# Assessing ecological condition in USA surface waters: EMAP's approach for fish assemblages









# Karr's Original IBI Concept

- Species richness & composition
- Trophic composition
- Tolerance & sensitive composition
- Abundance & Anomalies
- No metric evaluation
- Metrics scored 1, 3, 5
- IBI scored 12-60

# EMAP Adjustments to IBI

- Habitat guilds
- Reproductive guilds
- Life history guilds
- Aliens
- Size classes
- Rigorous metric evaluation
- Metric scoring based on reference sites
- Metrics scored 0-10; IBI scored 0-100
- Applied to fish, birds, benthos & algae

#### Metrics in USEPA's Tiered Aquatic Life Uses

- Sensitive, long-lived, endemic species
- Sensitive, rare taxa
- Sensitive, ubiquitous taxa
- Taxa of intermediate tolerance
- Tolerant taxa
- Alien species
- Proportion of individuals with anomalies
- Migratory species
- Ecosystem function
- Extent & duration of detrimental effects
- Ecosystem connectance

### Fish IBI Development Approach



#### The Problem with Maximum Species Richness Lines (subsidy-stress gradient effect on species richness)



### Watershed Correction

(Use relationships observed at reference sites to define 'natural' component of watershed size effect)



## Watershed Calibration

(Use relationships observed at reference sites to define 'natural' component of watershed size effect)



Result: Each metric scored against its expected value in a reference site with watershed area = 100 km²

#### Final Fish IBI Metrics

Ecological Category Species Richness

**Tolerance** Guilds

Habitat Guilds

Trophic Guilds

**Reproductive Guilds** 

Origin Guild

<u>Metric Name</u> No. Native Cyprinid Sp.

Number Intolerant Sp. Proportion Tolerant Ind.

No. Native Benthic Sp. Proportion Cottid Ind.

Prop. Invert-Pisc Ind. Prop. Macro-Omnivore Ind.

Prop. Gravel Spawners

**Prop. Alien Individuals** 

Responds to: Watershed Condition

Chem & Phys Hab, W5 Cond. Chem & Phys Hab, W5 Cond.

Watershed Disturbance Nutrients, Phys Hab

Nutrients Physical Habitat

**Physical Habitat** 

**Species Introductions** 

#### Special Case - 'Fishless' Sites (If fishless sites are scored as IBI=0)



### Habitat Volume



#### Conclusion: High probability of 'fishless' streams when Habitat Volume Index < 0.4

#### Minimum Watershed Size



Conclusion: Habitat Volume Index Values < 0.4 common in watersheds less than 2 square kilometers. Below this watershed size, we cannot confidently expect to encounter fish - set IBI to missing when number of fish is < 10.

## Metric Scoring

- •All metrics scored on continuous scale, from 0 to 10
- •Scoring based on distributions of reference and test site scores in calibration data
- •Upper limit (10) set by median score in the reference distribution
- •Lower limit (0) set by 10th percentile score in the nonreference distribution
- •Sum of metric scores (1.11) yields IBI from 0 to 100

## Metric Scoring



## **Responsiveness of Final Index**



Filtering Probability Sites to Yield Reference Sites

#### Excluded all sites with:

- sulfate over 400 µeq/L (mine drainage)
- acid neutralizing capacity less than 50 µeq/L (acid rain)
- average RBP habitat score less than 16 (physical habitat)
- total phosphorus over 20 µg/L (nutrient enrichment)
- total nitrogen over 750  $\mu$ g/L (nutrient enrichment)
- chloride over 100 µeq/L (general watershed disturbance)
- insufficient sample (watersheds < 2 sq. km.)</li>

## IBI ScoringThresholds

- Goal: Use the distribution of IBI scores in <u>reference</u> <u>sites</u> to set thresholds between good, fair and poor IBI.
- But there are multiple ways to define reference, and each gives a different reference distribution:
- Uncertain: based on best professionaljudgement, near roads (n = 38, good geographic coverage)
- Least restrictive: based on chemical and qualitative physical habitat filters (n = 27, good geographic coverage)
- Moderately restrictive: adds quantitative physical habitat filters (n = 23, good geographic coverage)
- Most restrictive: adds watershed condition class (1 or 2) (n =12, restricted geographic coverage)

