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## What is an m-IBI?

- Combination of metrics to generate numeric scores responding across a gradient of human disturbance
- Scores can be compared between lakes, or for a single lake overtime
- Good for lakes because it can describe the impacts of multiple pollutants or physical disturbances

- bar line indicates actual size
http://www.epa.gov/superfund/students/clas_act/spring/critter.htm\#Biotic Index
* Shelburne Farms, Copyright © 1995.


## Metrics and Stress Response

- Biological Metric- condenses a list of organisms into a number that responds predictably to natural or anthropogenic changes


## Metric Categories

- Richness and Composition Metrics: total number of taxa, number of long lived taxa
- Tolerance Metrics: number of tolerant taxa, percent of intolerant taxa
- Feeding Group Metrics: Percent abundance of scrapers, percent of predators
- Population Metrics: total abundance per sample, percent dominance
- Habit Metrics: percent clingers, number of burrower taxa
- Each metric increases or decreases in response to stress.
- Stress can include many variables for example: habitat destruction, nutrient inputs, or lack of oxygen.


## Macroinvertebrate

- 5 habitat method
- Littoral Plant
- Littoral Fine
- Littoral Hard Substrate (woody debris/cobble)
- Sub-littoral
- Profundal
- 3 grabs/jabs composite for each habitat type
- Each lake generated 5 samples



## Data Collection

- 2008 to 2012
- IL EPA data collections, each office conducted additional surveys at about 5 lakes each year. (15 per year)
- 2011 Contracted out monitoring of 50 lakes
- 102 surveys conducted total
- Temporally standardized as late summer
macroinvertebrate samples
- Also collected physical and chemical parameters, sediment chemistry. Shoreline habitat surveys and macrophyte surveys at
 IL EPA sampled lakes only.


## Sorting and Taxonomy

- Subsample to a standard 500 organism count
- Taxonomy to the lowest possible level
- Usually to genus
- Few key taxa routinely identified to species level: Ablabesmyia,
Dicrotendipes, and Polypedilum
- Had to contract out some taxonomy



## Shoreline Habitat

- Followed a method described by the USEPA National Lake Assessment Surveys in 2007.
- 10 equally spaced locations are chosen at random on the shoreline of a lake.
- Navigate to stations by boat
- Fill out form which describes:
- Bottom substrates-Littoral
- Aquatic macrophytes-Littoral
- Fish cover-Littoral
- Canopy-Riparian
- Understory-Riparian
- Shoreline substrate-Riparian
- Human Influence-Riparian
- Physical Habitat Features

|  |  | Physical Habitat Characterization - Lakes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station$(A \cdot J)$ | Site 10 | RHZE |  | Date. | 6/13/2011 |  |  |
|  | A | Deptn At Staton ( f ) | 3 |  | Latitude | 41.6522 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Longtude | -87.7952 |  |
| Was Station Relocated (ym)? is it an island( $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{m}$ )? |  | N | Was station dropped (y/m)? Unable to sample (y/n)? |  |  | N |  |
|  |  | N |  |  |  | N |  |
|  | Littoral Zone |  |  | Riparian Zone |  |  |  |
|  | Surtace Film None |  |  | 0-Absem(0\%) 12Sparse(<10\%) 2=Mod.(10-40\%) 3-Heasy(41-75\%) 4-Vary Heasy(e75\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Canopy ( $>15 \mathrm{ft}$ high)Canopy Type - None |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom Substrate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sedrack (-40to rem biger hah a tan (9-4)- <br>  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Deutes (banmat -cat siex) (D-4)- <br>  |  | 0 | Understory $(1.5 \mathrm{ft}-16 \mathrm{fl})$ <br>   |  |  |  |
|  | Orverf (latjbeg-tesnas bal sie (0-4). |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Send (* isdieua ven-priv) (0-4)- |  | 0 | Weety 5 trn b/Sanings (0-4 abeve) - <br> Tall harts. praseses farbs (b-4 above) |  |  | 0 |
|  | Sa. diay wt Hues (9-4)- |  | 2 |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Weody Detrs (b-s)- |  | 0 | Ground Cover (<1.5 f.) |  |  |  |
|  | Orpanc (ay peck, burtas) (0-4) |  | 0 | Woedy finnewliapings (0-4 meved) - <br> Herbs. grasses. trins (b-4 abive)- <br> Standing Waterthuntaited Veg. (B-4 above)- <br>  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Vepetaten wr ather (0-4)- |  | 4 |  |  |  | 3 |
|  | Bottom Substrate Color Bottom Substrate Odor |  | Black |  |  |  | 2 |
|  |  |  | None |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Aquatic Macrophytes |  |  | Shoreline Substrate Zone |  |  |  |
|  | Submergent (0-4) <br> Emergent (0-4) <br> Floating (0-4) <br> Total Macrophyte Coverage (0-4) <br> Op itacreptyles extend notaward (ybri? |  | 4 |  Doublers fastellal -tar san) (0-4- <br>  Gravel (batytug-ienns ball wise $00-4$ - <br>  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  | $Y$ |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Fish Cover |  |  |  <br> sat chay ar Heach (0.4). |  |  | 0 |
|  | Aquale 4 mundied Hebesent Veg (0-4) |  |  | Wuety Dabia is-4. |  |  | 0 |
| 1 MA |  | 1.1. Arferen | ancmi P |  |  |  |  |

