

Concepts and Approaches for the Bioassessment of Non-wadeable Streams and Rivers

Concepts and Approaches for the Bioassessment of Non-wadeable Streams and Rivers

Joseph E. Flotemersch¹, James B. Stribling², and Michael J. Paul²

¹US Environmental Protection Agency
National Exposure Research Laboratory
26 W. Martin Luther King Dr., MS 642
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268

²Tetra Tech, Inc.
400 Red Brook Blvd., Suite 200
Owings Mills, Maryland 21117-5159

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Washington, DC 20460

Notice

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency through its Office of Research and Development funded and managed the research described here. It has been subjected to the Agency's peer and administrative review and approved for publication. The document was prepared at the EPA National Exposure Research Laboratory, Ecological Exposure Research Division, with support under contract 68-C-02-108 to Tetra Tech, Inc. Although this work was reviewed by EPA and approved for publication, it may not necessarily reflect official Agency policy. Mention of trade names and commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

The correct citation for this document is:

Flotemersch, J. E., J. B. Stribling, and M. J. Paul. 2006. Concepts and Approaches for the Bioassessment of Non-wadeable Streams and Rivers. EPA 600-R-06-127. US Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, Ohio.

This entire document can be downloaded from the website of the USEPA, Office of Research and Development, National Exposure Research Laboratory, Ecological Exposure Research Division:

<http://www.epa.gov/eerd/rivers/>

**Cover image © 2006 by Martha Greenwald
www.marthagreenwald.com**

Foreword

“Downstream, that’s where we are all headed. Out in the flow, we all feel it, sometimes turbulent, sometimes gentle flowing, but always moving...downstream.”

Richard Russo

Empire Falls

Human history is replete with stories, songs, and pictures documenting the extraordinary importance and value of rivers to our lives. Almost every situation in life is reflected in rivers. Rivers are among the most animated of inanimate objects; among the liveliest of non-living natural things. Rivers offer us solace in times of trouble and instill awe in the power they can generate. They can provide a gentle place to rest, float, and think, but yet are persistent enough to erode even the hardest canyons the earth can muster.

Rivers touch all parts of the natural environment and nearly all aspects of human life and culture. They often act as centers of organization within landscapes. Their roles in providing natural resources such as fish and clean water are well known as are their roles in providing transportation, energy, diffusion of wastes and recreation (Naiman and Bilby 1998). However, as a consequence of this close relationship, the integrity of rivers is often challenged. Fish ecologist and essayist Peter Moyle has been quoted as saying “no matter how bad things are on land, you’ll find that they’re worse in nearby rivers.” (Shepard 2001).

Sociocultural evolutionists have postulated that the United States has evolved from a pre-industrial society, to an industrial society, into what Daniel Bell (1973) coined a post-industrial society. Such societal changes are generally accompanied by changes in what society values. In the 1960’s of the United States, this included an increased interest in the well-being and sustainability of our natural resources. ***This document is intended to provide support to those concerned with the well-being and sustainability of large rivers.***

There is a Chinese proverb that states *the mark of a successful man is that he has spent an entire day on the bank of a river without feeling guilty about it.* While this quote most likely speaks to the man’s freedom from the need to earn money, the closest most of us will ever come is to enjoy earning our living on the banks of a river. This document represents an opportunity to do just that.

The US Environmental Protection Agency through its Office of Research and Development (Cincinnati, OH) and Regional Methods Initiative funded much of the research described herein and subsequent production of this document. The US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Office of Science and Technology, Washington, DC provided additional funding for document production. Tetra Tech, Inc. provided primary technical support. Much appreciation is extended to the extensive list of reviewers who provided thoughtful and detailed critique of earlier drafts, and assisted our efforts to push the document toward scientific peer review standards. Any shortcomings, however, remain the responsibility of the authors.

