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**ABSTRACT**: Riparian zones are key transitional ecosystems between upland and aquatic zones, and these systems are often degraded due to both land use change and stream processes (e.g., deforestation and water impoundments and/or diversions). These important ecosystems require restoration because of the many benefits they provide ranging from providing habitat for diverse species to promoting water quality. Restoration practitioners, regulators, and researchers require riparian assessment methods and models to efficiently structure mitigation and restoration plans. This technical note compiles existing riparian tools and evaluates them relative to model objectives, modeling approach, and input variables. Findings are synthesized into a gap analysis of these models to inform future riparian model development and improve riparian assessment.

**INTRODUCTION**: Riparian zones are the transitional areas between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems that are located adjacent to freshwater systems (e.g., rivers, lakes, streams, reservoirs, wetlands; Fischer & Fischenich, 2000; Lind, Hasselquist, & Laudon, 2019). Riparian areas are important hotspots for biodiversity and ecological processes (Gene et al., 2019) as well as many other benefits such as filtering pollutants to prevent them from entering aquatic systems, attenuating floods, stabilizing streambanks to prevent erosion, and providing shade and temperature regulation for adjacent water bodies (National Research Council, 2002). Land use conversion for agriculture, livestock, forestry, and (sub)urban development can have significant impact on riparian zones, negatively affecting ecological functions. Anthropogenic disturbances can trigger effects such as sediment accumulation, streambank erosion, altered water quality, changes to streamflow, and habitat degradation (National Research Council, 2002). In some cases, riparian impacts can be minor enough for the area to recover naturally, while other times the degradation can be more severe and long lasting (NRCS, 1996) requiring restoration.

A variety of tools and models have been developed to assist regulators, managers, and researchers with impact assessment, mitigation planning, restoration, and conservation. In general, ecological models seek to translate a complex system into a simplified representation, although the scope, assumptions, and other factors can limit the breadth of their utility. Identifying and understanding these gaps is helpful for improving the utility of models to inform environmental decision-making. The goals of this technical note are to: (1) review existing riparian models commonly applied within the USACE, (2) examine the use of these models in management and restoration contexts, and (3) identify gaps in existing models. Accomplishing these goals will highlight frequent trends and patterns among the tools and chart a path forward for future riparian model development.

**METHODS AND RESULTS**: A structured approach was applied to systematically review riparian models following methods in Gurevitch et al. (2018). Riparian assessment procedures, models, and tools were compiled through four primary techniques: (1) direct search of the USACE ecosystem restoration model library[[4]](#footnote-5), (2) informal requests for models through USACE District practitioners and the National Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX), (3) exploration of tools developed by other government organizations (e.g., US Department of Agriculture and US Forest Service), and (4) search of peer-reviewed literature via Google Scholar.

Three criteria were used to screen riparian tools for this analysis. First, models had to be focused on riverine riparian zones, which includes the interface between terrestrial ecosystems and rivers or streams (lotic ecosystems). This excludes models with a primary purpose of performing stream or wetland assessment and those focused on lentic systems (e.g., lakes, reservoirs). Second, all models had to highlight multiple hydrologic, ecological, and/or environmental components of riparian zones and their communities, which excludes models only including one variable such as buffer width or cover type. Third, models had to inform riparian conservation, rehabilitation, or other management applications. Fourteen models met the search criteria (Table 1).

Qualitative data were then collected on each riparian tool relative to six topics (listed below). Two of these topics focus on ecological processes (1-2) typically assessed in riparian tools, and the others (3-6) focus more generally on common scoping issues in ecological model development.

1. **Ecological Functions of Instream Processes**: The processes by which riparian zones influence streams, such as: hydrologic attenuation, streambank erosion, thermal regulation, sediment trapping, nutrient uptake, and sequestration of contaminants (e.g., metals)
2. **Ecological Functions of Riparian Processes**: The processes that occur in the terrestrial zone, commonly characterized relative to vegetation communities (e.g., cover, patch size, species richness) and faunal habitat (e.g., bats, birds, herpetofauna, mammals).
3. **Model Type:** The framework and ideology the model is constructed around to obtain results. Common model types include habitat, statistical, and mechanistic models.
4. **Geographic Scope**: The geography where the model is most suitable or has been studied previously. This area can range from a specific site to a general landscape or ecosystem.
5. **Degree of model review**: The level to which the model has been reviewed. Applicable information includes publishing format, peer-review, and USACE model certification status (EC 1105-2-412, PB 2013-02).
6. **Numerical Structure**: The numerical environment or coding language in which the model is executed (e.g., spreadsheet vs. coding vs. executable software).