## Macrophyte Surveys

Aquatic Macrophyte Survey Sample Size by
Lake Size and Secchi Depth

| Lake Size <br> (acres) | Total Sample <br> Points | Surface to <br> Secchi | Secchi to $2 x$ <br> Secchi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<10$ | 20 | 13 | 7 |
| $10-49$ | 30 | 20 | 10 |
| $50-99$ | 40 | 27 | 13 |
| $100-199$ | 50 | 34 | 16 |
| $200-299$ | 60 | 40 | 20 |
| $300-399$ | 70 | 48 | 22 |
| $400-499$ | 80 | 53 | 27 |
| $500-799$ | 90 | 60 | 30 |
| $\geq 800$ | 100 | 67 | 33 |

- Conducted once during monitoring season
- July or August
- Samples dependent on lake size
- Qualitative Measure of aquatic plants


## Macrophyte Survey



## Stressor Gradients

- Targeted Stressors are related to human impact
- Anthropogenic nutrient inputs
- Eroded shorelines
- Habitat destruction
- Management Activities
- Not targeting natural variation



## Reference site criteria descriptions

| Variable | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| Primary Variables |  |
| ImprvPct | \% imperviousness in the whole catchment |
| UrbIndWgt | \% low, med, and high development land uses; weighted by distance: (catchment stat $+2^{*} 500 \mathrm{~m}$ stat $+3^{*} 100$ stat)/6 |
| AgIndWgt | \% crops and pasture uses; <br> weighted by distance: (catchment stat $+2^{*} 500 \mathrm{~m}$ stat $+3 * 100$ stat) $/ 6$ |
| RdDens | Count of road/stream crossings per 100 acres |
| RdXDens | Length of roads in miles per 100 acres |
| Mine | Gravel \& coal mines, weighted by distance: \# in 1km + 3*\# in 100m buffer |
| PtSrc | NPDES \& CERCLIS sites, weighted by distance: \# in 1km + 3*\# in 100m buffer |
| Secondary Variables |  |
| RDist | Riparian Disturbance Habitat Index (as calculated by National Lakes Assessment) |
| LitRip | Littoral and Riparian Complexity Habitat Index (as calculated by NLA) |


| Station | name | county | unit | TetraTech rating | IEPA rating | Final |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RCJ | ALTAMONT NEW | EFFINGHAM | CENTRAL | Other | Near Reference | Near Reference |
| RDE | ARGYLE | MCDONOUGH | CENTRAL | Other | Other | Other |
| RHZE | ARROWHEAD | COOK | NORTHERN | Extreme Stressed | Extreme Stressed | Extreme Stressed |
| RGZQ | AXEHEAD | COOK | NORTHERN | Extreme Stressed | Extreme Stressed | Extreme Stressed |
| RBZH | BEALL WOODS | WABASH | SOUTHERN | Other | Near Reference | Near Reference |
| RNO | BENTON | FRANKLIN | SOUTHERN | Other | Other | Other |
| RPK | BLACK OAK | LEE | NORTHERN | Near Reference | Other | Other |
| RAZI | BLOOMFIELD | JOHNSON | SOUTHERN | Other | Other | Other |
| RML | GEORGE | ROCK ISLAND | NORTHERN | Near Reference | Near Reference | Near Reference |
| RAF | GLEN O JONES | SALINE | SOUTHERN | Reference | Near Reference | Near Reference |
| RAP | GLENDALE | POPE | SOUTHERN | Reference | Near Reference | Near Reference |
| ROL | GLENN SHOALS | MONTGOMERY | CENTRAL | Near Reference | Other | Other |
| ROP | GOVERNOR BOND | BOND | SOUTHERN | Near Reference | Stressd | Stressd |
| VTI | GRASSY | LAKE | NORTHERN | Stressed | Stressed | Stressed |
| RGK | GRAYS | LAKE | NORTHERN | Extreme Stressed | Other | Other |
| RDZF | GREENFIELD | GREENE | CENTRAL | Other | Stressed | Stressed |
| REZQ | GRIDLEY | CASS | CENTRAL | Other | Near Reference | Near Reference |
| RTY | GRISWOLD | MCHENRY | NORTHERN | Other | Near Reference | Near Reference |

## Classification Variables

- Macroinvertebrate metric variance, correlation with class variables
- Average Latitude
- Average Longitude
- Lake surface area
- Watershed area
- Shoreline length
- Maximum depth
- Mean depth
- Relative depth
- Best fit? Only fit...Latitude

Lakes Macroinvertebrate IBI Development

## Legend

Lake mIBI Stations
IEPA Central/ Southern Monitoring Units IEPA Northern M onitoring Unit
$\square$ IEPA Central Monitoring UnitIEPA Southern Monitoring Unit

## Metric Testing

- Within the classes metrics were calculated 3 ways
- Grand composite
- Deep zone composite (profundal+sub-littoral)
- Littoral zone composite (littoral fine+littoral plant+littoral hard substrate)
- Virtual composites developed and tested with 68 metrics representing 5 metric categories
- Metrics were tested for sensitivity of discrimination between reference and stressed sites
- Tested metrics for redundancy



## Index



## Index Validation



## Index Calculation

| Metric | Scoring formula ${ }^{a}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Count of ECT taxa | $(\mathrm{X}-2) / 8$ |
| \% Diptera individuals | $(92.2-\mathrm{X}) / 83.4$ |
| \% filterer individuals | $(65.5-\mathrm{X}) / 65$ |
| Count of climber taxa | $(\mathrm{X}-3) / 11$ |
| \% tolerant individuals | $(80.6-\mathrm{X}) / 70.7$ |

## Metric scoring formulae.

a: " $X$ " represents the metric value. In each formula, the result is multiplied by 100 to convert to a percentage scale. Scores that are above 100 are re-set to 100 and those below 0 are re-set to 0 before averaging in an index.

## Index Calculation

Scores calculated from metrics and scoring formulae in Table 12 are averaged to arrive at an index score. Any metric score that is above 100 or below 0 should be re-set to 100 or 0 before averaging.

## Application

- IL EPA will continue to work with the index to develop impairment thresholds for Illinois lakes.
- The index will be incorporated into assessments for aquatic life use with other measures of human impacts.
- The index can identify high quality waters.
- Used to evaluate the effectiveness of best management practices.
- Evaluate sampling and sorting effort.



## Case \#1

- You're lake biologist for the IL EPA, and your boss just called wanting some information on a lake.
- It's Lake Kind-ofa-Mystery, in central Illinois.
- The lake has never been monitored.
- The lab also just called and said no more chemical samples can be collected until they fix all of their equipment which just broke simultaneously and possibly maliciously...
- What do you do?!



## Macroinvertebrate Sample



## Lake Kind-ofa-Mystery

| Metrics | Kind-ofa- <br> Mystery Scores |
| :--- | :--- |
| Count ECT taxa | 15 |
| \% Diptera Ind. | 7 |
| \% Filterer Ind. | 20 |
| Ct. Climber taxa | 18 |
| \% tolerant Ind. | 14 |

- Your macroinvertebrate dataset yields an index score of $\mathbf{1 1 3}$.



## Lake Kind-ofa-Mystery

- This is the highest m -IBI score found in the central region.
- Lake Kind-ofa-Mystery is a high quality and pristine lake in need of protection.
- Degradation and human impacts should be limited in and around Lake Kind-ofa-Mystery.
- Future monitoring should done to track changes in the lake.

Lake Kind-ofa-Mystery


## Case \#2

- Lake HABs-Alot is a nutrient rich lake in the southern region of IL.
- HABs-Alot has many invasive species and received an index score of 23 when it was monitored in 2008.



## Lake HABs-Alot

- The lake has recently adopted a management plan for the lake, and watershed.
- Nutrient runoff has been greatly reduced, and the shoreline has been improved using natural native plantings.
- Has the biological integrity of Lake HABs-Alo†
 improved yet?


## Lake HABs-Alot

- Some questions are best answered by looking at the biology directly.
- We don't have to collect a ton of chemical and physical parameters to guess whether the biology is improving, we can prove it with the macroinvertebrates.

| Metrics | HABs-A lot <br> scores |
| :--- | :--- |
| Count ECT taxa | 5 |
| \% Diptera Ind. | 45 |
| \% Filterer Ind. | 35 |
| Ct. Climber taxa | 14 |
| \% tolerant Ind. | 78 |

- Our current index score after the management activities yields an index score of 48.9 !


## Case \#3

- You have 2 lakes from different regions of Illinois. One lake is in the Northern region, the other is in the Southern region of Illinois.
- You want to compare and contrast the 2 lakes, show how they are different and how they are similar.



## Lake A





## Lake B