Preface

In 1998, the National Exposure Research Laboratory (NERL) of the US Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Research and Development (USEPA-ORD) received funding to develop standardized protocols for the bioassessment of large (i.e., non-wadeable) streams and rivers. The request came from scientists in USEPA's regional offices who recognized that states and tribes need these protocols (which we term Large River Bioassessment Protocols or LR-BP), to meet their monitoring and enforcement objectives. In response, we conducted several years of research and development to adapt existing or devise new protocols, specific to the ecological and logistical demands of these large, flowing systems. We systematically compared alternative approaches and documented their performance characteristics, collaborating extensively with regional, State and Tribal scientists to ensure that the protocols were both technically feasible and economically practical.

We originally conceived of this document as a compilation of these research results. At the request of the user community, however, we have expanded it to present a comprehensive technical framework for the bioassessment of non-wadeable streams and rivers. While presentation of the LR-BP remains our main focus, several other bioassessment approaches exist that vary in purpose and technical approach. Therefore, the document is structured to show the technical relationship of the LR-BP to other protocols, and to assist the user in the selection of those that best allow programmatic management objectives to be met. We realize that in some cases protocols will need to be modified; to support these cases, the document provides information to assist the reader in determining the performance characteristics of the modified protocol.

In several locations in the document, specific programs have been highlighted to provide examples of how program elements might be more fully developed. Highlights are not intended to indicate endorsement or recommendation of these programs, nor should they be used as a stand-alone reference for field application. For more information on field applications, please consult the cited materials on these programs:

Kaufmann, P. R. 2000. Physical habitat characterization - non-wadeable rivers. Chapter 6 in J. M. Lazorchak, B. H. Hill, D. K. Averill, D. V. Peck, and D. J. Klemm (editors). Environmental monitoring and assessment program - surface waters: field operations and methods for measuring the ecological condition of non-wadeable rivers and streams. US Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH.

<http://www.epa.gov/emap/html/pubs/docs/groupdocs/surfwatr/field/nonws1.html>

Moulton, S. R., II, J. G. Kennen, R. M. Goldstein, J. A. Hambrook. 2002. Revised protocols for sampling algal, invertebrate, and fish communities in the National Water-Quality Assessment program, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 02-150. <http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/protocols/OFR02-150/index.html>

Merritt, R. W., J. D. Allan, K. W. Cummins, K. J. Wessell, and J. G. O. Wilhelm. 2003. Qualitative biological and habitat survey protocols for Michigan's non-wadeable rivers. Submitted to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Lansing, MI.

Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission (ORSANCO).
<http://www.orsanco.org>

For the most recent field operations material from the US Environmental Protection Agency's, Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program, please consult:

Angradi, T. R. (editor). 2006. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program: Great River Ecosystems, Field Operations Manual. EPA/620/R-06/002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
<http://www.epa.gov/emap/greatriver/fom.html>

Peck, D. V., D. K. Averill, A. T. Herlihy, R. M. Hughes, P. R. Kaufmann, D. J. Klemm, J. M. Lazorchak, F. H. McCormick, S. A. Peterson, M. R. Cappaert, T. Magee, and P. A. Monaco. In press. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program - Surface Waters Western Pilot Study: Field Operations Manual for Non-Wadeable Rivers and Streams. EPA 620/R-0?/xxx. US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

Acknowledgments

Contributions to the Development of this Document

Victor de Vlaming

School of Veterinary Medicine
University of California
Davis, Davis, CA

Kevin Goding

School of Veterinary Medicine
University of California
Davis, Davis, CA

Kenneth Lubinski

US Geological Survey
Upper Midwest Environmental Center
La Crosse, WI

Technical Support

Brad Autrey

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Exposure Research Laboratory
Ecological Exposure Research Division
Cincinnati, OH

Abby Markowitz

Tetra Tech, Inc.
Owings Mills, MD

Brenda Decker

Tetra Tech, Inc.
Owings Mills, MD

Primary Review

J. David Allan

The University of Michigan
School of Natural Resources and
Environment
Ann Arbor, MI

Randy Bruins

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Exposure Research Laboratory
Ecological Exposure Research Division
Cincinnati, OH

John J. Hutchens, Jr.

