National Lake Assessment Survey Design: 2007

Contact:

Susan Holdsworth
Office of Water
OWOW Monitoring Branch
USEPA (4503T)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460
(202) 566-1187

Email: Holdsworth.Susan@epa.gov

Description of Sample Design

Target population: All lakes, reservoirs, and ponds within the 48 contiguous United States greater than 1 hectare in surface area that are permanent waterbodies. Note that the minimum surface area actually implemented may be increased to either 4 hectares or 10 hectares. The word "lake" in the remainder of this document includes lakes, reservoirs and ponds. Lakes that are saline are excluded as are those used for aquaculture, disposal-tailings, sewage treatment, evaporation, or other unspecified disposal use.

Sample Frame: The sample frame was derived from the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD).

Survey Design: A Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS) survey design for a finite resource is used. The design includes reverse hierarchical ordering of the selected lakes.

Multi-density categories: A complex unequal probability selection process was used to allocate number of lakes to be sampled to a number of lake categories. First, 791 lakes were identified as lakes sampled during the 1970s National Lake Eutrophication study (NES). Two lake area categories, (1,4] and (4,10] hectare ranges, were defined (excluding any NES lakes). All remaining lakes were categorized (1) by four lake area size categories, (10, 20], (20, 50], (50, 100], and >100 hectares; (2) by 48 states, and (3) by nine (9) aggregated Omernik Level 3 ecoregions. This resulted in 427 unique lake categories for the unequal probability design

Stratification: No stratification

Panels: Design uses a single panel with an over sample.

Expected sample size: Expected sample size 1000 lakes including all lakes/reservoirs greater than 1 hectare in surface area in the sample frame. Of the 1000

lakes, the expected sample size for NES lakes is 100; for lakes (1, 4] is 90, for lakes (4, 10] is 90, and 720 for the remaining 424 categories. The 720 lakes were allocated so that initially (1) 180 would occur in each of the four lake surface area categories of (10, 20], (20, 50], (50, 100], and >100 hectares and (2) 15 would occur in each of the 48 states. Assuming independence of lake area and states resulted in an expected number of lakes for each state and lake area category combination. These were then adjusted to have an expected sample size of 80 lakes within each of the nine aggregated ecoregions.

Over sample: 4000 lakes were selected as potential replacement lakes. The large over sample size was done to accommodate those states who may want to increase the number of lakes sampled within their state for a state-level design.

Site Use: Each lake selected to be sampled is given unique site identification (siteID) that consists of two parts, NLA06608, and a number between 1 and 5000. It critical this siteID be used in its entirety to make sure that the lakes are correctly identified. Within each state, lakes evaluated for potential sampling must have all siteIDs from the largest to the lowest number evaluated. For example, if NLA06608-0235 is the largest siteID evaluated within a state, then all siteID that are lower than "0235" within the state must be evaluated. Even more critical is that if NLA06608-0235 is the largest siteID that is actually sampled in the field, then all lower siteIDs within the state that are evaluated to be a target lake and is accessible must be sampled in the field.

If lakes (1, 4] or (4, 10] hectares in size are included in the target population, then only those lakes in the base sample of 1000 lakes (panel=Panel_1 lakes) will be evaluated. If one of these lakes can not be sampled, then it will not be replaced by another lake.

Sample Frame Summary

Number of NES lakes by lake surface area category

	# Lakes
(0,1]	0
(1,4]	2
(4,10]	8
(10,20]	5
(20,50]	44
(50,100]	62
>100	670
Total	791

Number of lakes by lake surface area and Three aggregated Ecoregions

	WMTNS	EHIGH	PLNLOW	OTHER	Sum
(0,1]	0	0	0	0	0
(1,4]	14272	28156	112773	0	155201
(4,10]	6951	9591	52017	0	68559
(10,20]	2644	3696	18562	0	24902
(20,50]	1684	2595	12209	0	16488
(50,100]	605	1085	4444	0	6134
>100	1058	1412	4886	0	7356
Sum	27214	46535	204891	0	278640

