

Using aquatic organisms to learn about river health



Rivers face many threats

Impoundment



Urbanization



Nonpoint pollution



Flow alteration




Stormwater runoff

Monitoring helps sustain designated uses




Rivers are a hierarchy of habitats




↑
Most appropriate for monitoring

Too much water to monitor!




USGS flow gauge sites

Too much water to monitor!



SCDNR: >400 fish sites

Too much water to monitor!



- >28,000 segments in SC
- >15,000 river miles
- And that's just wadeable streams (~84% of surface water in SC)

Too much water to monitor!




for people to



A freshwater biodiversity global hotspot


Fish Diversity



Richness of the 863 species with range maps

BiodiversityMapping.org

SC Freshwater Diversity



- 146 fish species
- 1,092 invertebrate groups (many more species)

Bio-assessment: using aquatic organisms to learn about river health

ASSESSMENT OF BIOTIC INTEGRITY USING FISH COMMUNITIES

James R. Karr

ABSTRACT

Man's activities have had profound, and usually negative, influences on freshwater fishes from the smallest streams to the largest rivers. Some negative effects are due to contaminants, while others are associated with changes in watershed hydrology, habitat modifications, and alteration of energy sources upon which the aquatic biota depends. Regrettably, past efforts to evaluate effects of man's activities on fishes have attempted to use water quality as a surrogate for more comprehensive biotic assessment. A more refined biotic assessment program is required for effective protection of freshwater fish resources. An assessment system proposed here uses a series of fish community attributes related to species composition and ecological structure to evaluate the quality of an aquatic biota. In preliminary trials this system accurately reflected the status of fish communities and the environment supporting them.

Passage of the Water Quality Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) stimulated many efforts to monitor the quality of water resource systems. Unfortunately, these efforts concentrated on development of thresholds and criteria levels for specific contaminants, often based on acute toxicity tests. The use of these criteria has been attacked on numerous grounds (Thurston et al. 1979); for example, they have not taken into account naturally occurring geographic variation of contaminants (e.g., asbestos, iron, zinc), considered the synergistic effects of numerous contaminants, nor considered sublethal effects (e.g., reproduction, growth) of most contaminants. In addition, monitoring of water quality parameters (nutrients, DO, temperature, pesticides, heavy metals, and other toxics) often misses short-term events that may be critical to assessment of biotic impacts. Finally, it is impossible to measure all factors that may impact biotic integrity. In fact, much literature on chem-



James R. Karr

THE AUTHOR: James R. Karr is Professor of Ecology in the Department of Ecology, Ethology, and Evolution and the Department of Forestry at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and an affiliate of the Aquatic Biology Section of the Illinois Natural History Survey. He received a B.S. from Iowa State University and M.S. and Ph.D. from the University of Illinois. He has served as a consultant to USEPA, USDA-SCS, and Organization of American States (in Venezuela) on water resource and watershed development projects. His interest in fisheries develops from an interest in applying ecological principles to a variety of resource problems. Another major research focus deals with tropical forest ecology, especially bird communities. Address: Department of Ecology, Ethology, and Evolution, University of Illinois, 606 E. Healey, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

ical contaminants is of questionable value for setting water quality standards for aquatic organisms (Gosz 1980). Chemical monitoring misses many of the man-induced perturbations that impair use. For example, flow alterations, habitat degradation, heated effluents, and uses for power generation are not detected in chemical sampling. In short, criteria that emphasize physical and chemical attributes of water are unsuccessful as surrogates for measuring biotic integrity (Karr and Dudley 1981).

Recent legislation (Clean Water Act of 1977, PL 95-217) clearly calls for a more refined approach when pollution is defined as "the manmade or man-induced alteration of the chemical, physical, biological, and radiological integrity of water." Despite this refinement, regulatory agencies have been slow to replace the classical approach (uniform standards focusing on contaminant levels) with a more sophisticated and environmentally sound approach.

The integrity of water resources can best be assessed by evaluating the degree to which waters provide for beneficial uses. Important uses as defined by society may include water supply, recreational, and other uses as well as the preservation of future options for the use of the resource. Since an ability to sustain a balanced biotic community is one of the best indicators of the potential for beneficial use, sophisticated monitoring programs should seek to assess "biotic integrity."

This paper describes a procedure for monitoring water resources using fish. My contention is that by carefully monitoring fishes, one can rapidly assess the health ("biotic integrity") of a local water resource. In short, carefully planned monitoring and assessment can rapidly and relatively inexpensively serve as an exploratory assessment of water resource quality. Where impaired use is suggested by biological monitoring, a more nearly complete monitoring program can be implemented in search of the causative agent(s).

WHY MONITOR FISH?

Biological communities reflect watershed conditions since they are sensitive to changes in a wide array of environmental factors. Many groups of organisms have been proposed as indicators of environmental quality, but no single group has emerged as the

Bio-assessment: using aquatic organisms to learn about river health

1. Identify which environmental attribute you want to evaluate
2. Hypothesize relationships between organisms and environmental attributes
3. Identify key relationships between organisms and environment
4. Use those results to inform management

Bio-assessment: using aquatic organisms to learn about river health

- 1. Identify which environmental attribute you want to evaluate**
2. Hypothesize relationships between organisms and environmental attributes
3. Identify key relationships between organisms and environment
4. Use those results to inform management

Rivers face many threats

Impoundment



Urbanization




Nonpoint pollution




Flow alteration



Stormwater runoff





Rivers face many threats

Impoundment



Urbanization



Nonpoint pollution



Flow alteration



Stormwater runoff

Bio-assessment: using aquatic organisms to learn about river health

1. Identify which environmental attribute you want to evaluate
2. Hypothesize relationships between organisms and environmental attributes
3. Identify key relationships between organisms and environment
4. Use those results to inform management

Characterizing aquatic diversity


- Diverse biota = healthy ecosystem
- **Species richness:** number of species
- **Diversity index:** Accounts for percentages



Negative relationship with flow alteration

Species traits: body shape

Flow specialists, need good flow



High tail aspect ratio
Rosyside Dace

Flow generalists, live anywhere



Low tail aspect ratio
Brown Bullhead



Long & slender (torpedo shaped)
Notchlip Redhorse



Short & stubby
Pirate Perch

- Negatively affected by flow alteration
- % will decrease with flow alteration

- Not affected by flow alteration
- % will increase with flow alteration

Bio-assessment: using aquatic organisms to learn about river health

1. Identify which environmental attribute you want to evaluate
2. Hypothesize relationships between organisms and environmental attributes
3. Identify key relationships between organisms and environment
4. Use those results to inform management


Identify relationships: plot biota against flow




Fish metric

Flow metric


Identify relationships: some are informative





Identify relationships: some are not informative



Identify relationships: remove uninformative relationships



Filter: statistical modeling process



Bio-assessment: using aquatic organisms to learn about river health

1. Identify which environmental attribute you want to evaluate
2. Hypothesize relationships between organisms and environmental attributes
3. Identify key relationships between organisms and environment
4. Use those results to inform management

Questions? Up next:

Dr. Luke Bower (USGS/Clemson): Developing flow-ecology relationships for all SC streams



Eric Kreuger (TNC): Using flow-ecology relationships to develop water use guidances