Coastal Carolina University
Department of Biology
Conway, SC

Additional Review

Ted Angradi

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Health & Environmental
Effects Laboratory
Mid-Continent Ecology Division
Duluth, MN

Brad Autrey

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Exposure Research Laboratory
Ecological Exposure Research Division
Cincinnati, OH

Mike Beiser

Mississippi Department of
Environmental Quality
Compliance and Enforcement
Monitoring Section
Pearl, MS

Mike Bilger

EcoAnalysts, Inc.
Selinsgrove, PA

Karen Blockson

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Exposure Research Laboratory
Ecological Exposure Research Division
Cincinnati, OH

Frank Borsuk

US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 3
Wheeling, WV

John Brumley

Kentucky Division of Water
Watershed Management Branch
Frankfort, KY

Erich Emery

The Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation
Commission (ORSANCO)
Cincinnati, OH

Steven W. Foster

US Army Corps of Engineers
Huntington District
Apple Grove, WV

Jennifer Greenwood

University of Tennessee at Martin
Biological Sciences
Martin, TN

Gretchen Hayslip

US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
Seattle, WA

Evan Hornig

US Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Water
Office of Science and Technology
Health & Ecological Criteria Division
Washington, D.C.

Brian Hill

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Health & Environmental
Effects Laboratory
Mid-Continent Ecology Division
Duluth, MN

Bob Hughes

Oregon State University
Department of Fisheries & Wildlife
Corvallis, OR

Donald Jackson

Mississippi State University
Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
Mississippi State, MS

Phil Kaufmann

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Health and Environmental
Effects Laboratory
Western Ecology Division
Corvallis, OR

Phil Larsen

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Health and Environmental
Effects Laboratory
Western Ecology Division
Corvallis, OR

Gary Lester

President, EcoAnalysts, Inc.
Moscow ID

Robert L. Limbeck

Delaware River Basin Commission
West Trenton, NJ

Maggie Passmore

US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 3
Wheeling, WV

Rodney Pierce

Kentucky Division of Water
Watershed Management Branch
Frankfort, KY

Barry C. Poulton

US Geological Survey
Columbia Environmental Research
Center
River Studies Station
Columbia, MO

Louis Reynolds

US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 3
Wheeling, WV

Greg Pond

US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 3
Wheeling, WV

Nancy Schuldt

Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior
Chippewa Reservation
Water Projects Coordinator
Cloquet, MN

John Van Sickle

US Environmental Protection Agency
National Health and Environmental
Effects Laboratory
Western Ecology Division
Corvallis, OR

Blaine Snyder

Tetra Tech, Inc.
Owings Mills, MD

Jeff Thomas

The Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation
Commission (ORSANCO)
Cincinnati, OH

Chris Yoder

Midwest Biodiversity Institute
Center for Applied Bioassessment &
Biocriteria
Columbus, OH

Matt Wooten

Northern Kentucky Sanitation
District #1
Watershed Management
Ft. Wright, KY

Table of Contents

	Page
FOREWORD.....	iii
PREFACE.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
ACRONYMS.....	xxiii
1.0 Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Purpose of the Document	1-1
1.2 Transitioning from Streams to Rivers	1-1
<i>1.2.1 Key Ecological Concepts About Large Rivers</i>	<i>1-2</i>
<i>1.2.2 Bioassessment and Rivers</i>	<i>1-3</i>
<i>1.2.3 Resource Typology</i>	<i>1-4</i>
1.3 Overview of the Large River Bioassessment Protocols	1-7
2.0 Elements of Biomonitoring.....	2-1
2.1 Bioassessment Elements	2-1
<i>2.1.1 Design Elements.....</i>	<i>2-1</i>
<i>2.1.2 Method Elements.....</i>	<i>2-9</i>
<i>2.1.3 Interpretation Elements</i>	<i>2-11</i>
2.2 Physical Habitat Quality	2-12
2.3 Chemistry.....	2-12
2.4 Biology.....	2-13
2.5 Data Management.....	2-14
3.0 Study Design, Data Quality, and the Performance-Based Methods Systems.....	3-1
3.1 Types of Study Designs.....	3-1
<i>3.1.1 Sampling Effort and Sampling Reach Length</i>	<i>3-1</i>
<i>3.1.1.1 What is a Reach?.....</i>	<i>3-3</i>
<i>3.1.1.2 Approaches for Sampling Reach Length Determination</i>	<i>3-3</i>
<i>3.1.2 Regional or Area-wide Assessments</i>	<i>3-6</i>
<i>3.1.3 Site-specific Assessments</i>	<i>3-9</i>
<i>3.1.4 Gradient Studies</i>	<i>3-10</i>
3.2 Coordinating Sampling Design with Management Objectives.....	3-11
3.3 Data Quality Objectives	3-12
3.4 Measurement Quality Objectives and Performance Characteristics	3-13
3.5 Performance-based Methods Systems.....	3-18
4.0 Habitat Assessment and Physicochemical Parameters	4-1
4.1 Introduction.....	4-1
4.2 Site Location and Other Descriptive Information	4-5
4.3 Sample Reach Characterization: Transects	4-5
4.4 Channel and Bank Characteristics	4-5