# **Reference** Condition



### **Reference and Trashed Sites**

Reference site definition: (all calibration reference sites met all these criteria) ANC > 50 µeq/L Total Phosphorus < 20 µg/L Total Nitrogen < 750 µg/L Chloride < 100 µeq/L Sulfate < 400 µeq/L Mean RBP Score > 15 Habitat Quality Metrics > 0.5 (QTPH1, QCPH1, QW1, QWR1) Trashed site definition: (a) calibration trashed sites failed at least one of these criteria) **bH < 5** Total Phosphorus >100 µg/L Total Nitrogen >5000  $\mu$ g/L Chloride > 1000  $\mu$ eg/L Sulfate > 1000 µeg/L Mean RBP Habitat Score < 10 Habitat Quality Metrics < 0.3 (QTPH1, QCPH1, QW1, QWR1) Watershed Condition Class = 5

## **IBI** Validation

#### Results from validation data set aside at start of process



## Conclusion: IBI can discriminate between disturbed and relatively undisturbed streams

# IBI Results Geographic Distribution



## W-EMAP Fish IBI Challenges

- Generally depauperate fauna
- Low species richness in streams
- Species with variable life histories
- Population abundance very important
- High % alien species & individuals
- Major natural gradients co-occur with human disturbance gradients

# Coast Range Fish IBI Metrics

- % Alien species
- % Coolwater species.
- % Anadromous species
- % Coldwater species
- No. tolerant individuals
- No. native coldwater species
- No. native coldwater individuals
- No. size classes







## Cold Water River IBI Metrics

- % cold water individuals
- No. cold water native species
- % sensitive native individuals
- No. coldwater individuals/minute
- No. selected salmonid age classes
- No. sculpin age classes
- No. alien species
- % tolerant individuals
- % common carp
- % individuals with DELT anomalies





% watershed area mapped as disturb

#### Willamette Valley IBI Metrics

- No. native families
- No. native species
- No. native benthic species
- No. native water column species
- No. hider species
- No. sensitive species
- No. native nonguarding lithophil nester species
- % tolerant individuals
- % filter feeding individuals
- % omnivores
- % native top carnivore individuals
- % target species with lunkers
- % individuals with anomalies

#### References

- Cao et al. 2001. CJFAS 58:1782-1793.
- Cao et al. 2002. JNABS 21:701-714.
- Hughes et al. 2002. NAJFM 22:1229-1240.
- Reynolds et al. 2003. NAJFM 23:450-461.
- Hughes & Gammon, 1987, TAFS 116:196-209.
- Hughes et al. 1998. CJFAS 55:1618-1631.
- Hughes et al. In Review. TAFS.
- McCormick et al. 2001, TAFS 130:857-877.
- Mebane et al. 2002, TAFS 132:239-261.

#### Oregon DEQ Biomonitoring Sites (from R. Hafele)

1996-2000

![](_page_33_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Biology Shows Greater Impairment than Chemistry

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Willamette Basin

Macroinvertebrate Community

![](_page_35_Picture_2.jpeg)

**Vertebrate Community** 

![](_page_35_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_5.jpeg)

**Fine Sediment** 

![](_page_35_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_8.jpeg)

# Willamette Valley Ecoregion

![](_page_36_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_3.jpeg)

Water Quality

**Vertebrate Community** 

![](_page_36_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_8.jpeg)

Random Adult Coho Surveys (from S. Jacobs)

- 540 sites per year
- ~120 per GCA
- Spatially-balanced sample

• Integrated with juvenile and habitat sampling

#### Coho Abundance By Monitoring Area

![](_page_38_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_0.jpeg)

#### **Oregon Population Estimates**

![](_page_40_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Fish Tissue Hg > 0.1 $\mu$ g/g by Taxon

![](_page_41_Figure_1.jpeg)