

### Rapid Ecological Assessments: Data Collection and Indicator Metrics

Demonstration Project Training: 27 March 2012 Christy Wolf





Any views or opinions expressed in this presentation are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect an official policy or position of any agency of the U.S. government.

Empowered lives Resilient nations



# Outline



- Data Collection
  - Planning
  - Objectives
  - Logistics
  - Resource Considerations
- Ecological levels of sampling
- Variables and Metrics
- Assessment Indices
- Final Notes

(Not going to spend time on sampling techniques)



# Data Collection Planning



- Review REA Goal/Objective(s)
- Understand and deal with reality of logistical concerns
- Consider existing policies/data/ planning structures
- Utilize GIS/RS in planning
- Utilize GPS in field (ideal!)
- Always, always consider field safety



### Common Objectives of Surveying



- Collect <u>repeatable</u> data (time/space <u>comparability</u>)
- Be spatially explicit (map locations)
- Be as quantitative as possible
- Be descriptive as possible (include photos, add notes)
- Collect the highest quality data given the limitation of time, money, and resources
  - Most rigorous methods yield higher level of certainty in assessment
  - Less rigorous approaches <u>are still valuable</u>; they just present relatively more uncertainty



# **Data Collection Logistics**



- Separate Teams (SMEs)
- Collaborate on assessment area
- Identify variables of interest
- Select field methods

- Create Protocols
- Create Field Data Forms
- Individual discipline reports start developing early, draft methods before fieldwork



Example of site layout for stream sampling protocol



# **Consider the Resource**

(Sampling Design, Data Collection)

- Important to understand the intrinsic complexity of stream/river systems, their interaction with the basin
- Classifying streams reduces natural variability among streams, allowing identification of potential adverse impacts
- Larger non-wadeable rivers are naturally and fundamentally different from wadeable rivers, smaller streams, lakes
- Where feasible/reasonable, have standardized protocols for different orders of streams



### **Classification Example:** Strahler Stream Order



![](_page_6_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **River Continuum Concept**

![](_page_7_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_5.jpeg)

(photos by: Konrad P Schmidt)

![](_page_7_Figure_7.jpeg)

FPOM is fine particulate organic matter; CPOM is coarse particulate organic matter; P/R is the production/respiration

![](_page_8_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Example of Cross-Section of Habitat Zones

![](_page_8_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_3.jpeg)

(figure source: EPA #903R03002)

![](_page_9_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Ecoregions and Other Classifications

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_3.jpeg)

 Classify sample sites according to ecoregion for comparability

Other classifications may be desirable if biodiversity is expected to vary significantly

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Levels of Biological Sampling**

![](_page_10_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Community Variables: Metrics & Indices**

![](_page_11_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Metric = Any characteristic of the aquatic community that can be measured reliably and reflects upon stream health (i.e., shows an empirical and predictable change along a gradient of human disturbance)
- Index = A multi-metric approach that involves combinations of metrics (indicators) into a simple model to provide an integrative assessment

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Structure Metrics

- Diversity (Richness & Evenness)
- Abundance
- Biomass
- Density
- Community composition (e.g., proportion tolerant)
- Community attributes (e.g., proportion exotics, endemics)

### Function Metrics

- Decomposition/leaching productivity
- Photosynthesis
- Respiration Denitification
- Nitrogen Fixation
- Other biochemical functions (e.g., methanogenesis)

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Species Diversity (Richness & Evenness)

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Which population has more diversity?

![](_page_13_Figure_4.jpeg)

# Species = 5
# Individuals = 25

# Species = 5 # Individuals = 25

- Species Richness = Total # of Species
- Species Evenness = Relative Abundance of each Species
- Diversity Index = Species Richness Index + Evenness Index
   (reflects proportional representation of each species)

![](_page_14_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Example: Shannon Diversity Index

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_3.jpeg)

Example:

Birds	Ni	Pi	In P <sub>i</sub>	$-(P_i * \ln P_i)$
Pigeon	96	.96	041	.039
Robin	1	.01	-4.61	.046
Starling	1	.01	-4.61	.046
Crow	1	.01	-4.61	.046
House	1	.01	-4.61	.046
sparrow				
				H = 0.223

High values of "H" represents more diverse communities

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Index of Biological Integrity

- Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) An integrative expression of site condition across *multiple* metrics.
  - Often composed of at least 7 metrics
  - IBI is specific to assemblage (fish, vascular plants, algae, macroinvertebrates, etc.)
  - Numeric index score is then compared to "standards" or "reference" streams in same ecoregion to determine whether a stream is meeting expectations for supporting aquatic life

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Ephemeroptera/Plecoptera/Trichoptera (EPT) Taxa Index (pollution sensitivity)
- Benthic Index Biotic Integrity
- Diatom Nutrient Index
- Diatom Biotic Index
- Amphibian Index Biotic Integrity
- Water Quality Index
- Etc.

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Reference Conditions, Biocriteria, Thresholds

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Reference Condition (for biological integrity): "standard" or benchmark of an unimpaired or minimally impaired ("natural") system
- Biocriteria: Narrative descriptions or numeric values that describes the reference biological integrity; qualities of the reference standards against which results are compared
- Thresholds: Cut-off points for criteria values (e.g., good, fair, poor)

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Reference Stream IBI Values Depend on Ecoregion

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_3.jpeg)

(figure source: http://water.epa.gov)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **Adding Thresholds**

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

(notional thresholds depicted)

![](_page_19_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

### A Note about Data Collection

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

- There are many ways to collect data
  - Rigorous field protocols
  - Many sampling designs, collecting techniques
  - Directed searches (e.g., certain taxa)
  - Opportunistic findings
  - Local knowledge
- Record as much as possible about methodology
- Incorporate random element to sampling design; don't just survey sites easiest to access

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

### A Note about Levels of Data

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_3.jpeg)

Level 1...

- No numeric biocriteria
- No thresholds
- Can detect severe impairments, but have less power to distinguish degrees of impairment.

#### All data are useful!

<sup>(</sup>figure source: www.epa.gov/bioiweb1/html/biological\_endpoints.html)

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

### A Note about Data Management

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Well designed field data forms and training helps maintain quality and consistency of data
- Maintain hard and electronic copies of all <u>raw</u> <u>data</u> forms; file in logical manner
- Quality control check data entry
- Database Management
  - GIS and GeoDatabases are often most comprehensive way to maintain REA information
  - Populate metadata information!

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Behavior of Metrics Along Stressor Gradient

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

Fig. 2. Behavior of IBI metrics along the stressor gradient (from Yoder, 2002). (Source: Novotny et al. 2005)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Avifauna Index Metrics for Wetlands (source: Carlisle 1998)

		Response to	Metric
Metric	Rationale	Stressors	Computation
Taxa Richness	Feeding and breeding response based on	Decline	Differences from
	habitat quality and food supply		reference site total taxa
% Neotropical	Migrants are generally sensitive to	Decline	Percentage of total
Migrants	habitat quality and are habitat specialists		species
% Resident	Resident species less sensitive to habitat	Rise	Percentage of total
Species	quality and tend to be generalists		species
% Tolerant	Tolerant species are generalists that have	Decline	Number of Species
Species	adapted to human-altered habitats and		
	landscapes		
Wetland-	Species with habitat requirements that	Decline	Number of Species
Dependent	tie them exclusively to aquatic habitats		
Species			

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Example of Avifauna Scoring

Avifauna Index Metric Scoring Criteria: Freshwater Sites					
Score:	6	4	2	0	
Taxa Richness (diff. from	<2	2-5	6-9	>9	
reference site)					
% Neotropical Migrants	>40	30-40	20-29	<20	
% Resident Species	<30	30-40	41-50	>50	
% Tolerant Species	<20	20-30	31-40	>40	
Wetland-Dependent	>5	3-5	1-3	<1	
Species					
(source: Carlisle 1998)					

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Example of Avifauna Scoring

Avifauna Index Metric Scoring Criteria: Freshwater Sites					
	Site #1		Site #2		
	Value	Score	Value	Score	
Taxa Richness	4	4	1	6	
% Neotropical Migrants	30	4	57	6	
% Resident Species	60	0	29	6	
% Tolerant Species	40	2	35	6	
Wetland-Dependent Species	4	4	2	2	
FINAL AVI SCORE		14		26	
(source: Carlisle 1998)					