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
4.4.1 Water Depth.....	4-5
4.4.2 Wetted and Bankfull Width	4-6
4.4.3 Sinuosity	4-6
4.4.4 Gradient.....	4-6
4.4.5 Bank Characteristics.....	4-7
4.4.6 Channel Alterations (Unnatural Disturbance).....	4-8
4.5 Instream Habitat.....	4-8
4.5.1 Physical Characteristics.....	4-8
4.5.2 Chemical Characteristics	4-11
4.6 Remote Sensing Applications for Habitat Assessment.....	4-13
4.7 Unnatural Disturbances	4-14
4.7.1 Land Use Alterations	4-14
4.7.2 Hydrological Modification.....	4-14
4.7.3 Channel Modification	4-15
5.0 Algae.....	5-1
5.1 Introduction.....	5-1
5.1.1 Benthic Algae Overview.....	5-2
5.1.2 Phytoplankton Overview	5-2
5.2 Discussion on Algal Methods	5-3
5.3 Field Sampling Methods.....	5-4
5.4 The Large River Bioassessment Protocol (LR-BP) for Periphyton	5-6
5.4.1 Substrata Selection.....	5-7
5.4.2 Sample Collection	5-7
5.5 Laboratory Processing.....	5-10
5.5.1 Chlorophyll <i>a</i> and AFDM Analyses	5-10
5.5.2 Taxonomy and Enumeration: Soft-bodied Algae	5-11
5.5.3 Taxonomy and Enumeration: Diatoms.....	5-11
5.6 Data Entry	5-12
5.7 Data Reduction (Metric Calculation).....	5-12
5.7.1 Diversity Metrics	5-12
5.7.2 The Pollution Tolerance Index (PTI) of Diatoms	5-12
5.7.3 Percent Community Similarity (PSc).....	5-13
5.7.4 The Autotrophic Index.....	5-14
5.7.5 Diagnostic Diatom Metrics	5-14
5.8 Site Assessment and Interpretation.....	5-15
5.9 Performance Characteristics for Biological Assessments Using Algae.....	5-16
5.9.1 Field Sampling	5-16
5.9.2 Laboratory Sorting/Subsampling	5-18
5.9.3 Taxonomy	5-18

