. These fire events burned 544 acres of *Arundo* over a ten year period for the study area. *Arundo* stands that burn during wildfires burn hotter than native vegetation due to the high fuel load, and are very likely conveying fires through riparian corridors. The Simi fire in the Santa Clara watershed was one of the clearest examples of an upland wildfire spreading across a riparian zone dominated by *Arundo*, and then igniting fuels on a separate mountain range. *Arundo*-initiated fires and wildfires together burned 12% of *Arundo* acreage in a ten year period within the study area. The high acreage of burned *Arundo* and native vegetation, as well as suppression impacts, has significant impacts on the ecosystem and listed species.

Impacts to plants and animals were explored by examining 22 federally listed species from five taxonomic groups. Detailed biological assessments examining habitat, life history, distribution and abundance were carried out for these species. Listing documents and spatial occurrence data were used to evaluate *Arundo* impacts on each species. An *Arundo* impact score was calculated for each listed species. An additional metric examining the specific co-occurrence of *Arundo* and each species was derived for each watershed. The impact rank and the co-occurrence rank were then multiplied to generate an overall cumulative impact score. From this analysis, the taxonomic group, individual species, and watersheds were ranked based on scores. Avian and fish species were found to be the most impacted by *Arundo*, with amphibians also ranking high. Plants and mammals ranked very low in cumulative scoring. The two most severely impacted species were least Bell's vireo and the arroyo toad, followed by the southwestern willow flycatcher, southern steelhead, and tidewater goby. Several species that occur in estuary and beach habitat near river mouths also had impacts from *Arundo* identified. The watersheds with highest impacts to federally listed species were the Santa Margarita, Santa Ana, San Luis Rey, and Santa Clara watersheds. Three of the four watersheds have the oldest and most complete *Arundo* control programs in the study area.

A rudimentary cost-to-benefit analysis was also completed using *Arundo* spatial data. Cost of *Arundo* control was determined based on completed control work on numerous watersheds over the past 15 year. The \$71 million expended to control 2,862 acres generates a per acre control cost of \$25,000. Benefits derived from controlling *Arundo* are based on each impact (water use, sediment trapping, flood damage, fire, habitat, and beach debris). Valuations were conservative and a rationale was given for each impact class. Impacts that were difficult to quantify or value were not included. The benefit to cost ratio for *Arundo* at its pre-control distribution level was 1.94 to 1 (\$380,767,747 to \$196,481,844). Current *Arundo* distribution (reflecting 3,000 acres of control to date) generates a similar benefit to cost ratio of 1.91 to 1 (\$239,461,270 to \$124,934,194). A roughly 2:1 return ratio on funds invested is a significant benefit, particularly considering the additional impacts that were not assessed (due to complex valuation), as well as the conservative valuation of factors that were included.

The report concludes with a discussion of treatment priorities that include: continuing treatments of areas that have already been treated (protecting initial investment), controlling *Arundo* on watersheds where it is not abundant but could spread (early control is more cost effective), and prioritization of watersheds with large *Arundo* infestations. Programs are encouraged to use a top-down watershed implementation approach (starting in the upper reaches of the watershed), particularly if the watershed is heavily invaded. The watershed priority rankings are based on four impact classes (water use, geomorphology, fire, and listed species) and two classes of program capacity (experience and regulatory permits). Watershed-based control is most effective when there is a lead organization that can implement comprehensive control, acquire permits, obtain right of entry agreements, and secure funding.