Number of lakes by lake surface area and nine aggregated ecoregions

CPL NAP NPL SAP SPL TPL UMW WMT XER OTH Sum	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	45228 10847 11363 17309 15536 23213 17433 9537 4735	20781 5335 5137 4256 6006 9114 10979 4804 2147	7018 2421 1438 1275 1863 3041 5202 1763 881	4199 1923 764 672 881 2026 4339 1039 645	838 286 247 252 775 1797 351 254	1475 1047 235 365 351 809 2016 598 460 0	80035 22411 19223 24124 24889 38978 41766
Number				and lake				_
						(50,100]		Sum
AL	0	4781	1440	359	179	67		6881
AR	0	2768	1445	570	362	118		5406
AZ	0	276	124	56	45	22	39	562
CA	0	3051	1479	586	346	112	240	5814
CO	0	2305	1073	332	202	72	117	4101
CT	0	1071	376	152	128	51	38	1816
DE	0	209	62	45	32	10	3	361
$_{ m FL}$	0	7691	5213	1926	1296	451		17053
GA	0	7290	2974	709	325	73	62	11433
HI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IA	0	3014	711	202	152	48	58	4185
ID	0	1094		177	105	46		1974
$_{ m IL}$	0	4077		524	285	95		6718
IN	0	3224	1184	371	200	72		5114
KS	0	6428	1239	272	115	33	50	8137
KY	0	1433	434	172	73	25	27	2164
LA	0	5881	3188	1180	720	280	386	11635
MA	0	1427	742	372	313	130	86	3070
MD	0	597	242	93	50	9	12	1003
ME	0	1519	921	547	468	256	482	4193
MΙ	0	5164			1133			
MN	0	9312		2876	2552		1311	
MO	0	3976	1514	378	165	51		6131
MS	0		1792	535	308	64		9167
MT	0							9158
NC	0	4544	846	266	145	62	94	5957
ND	0	3925	3157		882	355	258	9891
	0		1261		320	103	73	
NE		2278		478				4513
NH	0	622	434	234	161	98	77	1626
NJ	0	1077	526	230	130	26	35	2024
NM	0	521	167	68	50	25	39	870
NV	0	204	127	70	67	20	72	560
NY	0	3576	1860	783	546	201	255	7221
OH	0	3148	931	217	123	53	76	4548
OK	0	4550	1749	472	212	61	89	7133
OR	0	999	554	237	171	59	138	2158
PA	0	2182	835	324	239	80	71	3731
PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	0	226	115	53	49	25	20	488
SC	0	3755	1137	322	153	32	44	5443
SD	0	5093	2152	600	382	135	152	8514
עט	J	5075	4174	000	202	100	104	0314

TN	0	1030	467	175	114	33	49	1868
TX	0	14937	5880	1943	929	245	346	24280
UT	0	857	560	206	115	65	110	1913
VA	0	2912	801	263	146	39	45	4206
VT	0	389	205	76	75	38	39	822
WA	0	2237	1086	395	289	93	124	4224
WI	0	4200	2929	1312	1070	450	487	10448
WV	0	339	111	27	8	4	12	501
WY	0	2938	1162	424	257	77	83	4941
Sum	0	155201	68559	24902	16488	6134	7356	278640

Site Selection Summary

Number of NES lakes by Lake surface area in sample

Area Ca	Base		Sum
(0,1]	0	0	0
(1,4]	0	2	2
(4,10]	1	1	2
(10,20]	1	2	3
(20,50]	11	16	27
(50,100]	9	31	40
>100	91	354	445
Total	113	406	519

Number of lakes by Aggregated Ecoregion and lake surface area

Base Sample:

Jase	pampre.							
		Lake	e surfac	ce area d	category	(hectares	3)	
	(0,1]	(1,4]	(4,10]	(10,20]	(20,50]	(50,100]	>100	Sum
CPI	. 0	25	39	19	23	19	19	144
NAF	0	4	7	15	21	26	25	98
NPI	. 0	9	7	30	22	22	11	101
SAF	0	16	5	22	16	12	29	100
SPI	. 0	5	12	28	19	13	30	107
TPI	. 0	13	10	31	28	16	31	129
UMW	1 0	12	16	11	19	20	35	113
ΓMW	. 0	4	8	18	19	25	44	118
XEF	0	3	0	11	17	19	40	90
OTH	0 E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sun	n 0	91	104	185	184	172	264	1000

Over Sample:

	_								
		Lake	e surfac	ce area d	category	(hectares)			
	(0,1]	(1,4]	(4,10]	(10,20]	(20,50]	(50,100]	>100	Sum	
CPL	0	126	100	96	102	61	101	586	
NAP	0	28	23	65	86	100	111	413	
NPL	0	33	34	104	85	74	59	389	
SAP	0	23	27	100	64	73	126	413	
SPL	0	32	36	107	62	66	105	408	
\mathtt{TPL}	0	61	38	94	91	83	137	504	
UMW	0	41	50	64	101	94	137	487	
WMT	0	28	28	82	76	60	115	389	
XER	0	14	12	62	68	71	135	362	

OTH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Sum	0	386	348	774	735	682	1026	3951						
Total	Sample	: :												
		(hectares	3)											
	(0,1]	(1,4]	(4,10]	(10,20]	(20,50]	(50,100]	>100	Sum						
CPL	0	151	139	115	125	80	120	730						
NAP	0	32	30	80	107	126	136	511						
NPL	0	42	41	134	107	96	70	490						
SAP	0	39	32	122	80	85	155	513						
SPL	0	37	48	135	81	79	135	515						
\mathtt{TPL}	0	74	48	125	119	99	168	633						
UMW	0	53	66	75	120	114	172	600						
VMT	0	32	36	100	95	85	159	507						
XER	0	17	12	73	85	90	175	452						
OTH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Sum	0	477	452	959	919	854	1290	4951						

Number of lakes by state and lake surface area

LVallid	O	Laiser	$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$	Deace	ana
	OverSam	np	Base	Sum	
AL	6	52	18	80	
AR		55	11	66	
AZ	7	4	21	95	
CA	9	0	22	112	
CO	9	6	30	126	
CT		19	14	63	
DE	2	29	9	38	
$_{ m FL}$	10		23	130	
GA		3	22	85	
IA		2	19	91	
ID		59	21	90	
$_{ m IL}$	8	37	20	107	
IN		6	23	119	
KS		7	20	117	
KY		0	13	73	
LA		15	17	92	
MA		ł O	11	51	
MD		ł O	5	45	
ME		51	11	72	
MΙ	13		31	170	
MN	20		49	249	
MO		19	20	99	
MS		18	15	63	
MT	18		44	224	
NC		55	21	86	
ND	17		43	222	
NE	11		32	144	
NH		18	13	61	
NJ		18	10	58	
NM		1	15	106	
NV		32	19	101	
NY		59	12	81	
OH		57	20	87	
OK	10		36	139	
OR		3	30	103	
PA	6	57	20	87	

RI	44	12	56
SC	60	9	69
SD	139	43	182
TN	61	12	73
TX	143	31	174
UT	82	23	105
VA	60	16	76
VT	49	9	58
WA	78	20	98
WI	144	32	176
WV	36	8	44
WY	83	25	108
Sum	3951	1000	4951

Number of lakes by state and lake area category for base sample only $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($

_	(0,1]	(1,4]	(4,10]	(10,20]	(20,50]	(50,100]	>100	Sum
AL	0	4	3	2	1	1	7	18
AR	0	1	3	0	3	2	2	11
AZ	0	0	0	2	7	4	8	21
CA	0	1	1	4	5	3	8	22
CO	0	0	2	7	4	6	11	30
CT	0	0	0	2	6	4	2	14
DE	0	1	0	1	1	5	1	9
FL	0	3	10	2	3	2	3	23
GA	0	8	6	1	3	0	4	22
HI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IA	0	1	1	8	4	2	3	19
ID	0	2	1	1	6	3	8	21
$_{ m IL}$	0	3	1	4	5	2	5	20
IN	0	2	3	4	6	3	5	23
KS	0	2	1	7	4	3	3	20
KY	0	3	0	3	3	3	1	13
LA	0	3	4	0	1	4	5	17
MA	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	11
MD	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	5
ME	0	1	1	0	1	4	4	11
MΙ	0	2	6	1	6	7	9	31
MN	0	8	7	4	4	8	18	49
MO	0	1	6	6	2	3	2	20
MS	0	4	3	2	3	2	1	15
MT	0	4	4	10	6	10	10	44
NC	0	3	1	3	3	6	5	21
ND	0	5	3	8	13	9	5	43
NE	0	0	2	10	10	5	5	32
NH	0	0	1	3	0	5	4	13
NJ	0	2	0	1	4	1	2	10
NM	0	0	0	5	1	3	6	15
NV	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	19
NY	0	0	2	1	2	2	5	12
OH	0	1	1	4	3	4	7	20
OK	0	1	2	11	7	4	11	36
OR	0	0	2	4	5	6	13	30
PA	0	2	2	6	4	3	3	20
PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	0	1	0	4	3	2	2	12

SC	0	3	3	1	0	0	2	9
SD	0	4	0	16	10	7	6	43
TN	0	0	0	3	5	1	3	12
TX	0	6	14	2	0	0	9	31
UT	0	0	1	2	1	6	13	23
VA	0	1	1	6	6	0	2	16
VT	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	9
WA	0	2	0	5	4	5	4	20
WI	0	3	2	4	6	5	12	32
WV	0	0	0	4	2	1	1	8
WY	0	2	2	6	3	6	6	25
Sum	0	91	104	185	184	172	264	1000

Description of Sample Design Output:

The dbf file for the shapefile ("NLA Lake Sites Final") has the following variable definitions:

definitions:			
Variable Name	Description		
siteID	Unique identification label for each lake in the sample		
xcoord	x-coordinate of lake centroid (see Albers projection information below)		
ycoord	y-coordinate of lake centroid (see Albers projection information below)		
mdcaty	inclusion probability used for the unequal probability selection of the sample lake		
wgt	Weight (number of lakes) to be used in the statistical analyses. It is the inverse of the inclusion probability		
stratum	Strata used in design. All equal to NLALake		
panel	Panel_1 identifies the 1000 lakes in the base design. Oversamp identifies lakes to be used as replacements as necessary.		
EvalStatus	Placeholder to record the results of the lake recon evaluation (see below)		
EvalReason	Placeholder to record reason for the evalution result.		
oid_	ID from original lake frame shapefile		
rch_com1	From original NHD lake frame shapefile		
com_id	From original NHD lake frame shapefile		
ftype	NHD ftype field		
fcode	NHD fcode field		
gnis_id	GNIS identification		
name	Lake name		
statecty	FIPS state and county code		
st	State two-letter abbreviation		
cntyname	County name		
eco	Omernik level 3 ecoregion number (DO NOT USE)		
level3	Omernik level 3 ecoregion number (USE THIS for ecoregion)		
level3_nam	Omernik level 3 ecoregion name (DO NOT USE; not all are present)		
	·		

huc_1214	USGS hydrologic catalog code for 12-14 digit units		
cu_name	USGS hydrologic catalog unit name		
region	USGS hydrologic region number		
storetassi	Storet number for NES lakes		
area_ha	Area in hectares calculated from polygon lake frame in Albers projection		
epa_reg	EPA region number		
wsa_eco9	Name of nine aggregated Omernik level 3 ecoregion		
wsa_eco3	Name of three aggregated Omernik level 3 ecoregion		
area_cat	Detailed lake surface area categories in hectares		
area_cat3	Three category lake surface area categories in hectares		
area_cat5	Five category lake surface area categories in hectares		
area_cat7	Seven category lake surface area categories in hectares		
dsgn_cat	Multi-density categories used in unequal probabilty survey design		
inc_nw	Inclusion probability based on nationwide sample of (1, 10] hectare lakes		
inc_st	Inclusion probability based on states		
inc_cat7	Inclusion probability based on seven area categories		
inc_st7	Inclusion probability based on combined state and seven area categories		
inc_9st7	Inclusion probability based on combined nine aggregated ecoregions,		
inc_nes	Inclusion probability based on NES lakes		
neslake	Identifies NES lake		

Projection Information

PROJCS["USA_Contiguous_Albers_Equal_Area_Conic",

GEOGCS["GCS_North_American_1983",

DATUM["D_North_American_1983",

SPHEROID["GRS_1980",6378137.0,298.257222101]],

PRIMEM["Greenwich", 0.0],

UNIT["Degree",0.0174532925199433]],PROJECTION["Albers"],PARAMETER["False _Easting",0.0],

PARAMETER["False_Northing",0.0],

PARAMETER["Central_Meridian",-96.0],

PARAMETER["Standard_Parallel_1",29.5],

PARAMETER["Standard_Parallel_2",45.5],

PARAMETER["Latitude_Of_Origin",37.5],

UNIT["Meter",1.0]]

Evaluation Process

The survey design weights that are given in the design file assume that the survey design is implemented as designed. Typically, users prefer to replace sites that can not be sampled with other sites to achieve the sample size planned. The site replacement

process is described above. When sites are replaced, the survey design weights are no longer correct and must be adjusted. The weight adjustment requires knowing what happened to each site in the base design and the over sample sites. EvalStatus is initially set to "NotEval" to indicate that the site has yet to be evaluated for sampling. When a site is evaluated for sampling, then the EvalStatus for the site must be changed. Recommended codes are:

EvalStatus	Name	Meaning
Code		
TS	Target Sampled	site is a member of the target population and was
		sampled
LD	Landowner Denial	landowner denied access to the site
PB	Physical Barrier	physical barrier prevented access to the site
NT	Non-Target	site is not a member of the target population
NN	Not Needed	site is a member of the over sample and was not
		evaluated for sampling
Other		Many times useful to have other codes. For
codes		example, rather than use NT, may use specific codes
		indicating why the site was non-target.

Statistical Analysis

Any statistical analysis of data must incorporate information about the monitoring survey design. In particular, when estimates of characteristics for the entire target population are computed, the statistical analysis must account for any stratification or unequal probability selection in the design. Procedures for doing this are available from the Aquatic Resource Monitoring web page given in the bibliography. A statistical analysis library of functions is available from the web page to do common population estimates in the statistical software environment R.

For further information, contact

Anthony (Tony) R. Olsen USEPA NHEERL Western Ecology Division 200 S.W. 35th Street Corvallis, OR 97333

Voice: (541) 754-4790 Fax: (541) 754-4716

email: Olsen.Tony@epa.gov

Bibliography:

Diaz-Ramos, S., D. L. Stevens, Jr, and A. R. Olsen. 1996. EMAP Statistical Methods Manual. EPA/620/R-96/002, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, NHEERL-Western Ecology Division, Corvallis, Oregon.

Stevens, D.L., Jr. 1997. Variable density grid-based sampling designs for continuous spatial populations. Environmetrics, 8:167-95.

Stevens, D.L., Jr. and Olsen, A.R. 1999. Spatially restricted surveys over time for aquatic resources. Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics, 4:415-428

Stevens, D. L., Jr., and A. R. Olsen. 2003. Variance estimation for spatially balanced samples of environmental resources. Environmetrics **14**:593-610.

Stevens, D. L., Jr., and A. R. Olsen. 2004. Spatially-balanced sampling of natural resources in the presence of frame imperfections. Journal of American Statistical Association:99:262-278.

Horn, C.R. and Grayman, W.M. (1993) Water-quality modeling with EPA reach file system. Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management, 119, 262-74.

Strahler, A.N. 1957. Quantitative Analysis of Watershed Geomorphology. Trans. Am. Geophys. Un. 38,913-920.

Web Page: http://www.epa.gov/nheerl/arm