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
5.9.4 <i>Data Entry</i>	5-19
5.9.5 <i>Data Reduction (Metric Calculation)</i>	5-19
5.9.6 <i>Site Assessment and Interpretation</i>	5-20
6.0 Benthic Macroinvertebrates	6-1
6.1 Introduction	6-1
6.2 Field Sampling Methods	6-5
6.2.1 <i>Passive Methods</i>	6-5
6.2.2 <i>Active Methods</i>	6-8
6.3 The Large River Bioassessment Protocol (LR-BP) for Benthic Macroinvertebrate Sampling	6-12
6.4 Field Preservation	6-12
6.5 Laboratory Processing	6-13
6.5.1 <i>Sorting and Subsampling</i>	6-14
6.5.2 <i>Taxonomy and Enumeration</i>	6-16
6.6 Data Entry	6-17
6.7 Data Reduction (Metric Calculation)	6-18
6.8 Final Index and Site Assessment	6-18
6.9 Performance Characteristics for Biological Assessments Using Benthic Macroinvertebrates	6-21
6.9.1 <i>Field Sampling</i>	6-21
6.9.2 <i>Laboratory Sorting/Subsampling</i>	6-23
6.9.3 <i>Taxonomy</i>	6-24
6.9.4 <i>Data Entry</i>	6-25
6.9.5 <i>Data Reduction (Metric Calculation)</i>	6-25
6.9.6 <i>Site Assessment and Interpretation</i>	6-25
7.0 Fish	7-1
7.1 Introduction	7-1
7.2 Methods	7-4
7.2.1 <i>Electrofishing</i>	7-5
7.2.2 <i>Seining</i>	7-15
7.2.3 <i>Trawling</i>	7-15
7.3 The Large River Bioassessment Protocol (LR-BP) for Fish	7-16
7.4 Sample Processing in the Field	7-17
7.5 Quality Control in the Field	7-17
7.6 Fish-based Index of Biotic Integrity	7-18
7.7 Performance Characteristics for Biological Assessments Using Fish	7-21
7.7.1 <i>Field Sampling</i>	7-21

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
7.7.2 <i>Laboratory Sorting/Subsampling</i>	7-23
7.7.3 <i>Taxonomy</i>	7-23
7.7.4 <i>Data Entry</i>	7-24
7.7.5 <i>Data Reduction (e.g., Metric Calculation)</i>	7-24
7.7.6 <i>Site Assessment and Interpretation</i>	7-24
8.0 Data Analysis	8-1
8.1 Introduction	8-1
8.2 Biological Analysis Strategies	8-1
8.2.1 <i>Multimetric Indexes</i>	8-2
8.2.2 <i>Predictive Models</i>	8-9
8.2.3 <i>Estimating Measurement Error</i>	8-25
8.3 Site Specific Assessments	8-27
8.4 Watershed Assessments	8-28
8.5 Gradient Designs	8-31
8.6 Reporting Results	8-33
8.6.1 <i>Graphical Displays</i>	8-33
8.6.2 <i>Report Format</i>	8-34
9.0 Literature Cited	9-1
Glossary	G-1

List of Tables

Table	Page
1-1	Prototype site classification approach for streams and rivers..... 1-8
2-1	Important elements for a large river biological assessment program 2-3
3-1	A serially alternating or rotating design for site sampling 3-9
3-2	Formulas and explanations for quantitative performance characteristics 3-16
4-1	Major large river program habitat approaches..... 4-4
4-2	Analytical strategy for basic fixed sites in NAWQA (Shelton 1994)..... 4-12
4-3	Analytical strategy for intensive fixed sites not required by the basic fixed site analyses in NAWQA (Shelton 1994)..... 4-12
5-1	Advantages and disadvantages of selected algal methods..... 5-4
5-2	Major large river periphyton and phytoplankton sampling methods 5-5
5-3	Diatom and non-diatom metrics summarized from various sources 5-13
5-4	Error partitioning framework for biological assessments and biological assessment protocols for algae 5-17
5-5	Assessment results shown for sample pairs taken from 29 sites, each pair representing two adjacent reaches (back to back)..... 5-21
6-1	A comparison of large rivers program macroinvertebrate sampling approaches 6-3
6-2	Advantages and disadvantages of artificial substrate samplers..... 6-6
6-3	Advantages and disadvantages of bottom grab samplers 6-9
6-4	Advantages and disadvantages of shoreline benthic sampling 6-11
6-5	Example list of counting “rules”: what not to count 6-14
6-6	Example of taxonomic hierarchical targets used in benthic macroinvertebrate identifications 6-17

List of Tables (continued)