Table 1. Riparian modeling tools meeting the three criteria for riparian models.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Model** | **General Description** |
| 1. Resaca Reference Condition Model | This model uses a Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) framework[[5]](#footnote-6) to assess restoration sites for resaca ecosystems (a dry channel or former marshy course of a stream) based on three vegetation communities: Texas Ebony Resaca Forest, Subtropical Texas Palmetto Woodland, and Texas Ebony/Snake-eyes Shrubland (USACE, 2016). |
| 2. Upper Mississippi River System | This HSI-based tool is designed to capture habitat changes from common management actions in floodplain forests (also known as “bottomland forests and “wooded swamps and floodplains”). The model assesses “silvicultural prescriptions” at a scale of “management areas”, which are typically 5-100 acres (USACE 2021). |
| 3. Modified Riverine HSI Model for Mink | This HSI model evaluates riverine cover types and their potential for providing year-round habitat for the mink species. A modification now includes an additional variable to compare natural vs. channelized streams (Devendorf and Yager, 2013). |
| 4. Simple Model for Urban Riparian Function | This HSI-style model assesses multiple aspects of stream processes for constrained urban riparian zones in the Midwest (specifically Louisville, McKay et al. In Press). |
| 5. Community-Based Model for Cottonwood Riparian Forests of Missouri River | The Missouri River model's purpose is to assess ecosystem benefits, specifically for Cottonwood riparian forests, through a community-based ecosystem response model. The model utilizes community- or ecosystem-scale indices (as opposed to taxa-specific models) to assess ecosystem functions on a broader and more complex, landscape scale (Burkes-Copes, 2016). |
| 6. Middle Rio Grande Bosque Riparian Community Index Model | The Middle Rio Grande model quantifies the effects of changes in ‘bosque’ (riparian) ecosystems of central New Mexico. The HSI-style model focuses the unique and culturally significant ‘bosque’ communities in New Mexico due to its diminishing habitat and ecosystem functions (Burkes-Copes and Webb, 2012). |
| 7. Ecological Functions Approach at Chatfield Reservoir | This model utilizes the application of the Colorado-specific model for wetland habitats, FACwet, to account for terrestrial habitats at Chatfield Reservoir. The model quantifies species/habitat and habitat/function relationships to aid in decision-making and mitigation planning within Chatfield (ERO Resources Corporation, 2009). |
| 8. Lower Willamette River Ecosystem Restoration Project | This model assesses riverine, riparian, and floodplain habitats and their connections to fish and wildlife species. The model adapts existing HSI models for a selection of individual species and addresses the concept of how habitat restoration benefits multiple key fish and wildlife species (Tetra Tech, Inc., 2014). |
| 9. Skokomish River Environmental Benefits Analysis | This model was developed for restoration planning and aims to incorporate positive aspects of multiple existing frameworks, including Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP), HSI, and the Biodiversity Security Index (Cole, 2010). The approach also compares sets of alternatives to identify key spatial gaps in restoration planning (Klimas and Yuill, 2013). |
| 10. The Riparian Ecosystem Management Model | This U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) tool quantifies water quality benefits of riparian buffers and management zones. The model uses analytical methods to estimate nonpoint source pollution control in various site conditions. It simulates processes including (sub)surface hydrology; sediment transport and deposition; carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus transport, removal, and cycling; and vegetation growth. It also can simulate management options such as vegetation type, buffer zone size, and biomass harvesting (Lowrence et al., 2000). |

Table 1 (cont.). Riparian modeling tools meeting the three criteria for riparian models.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Model** | **General Description** |
| 11. Riparian Aquatic Interaction Simulator | This model quantifies forest growth and connects it to large wood dynamics, riparian recruitment, and shade. The tool is directly applicable to Pacific Northwest forest types and allows managers to forecast functions over a range of critical variables for up to 300 years (Welty et al., 2001). |
| 12. Wetland and Riparian Forests in Ouachita Mountains and Crowley’s Ridge Regions of Arkansas | This model is a Regional Guidebook following a Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) approach to assesses wetland functions. This approach applies functional indices and their protocols in the assessment of various wetland subclasses. is guidebook is intended for the most common types of wetlands and riparian forests that occur in the Ouachita Mountains and Crowley’s Ridge Regions of Arkansas (Klimas, 2006) |
| 13. Wetland Functions of Riverine Floodplains in the Northern Rocky Mountains | The development and application of This HGM Regional Guidebook is intended for the most common types of wetlands and riparian forests that occur in the floodplains in the Northern Rocky Mountains (Hauer, 2002). |
| 14. High-Gradient Headwater Streams and Low-Gradient Perennial Streams in Appalachia | This HGM Regional Guidebook is intended for the most common types of wetlands and riparian forests that occur in the headwater and perennial streams in the Appalachia region (Summers, 2017). |

The fourteen riparian models were evaluated independently, and data were compiled for each of the six criteria shown above. Input variables related to instream and riparian functions were compiled and categorized, which ultimately provide the primary mechanism for the modeling gap analysis. These processes were sub-divided into groups of variables to identify trends across models. Notably, some variables overlap into both instream and riparian processes. Specifically, variables were grouped as follows:

* **Instream Processes**
  + **Physical Characteristics:** geomorphological components of the stream and streambank (e.g., slope of bank, soil characteristics).
  + **Stream Condition:** degree of disturbance within the stream (e.g., temperature, chemical concentrations).
  + **Hydrologic Processes:** processes that occur in a stream in response to precipitation or flooding events (e.g., flood attenuation, interflow processes).
  + **Adjacent Land Use:** land uses adjacent to the stream and riparian zone.
  + **Climate and Weather:** precipitation events and temperature patterns.
* **Riparian Zone Processes**
  + **Bank Characteristics:** physical components of the bank in relation to the riparian zone (e.g., depth to groundwater).
  + **Habitat Connectivity:** organismal movement occurring within riparian habitats (e.g., migration/dispersal, neighboring habitat loss).
  + **Stream Habitat:** vegetation and organism functions relative to the adjacent stream (e.g., aquatic vegetation).
  + **Canopy/Ground Cover:** tree and ground vegetation within the riparian zone.
  + **Native/Invasive Species:** degree of invasive species dominance.
  + **Vegetation Composition:** diversity, size, and characteristics of vegetation.
  + **Species Richness:** the number of plant and animal species.
  + **Riparian Functions:** ecological processes occurring within the riparian zone that impact the riparian zone itself or the adjacent stream (e.g., large woody debris).
  + **Floodplain Functions:** processes that occur within the floodplain in relation to the riparian zone (e.g., frequency of flooding, duration of flooding events).
  + **Landscape Connectivity:** movements and processes occurring along the longitudinal dimension of the stream corridor (e.g., local confinement).
  + **Buffer Functionality:** properties and functions of a buffer that impact adjacent streams and riparian areas (e.g., buffer capacity, buffer physical description).

Qualitative data were collected and summarized for each model. Table 2 presents input variables found in each model document summarized by the number of variables from each model relevant to each category. Notably, the Lower Willamette model data is the overall number of variables collected from three individual species habitat suitability models (beaver, wood duck, and yellow warbler), compared to the other models that do not have individual species indices. Additional data on model scope and structure are presented in Table 3.

Table 2. Summary of the number of input variables associated with a particular ecological process in each riparian model.



Table 3. Gap analysis of riparian modeling tools.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **Model Type** | **Geographic Scope** | **Degree of model review** | **Numerical Structure** |
| 1. Resaca Reference Condition Model | Conceptual  Index | Cameron County, TX. Resacas with three vegetation types (Table 1). | USACE certification | Spreadsheet calculator |
| 2. Upper Mississippi River System | Conceptual  Index | Wetland forest system dominated by hardwoods in eastern US. Upland forest systems. | Informal review via model development workshop | Spreadsheet calculator |
| 3. Riverine HSI Model for Mink | Index | Inland wetland habitats of North America. Stream/riverine corridors (modified model). | USACE certification | Spreadsheet calculator |
| 4. Simple Model for Urban Riparian Function | Conceptual  Index | Urban areas with emphasis on Midwestern streams. Riparian zones to maximum width of 100m. | USACE certification (regional) | Function in the R statistical language |
| 5. Community Model for Cottonwood Riparian Forests of Missouri River | Conceptual  Index  Analytical  Spatial | Cottonwood-forested communities along the Missouri River. | Informal review via development; panel review; USACE certification | Access database format and spreadsheet file |
| 6. Middle Rio Grande Bosque Riparian Community Index | Conceptual  Index  Analytical  Spatial | Riparian habitat between levees along Middle Rio Grande, NM. Arid riparian forests, wetlands, or bosques. | USACE certification (one-time use) | Access database format and spreadsheet file |
| 7. Chatfield Ecological Functions Approach | Conceptual  Index  Spatial | Great plains riparian vegetation with adjacent undisturbed grassland communities. Ephemeral streams, in-stream ponds, and canals / ditches. | Adapted from prior models | Spreadsheet calculator |
| 8. Lower Willamette River Ecosystem Restoration Project | Index | Aquatic, riparian, & floodplain habitats in the Lower Willamette River between Columbia River and Willamette Falls and Columbia Slough and Tyron Creek. | USACE certification (one-time use) | Spreadsheet calculator |
| 9. Skokomish River Environmental Benefits Analysis | Conceptual  Index  Spatial | Skokomish river basin. Pacific Northwest native river valley communities. | Adapted from prior models; USACE certification (one-time use) | Spreadsheet calculator |
| 10. The Riparian Ecosystem Management Model | Conceptual  Analytical | Built with data from mature riparian forest in south GA but applicable to various sites. Tested on buffer zones averaging 65m width. | Developed cooperatively by multiple agencies | C++ language |
| 11. Riparian Aquatic Interaction Simulator | Conceptual  Analytical | Pacific Northwest streams. Riparian stands of Douglas-fir, hemlock, alder, & big leaf maple. Bank full widths from 5 to 25m and gradients less than 6%. | Formally reviewed by universities, government, and industry | Metamodel that uses ORGANON forest simulator |
| 12. HGM for Central Arkansas | Conceptual  Spatial | Ouachita Mountains and Crowley’s Ridge Regions of Arkansas. Common types of wetlands and riparian forests. | USACE certification (regional) | Spreadsheet calculator |
| 13. HGM for the Northern Rocky Mountains | Conceptual  Spatial | Northern Rocky Mountains throughout MT, WY, ID, and northeastern WA. Riverine floodplains on alluvial gravel-bed rivers and low riparian terraces. | USACE certification (regional) | Spreadsheet calculator |
| 14. HGM for Streams in Appalachia | Conceptual  Spatial | Appalachia Plateau in KY, VA, TN, OH, and PA. High-gradient headwater and low-gradient perennial streams. | USACE certification (regional) | Spreadsheet calculator |

**RIPARIAN MODELING GAP ANALYSIS**: This analysis evaluated riparian models to highlight frequent trends and patterns among the tools. The gap analysis summarized these trends to understand the state-of-practice in riparian modeling and identify key opportunities to improve future riparian tools. The following major themes emerge from this analysis:

Heavy emphasis on habitat suitability-style approaches: Most of the reviewed tools have adopted an index-based approach, specifically quantifying numerical data with HSI variables. HSI models are a simple yet efficient way to assess ecosystems with varying conditions, when locally model verified. Index-based models allows users to connect ecological processes with changes in physical processes, evaluate changes in ecosystem quality and quantity, and communicate the model outcomes in a simple way. The HGM approach has also been used to assess ecosystem-scale outcomes for regulatory wetland decision-making. While some wetlands are riparian, these models may not emphasize non-wetland functions of the riparian zone. Three HGM models were included in this analysis that emphasize riparian functions.

Division between ecological vs instream functions: In general, the models analyzed focus more directly on the habitat and corridor functions of a riparian zone itself rather than the riparian zone in relation to the processes that are occurring within the stream and habitat adjacent to it. Conversely, stream models tend to include few variables associated with riparian habitat, even though the two ecosystems are functionally connected. Because riparian zones have a significant impact on the instream processes as well as the ecological functions, it is beneficial to consider both systems as a connected ecosystem when completing assessment procedures.

Geographical influence on model prioritization: The gap analysis chart has been organized to display geographic trends among the regional areas where the tools are applicable. From this, it seems that, in general, model variables closer to Pacific Northwest regions of the United States are species-oriented and reliant on the habitat aspects (aquatic and terrestrial) of the riparian zone for assessment. The Lower Willamette document, for example, incorporated HSI models where every variable was developed for individual species. This pattern could be a result of the other regions prioritizing the instream processes where pollution is of greater concern. Evidence of this includes both the Missouri River and Rio Grande models incorporating ‘adjacent land use’ as index variables. Assessing a larger number of riparian models would be beneficial to support this analysis.

Missing components of lateral/longitudinal connectivity: Lateral and longitudinal connectivity are important concepts to consider in riparian assessment. The idea of connectivity addresses the perception that an entire riparian ecosystem is interconnected through dimensional relationships rather than occurrences of separate individual processes. Some tools included in this review touched on the concept of lateral and longitudinal connectivity in their reports, but most of them failed to reflect the information in their model variables.

Few models include soil metrics: Soil is important because it is the source of many natural processes within an ecosystem. Riparian soil influences condition of vegetation, resiliency to droughts, floods, and fires, temperature regulation, carbon storage, and resistance to erosion. Very few models currently include metrics of soil condition, texture, or health. The lack of inclusion may stem from challenges of capabilities to assess soil condition in a rapid assessment process inherent in the index-based approach. While some tools include aspects of soil assessment (i.e. Cottonwood Riparian Forests of Missouri River, Middle Rio Grande Bosque Community, and most HGM models), determining an efficient method for assessing soil metrics within a riparian zone would be beneficial for understanding overall ecosystem condition.

Lack of urban representation as surrounding land use: The landscape surrounding a riparian zone can have a significant impact on the processes that occur within the ecosystem itself. Riparian buffer zones are frequently utilized as management practices in certain areas depending on the type (urban vs suburban vs rural) and the adjacent land use. The type of riparian model is going to be influenced by these factors and the purpose for which the tool will be developed. The gap analysis revealed that many of the tools were developed for rural and/or suburban settings. There is a different range of land use activities that vary from rural to suburban to urban areas and their impact on riparian zones and streams. For example, runoff from agricultural areas could contain large amounts of sediment and chemicals from fertilizers (i.e., pesticides and herbicides), whereas runoff from a highly urbanized region with large areas of impervious surface may contain larger amounts of a different set of pollutants such as, hydrocarbons, PCBs, and heavy metals. Because of this, urban-oriented assessment tools are needed for larger densely populated cities and areas.

Minimal forecasting capability: The models reviewed here largely focus on static assessment of ecological condition with notable exceptions (Welty et al., 2001). However, many riparian management applications require the ability to predict condition through time in response to changing climate, forest succession, environmental variability, and other changes. Future models should seek to more explicitly and mechanistically incorporate dynamic change through time.

**SUMMARY**: The purpose of this review was to identify gaps in model components and model types that are critical to understanding riparian and instream processes. This systematic review has revealed existing limitations in current riparian models that would improve model performance if corrected in future development of riparian tools. Interpreting the gap analysis and understanding what trends have been observed from previously developed models will help guide the evolution of various prospective models. Concepts including riparian function, geographic scope, ecosystem connectivity, and land use will be important considerations for researchers, regulators, and managers when making management/planning decisions for riparian restoration and mitigation. This project aims to develop a riparian model that assesses the impacts and benefits of riparian management actions. Following a tiered approach, several steps will be implemented to reach the model objectives. This review will be utilized as a valuable tool when considering input variables and ecological factors for the future riparian model.

Beyond this analysis, there are broader gaps to acknowledge. Due to their complexity, riparian ecosystems are a regulatory gap. Identified as the transitional area between aquatic and terrestrial land, riparian zones are not considered to be regulatory streams nor wetlands. This gap has impacted the riparian model development process. Model frameworks tend to only focus on parts of riparian function (e.g., floodplain wetlands, wetlands in riparian zones, adjacent streams, buffer vegetation) instead of including processes in all necessary components of the ecosystem. As a result, many current riparian models lack important variables (e.g., soil, connectivity, land use) that are essential when assessing a riparian zone. There remains more to understand about riparian zones to effectively model and manage them, and this review has provided a brief state-of-the-practice of the current approaches to riparian assessment.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** The authors are grateful for thoughtful input from the ERDC integrated ecological modeling and wildlife ecology teams. Specifically, reviews by Drs. Jacob Jung and Michael Guilfoyle significantly improved this technical note. The use of products does not represent an endorsement of these products by either the author or the Department of the Army. The study was conducted with support from the Ecosystem Management and Restoration Research Program (EMRRP). For information on EMRRP, please contact the Program Manager, Dr. Brook Herman ([Brook.D.Herman@erdc.usace.army.mil](mailto:Brook.D.Herman@erdc.usace.army.mil)) or consult https://emrrp.el.erdc.dren.mil/. This technical note should be cited as follows:

Wiest S., Hernandez-Abrams D.D., and McKay S.K. 2022. Review of riparian models for assessing ecological impacts and benefits. ERDC TN-EMRRP-xx. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. http://el.erdc.usace.army.mil/emrrp/emrrp.html

**REFERENCES CITED:**

Burkes-Copes, K.A. 2016. A Community-based Ecosystem Response Model for the Cottonwood Riparian Forests of the Missouri River. ERDC/EL FINAL REPORT. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center. [ERDC Knowledge Core: A community-based ecosystem response model for the resacas (oxbow lakes) of the lower Rio Grande (dren.mil)](https://erdc-library.erdc.dren.mil/jspui/handle/11681/7073)

Burkes-Copes, K.A. and Webb, A.C. 2012. A Bosque Riparian Community Index Model for the Middle Rio Grande, Albuquerque, New Mexico. ERDC/EL TR-12-26. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center. [ERDC Knowledge Core: A bosque riparian community index model for the Middle Rio Grande, Albuquerque, New Mexico (dren.mil)](https://erdc-library.erdc.dren.mil/jspui/handle/11681/7166)

Cole, R.A. 2010. A new nonmonetary metric for indicating environmental benefits from ecosystem restoration projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. ERDC/EL TR-10-12. [A new nonmonetary metric for indicating environmental benefits from ecosystem restoration projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (dren.mil)](https://erdc-library.erdc.dren.mil/jspui/handle/11681/6953)

Devendorf, R. and Yager, T. 2013. Modification of the Riverine Cover Type Component of the Habitat Suitability Index Model for Mink. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers St. Paul District.

ERO Resources Corporation. 2009. Ecological functions approach for terrestrial habitats at Chatfield Reservoir. Denver, CO.

Fischer, R.A. and Fischenich, J.C., 2000. Design recommendations for riparian corridors and vegetated buffer strips. Army engineer waterways experiment station Vicksburg ms engineer research and development center. [Design recommendations for riparian corridors and vegetated buffer strips (dren.mil)](https://erdc-library.erdc.dren.mil/jspui/handle/11681/3951)

Gene, S. M., Hoekstra, P. F., Hannam, C., White, M., Truman, C., Hanson, M. L., &amp; Prosser, R. S.

(2019). The role of vegetated buffers in agriculture and their regulation across Canada and the

United States. Journal of Environmental Management, 243(April), 12–21.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.05.003

Gurevitch, J., Koricheva, J., Nakagawa, S., Stewart, G. 2018. Meta-analysis and the science of research synthesis. Nature, Vol 555, pp. 175-182, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25753>.

Hauer, F.R., B.J. Cook, M.C. Gilbert, E.J. Clairain, and R.D. Smith. (2002). "A Regional Guidebook for Applying the Hydrogeomorphic Approach to Assessing Wetland Functions of Riverine Floodplains in the Northern Rocky Mountains," [ERDC/EL TR-02-21](https://wetlands.el.erdc.dren.mil/pdfs/trel02-21.pdf), U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. *(*[*FCI Calculator*](https://wetlands.el.erdc.dren.mil/calc/NorthernRockyMt.zip)*)*

Johnson R.R., Carothers S.W., Finch D.M., Kingsley K.J., and Stanley J.T. 2018. Riparian research and management: Past, present, future: Volume 1. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-377. Fort Collins, CO: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station.

Klimas, C. V., Murray, E. O., Langston, H., Witsell, T., Foti, T., and Holbrook, R. (2006). "A Regional Guidebook for Conducting Functional Assessments of Wetland and Riparian Forests in the Ouachita Mountains and Crowley's Ridge Regions of Arkansas," [ERDC/EL TR-06-14](https://wetlands.el.erdc.dren.mil/pdfs/trel06-14.pdf), U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. *(*[*FCI Calculator*](https://wetlands.el.erdc.dren.mil/calc/Ouachia_CrowleysRidge_FCICalc_10-2005.zip)*)*

Klimas, C. and Yuill, B. 2013. Skokomish river ecosystem restoration project environmental benefits analysis. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. [Skokomish river ecosystem restoration project environmental benefits analysis](https://publibrary.planusace.us/document/bbefff3e-f0b9-4c08-d209-60d985c73662)

Lind, L., Hasselquist, E. M., & Laudon, H. (2019). Towards ecologically functional riparian zones: A meta-analysis to develop guidelines for protecting ecosystem functions and biodiversity in agricultural landscapes. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *249*(July), 109391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109391

Lowrance, R., Altier, L.S., Williams, R.G., Inamdar, S.P., Sheridan, J.M., Bosch, D.D., Hubbard, R.K. and Thomas, D.L. 2000. REMM: The Riparian Ecosystem Management Model. Soil and Water Conservation Society. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 55(1):27-34.

McKay S.K., Goss M., Veraldi F., and Mattingly L. In press. Simple Model for Urban Riparian Function (SMURF), Version 1.0. ERDC TR-EMRRP. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 1996. Riparian areas environmental uniqueness, functions, and values. United State Department of Agriculture (USDA). <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/technical/?cid=nrcs143_014199>

National Research Council. 2002. Riparian Areas: Functions and Strategies for Management. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.https://doi.org/10.17226/10327.

Summers, E.A., Noble, C.V., Berkowitz, J.F., and Spiker, F.J. (2017). "Operational Draft Regional Guidebook for the Functional Assessment of High-Gradient Headwater Streams and Low-Gradient Perennial Streams in Appalachia," [ERDC/EL TR-17-1](https://wetlands.el.erdc.dren.mil/pdfs/trel17-1.pdf), U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS *(*[*FCI Calculator-High Gradient*](https://wetlands.el.erdc.dren.mil/calc/TR_17_1_a.zip)*,*[*FCI Calculator-Low Gradient*](https://wetlands.el.erdc.dren.mil/calc/TR_17_1_b.zip)*)*

Swannack T.M., Fischenich J.C., and Tazik D.J. 2012. Ecological modeling guide for ecosystem restoration and management. ERDC/EL TR-12-18. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center. [Ecological modeling guide for ecosystem restoration and management (dren.mil)](https://erdc-library.erdc.dren.mil/jspui/handle/11681/7222)

Tetra Tech, Inc. 2014. Lower Willamette River ecosystem restoration project. Appendix f: habitat evaluation model planning models documentation. Portland, OR.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2021. Upper Mississippi River System Floodplain Forest Habitat Model. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Galveston District. 2016. Model approval plan resaca reference condition for Brownsville Resaca Ecosystem Restoration Study. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Galveston District. [Model approval plan resaca reference condition for Brownsville Resaca Ecosystem Restoration Study](https://publibrary.planusace.us/document/ed2d5451-3af3-4708-940b-f36adbb39c9e)

Welty, J.J., Beechie, T., Sullivan, K., Hyink, D.M., Bilby, R.E., Andrus, C. and Pess, G. 2001. Riparian aquatic interaction simulator (RAIS): a model of riparian forest dynamics for the generation of large woody debris and shade. Elsevier. Forest Ecology and Management 162 (2002) 299–318.

1. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), Environmental Laboratory (EL), Vicksburg, MS, Phone: 601-634-XXXX, Email: [samantha.r.wiest@erdc.dren.mil](mailto:swiest@bennettaerospace.com) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. ERDC-EL, Vicksburg, MS, Email: [Darixa.D.HernandezAbrams@usace.army.mil](mailto:Darixa.D.HernandezAbrams@usace.army.mil) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. ERDC-EL, New York, NY, Email: [kyle.mckay@usace.army.mil](mailto:kyle.mckay@usace.army.mil) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. <https://ecolibrary.planusace.us/#/home> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Habitat suitability index models provide an assessment of ecosystem condition relative to the quantity and quality of a given patch of habitat (i.e., the area and a 0-1 index of “suitability”, respectively). Habitat quality or suitability is typically assessed relative to multiple environment metrics, each of which has an independent “suitability curve”. These models follow a general approach called the Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)