Table	Page
6-7 Benthic macroinvertebrate metrics evaluated by Blocksom and Flotemersch (2005) for responsiveness to measured disturbance gradients in large rivers.....	6-19
6-8 Error partitioning framework for biological assessments and biological assessment protocols for benthic macroinvertebrates.....	6-21
6-9 Precision and sensitivity of field sampling using the LR-BP for benthic macroinvertebrates (Blocksom and Flotemersch 2006)	6-22
6-10 Assessment results shown for sample pairs taken from 29 sites, each pair representing two adjacent reaches (back to back).....	6-26
7-1 Advantages and disadvantages to using fish as bioindicators	7-2
7-2 A comparison of large river program fish sampling approaches.....	7-3
7-3 Advantages and disadvantages of non-electrofishing sampling approaches including passive (e.g., hoop, fyke, and gill nets, and trotlines) and active (e.g., seines, trawls) sampling gears.....	7-6
7-4 A comparison of different reach lengths found suitable for bioassessment of rivers.....	7-9
7-5 Preparation activities onshore at launch site.....	7-10
7-6 Field equipment supply checklist for fish sampling via electrofishing	7-16
7-7 Fish metrics selected for inclusion in biological indexes developed for large rivers.....	7-19
7-8 Error partitioning framework for biological assessments and biological assessment protocols for fish.....	7-21
7-9 Assessment results shown for sample pairs taken from 29 sites, each pair representing two adjacent reaches (back to back).....	7-25
8-1 Some potential metrics for periphyton, benthic macroinvertebrates, and fish that could be considered for rivers.....	8-4

List of Tables (continued)

Table	Page
8-2 Predictor variables commonly used for building multivariate predictive models.....	8-11
8-3 The first component of the prediction phase is to estimate average assemblage composition of reference groups.....	8-21
8-4 Having calculated the taxon frequencies ($g_{j,x}$, above) and the group probabilities (p_j , from the discriminant function analysis), the product of these values is used to calculate the probability of capturing each taxon at a site (P_c)	8-22
8-5 An ANOVA table for the simple before-after model.....	8-29
8-6 ANOVA table for a similar design to Table 8-5, but with multiple sampling sites for each treatment	8-29
8-7 ANOVA table for the two-factor BACI design	8-29
8-8 ANOVA table for the BACIP design (Smith 2002).....	8-29
8-9 ANOVA table for the asymmetrical BACI design with L-1 control sites and N observations (Smith 2002)	8-30

List of Figures

Figure	Page
1-1 The delineation between wadeable and non-wadeable streams is not discrete, but rather a gradual transition (after C. Yoder, personal communication)	1-5
2-1 Data elements for biological assessment programs (modified from NWQMC [2006]).....	2-2
2-2 Conceptual illustration of confidence in detecting different level of stress on an ecosystem as a function of assessment precision (with 4 being most precise) (modified from Barbour and Yoder 2004).....	2-4
2-3 Total error or variability (S^2) associated with a biological assessment is a combined result of each component of the process (Barbour and Yoder 2004, modified from Taylor 1988)	2-5
2-4 Environmental features sampled are nested in a spatial hierarchy	2-7
2-5 Example of the relationship of data tables in a typical relational database	2-17
2-6 Example input or lookup form in a typical relational database	2-18
3-1 Examples of two-dimensional probabilistic sampling designs.....	3-8
3-2 The relationship among management, data quality, and measurement quality objectives.....	3-12
3-3 Results of power analysis showing the relationship between number of samples and the ability to detect differences (or changes) in mean index score (Stribling and Davie 2005).....	3-13
3-4 The overall variability of any measurement system results from both systematic error and random error.....	3-14
3-5 Use of MQOs and performance characteristics to ensure defensibility of management decisions (USEPA in preparation).....	3-19
3-6 Framework for analyzing the comparability of multiple biological assessment protocols.....	3-19
5-1 Example of the six transects and 12 sample zones for collection of periphyton in large rivers using the LR-BP design	5-6

List of Figures (continued)

Figure	Page
5-2	Adjacent reaches (primary secondary) on a fluvial channel 5-17
6-1	Rock-filled wire basket used as introduced substrate 6-7
6-2	a) Modified Hester-Dendy multiplate artificial substrate sampler; b) Exposed Hester-Dendy sampler attached to cinder block anchor 6-8
6-3	Example of the six transects and 6 sample zones for collection of benthic macroinvertebrates in large rivers using the LR-BP design 6-13
6-4a	Gridded screen (Caton 1991) used to facilitate subsampling 6-15
6-4b	Schematic diagram of the Caton gridded subsampling screen, consisting of 30 6-cm grids 6-15
6-5	Adjacent reaches (primary and repeat) on a river channel 6-22
7-1	Use of a hoop net as a passive fish sampling method 7-6
7-2	Net retrieval of fish stunned by boom-shockers, an active method 7-7
7-3	Two different scenarios for obtaining repeat reaches for large river fish bioassessments 7-22
8-1	A box and whisker plot comparing the distribution of the number of EPT taxa, a common macroinvertebrate metric, in reference and stressed sites 8-6
8-2	A comparison of different methods used for standardizing metric scores 8-8
8-3	Schematic showing the three main steps involved in building RIVPACS-type bioassessment models 8-10
8-4	A table demonstrating decisions made for lumping taxa upwards or discarding higher taxa records 8-14
8-5	A final dendrogram used with a genera only dataset 8-16
8-6	This figure shows the O/E score distributions for reference calibration, validation, and non-reference test site data 8-24

List of Figures (continued)

Figure	Page
8-7 Comparisons of the discrimination between least and most disturbed sites using $P_c < 0.01$ and $P_c < 0.5$ taxa.....	8-25
8-8 A bivariate scatter plot of an ordination used to support site classification	8-35
8-9 An example dendrogram, illustrating reference site clusters based on taxonomic composition	8-35
8-10 A pie chart, used to efficiently illustrate proportional information.....	8-36
8-11 Box and whisker plots are used to illustrate differences in the distribution of values among different categories.....	8-36
8-12 A line graph used to illustrate trends in the dependent variable relative to the independent variable	8-37
8-13 Cumulative frequency diagrams can be used to illustrate the ordered accumulation of observations from lowest to highest.....	8-37
8-14 A bar chart used to display the magnitude and variance of values for individual elements	8-38
8-15 Sun ray plots and used to compare more than two endpoints simultaneously	8-38
8-16 Box and whisker plots can also be used to illustrate the relative magnitude and variability associated with different variables on a common scale.....	8-39
8-17 Florida Department of Environmental Protection Ecosummary – an example summary report	8-40

Acronyms

ALU	Aquatic Life Use
USACE	US Army Corps of Engineers
ATtILA	Analytical Tools Interface for Landscape Assessments
BCG	Biological Condition Gradient
BMP	Best Management Practice
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
BPJ	Best Professional Judgment
CAFO	Confined Animal Feeding Operation
CDG	Catchment Disturbance Gradient
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CSO	Combined Sewer Overflows
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEQ	Department of Environmental Quality
DQO	Data Quality Objectives
EMAP	Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program
EPT	Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, Trichoptera
FWPCA	Federal Water Pollution Control Act
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GLEI	Great Lakes Environmental Indicators
HDG	Human Disturbance Gradient
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
IBI	Index of Biological/Biotic Integrity
ICI	Invertebrate Community Index
IDEQ	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
ITFM	Intergovernmental Task Force on Monitoring Water Quality
LDM	Linear Discriminant Model
LR-BP	Large River Bioassessment Protocol
LWD	Large Woody Debris
MDCB	Methods and Data Comparability Board
MQO	Measurement Quality Objectives
NAWQA	National Water-Quality Assessment Program

NLCD	National Land Cover Database (NLCD)
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NWHI	Non-Wadeable Habitat Index
NWQMC	National Water Quality Monitoring Council
OHEPA	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
ORSANCO	Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission
ONRW	Outstanding Natural Resource Waters
PBMS	Performance Based Methods Systems
POTW	Publicly-Owned Treatment Works
QHEI	Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index
RBP	Rapid Bioassessment Protocols
RIVPACS	River Invertebrate Prediction and Classification System
TALU	Tiered Aquatic Life Use
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
SCI	Stream Condition Index
STP	Sewage Treatment Plants
UAA	Use Attainability Analyses
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WLAs	Waste Load Allocations
WQS	Water Quality Standards
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant