

ETD Archive

2014

Dispersal Capabilities of Two Plecopteran Species and Macroinvertebrate Community from Four Watersheds in Northeast Ohio

Alison L. Yasick
Cleveland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive>

 Part of the [Environmental Sciences Commons](#)

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Recommended Citation

Yasick, Alison L., "Dispersal Capabilities of Two Plecopteran Species and Macroinvertebrate Community from Four Watersheds in Northeast Ohio" (2014). *ETD Archive*. 315.
<https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive/315>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETD Archive by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

DISPERSAL CAPABILITIES OF TWO PLECOPTERAN SPECIES AND
MACROINVERTEBRATE COMMUNITY FROM FOUR WATERSHEDS IN
NORTHEAST OHIO.

ALISON L. YASICK

Bachelor of Science in Biology

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May 1999

Masters of Science in Biology

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May 2001

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN REGULATORY BIOLOGY

at the

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2014

We hereby approve this dissertation
For
Alison L. Yasick
Candidate for the Doctoral Degree in Regulatory Biology for the
Department of Biological, Geological, and Environmental Sciences
and
Cleveland State University
College of Graduate studies by:

_____ Date: _____
Dr. Julie Wolin, BGES/CSU
Chairperson

_____ Date: _____
Dr. Robert Krebs, BGES/CSU
Committee Member

_____ Date: _____
Dr. B. Mike Walton, BGES/CSU
Committee Member

_____ Date: _____
Dr. Joe Kieper, Director of Virginia Museum of Natural History
Committee Member

_____ Date: _____
Dr. Wentworth Clapham, BGES/CSU
Internal Examiner

_____ Date: _____
Dr. Karen Munroe, Department of Biology and Geology, Baldwin Wallace University
External Examiner

April 18 2014

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

Then took the other, as just as fair
And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that, the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,

And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.

I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

Robert Frost *The Road Not Taken*, 1920

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Over the past twelve years I have received support and encouragement from a great number of individuals. First, I would like to thank my dissertation advisory committee of Drs. Julie Wolin (CSU), Robert Krebs (CSU), Joe Keiper (VMNH), and Mike Walton (CSU) who helped me as I moved from the idea of stonefly natural history to a complete dissertation. I would also like to thank Dr. Pete Clapham (CSU) for taking on the role as the internal examiner and Dr. Karen Munroe (BWU) who took the position of the external examiner. I thank the Cuyahoga Valley National Park, Cleveland Metroparks, and Holden Arboretum for permission to use their land as sampling sites. Financial support to conduct laboratory work was provided by the Department of Biological, Geological, and Environmental Sciences, the College of Science and Health Careers Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant, Cleveland Natural History Museum, the Shoemaker Foundation, and research funds of Julie Wolin and Robert Krebs. Insect collecting equipment was largely provided by Michael Yasick.

I would also like to thank my family and extended families as my main support structure of this program. To Michael and Carol Yasick, you are everything to me, I will never be able to give back a gram of your support, from constant encouragement, financial support, and providing a place to run and hide when it got too much. But most of all both of you provided me with love, wisdom, guidance, and inner strength that gave me the determination and endurance to keep moving forward. I thank Michelle Yasick-Craft for always being there and listening to me; your advice has helped more than you know. I thank David Cronin, my soul mate for helping me find light at the end of the tunnel. Without his devotion, encouragement, and excellent editing skills, I would have never finished. You are and always will be the positive reaction to my negative action.

To my friends who helped me along the way, especially Kristen Hopson. Although we had a few close calls when I almost lost you in snow piles and fast moving water, you always agreed to go back out. Finally I want to thank my silent partners: Fidget, Beauregard, and Tesse and to those I lost along the way: Chester, Buster, and Shiloh.

DISPERSAL CAPABILITIES OF TWO PLECOPTERAN SPECIES AND
MACROINVERTEBRATE COMMUNITY FROM FOUR WATERSHEDS IN
NORTHEAST OHIO.

ALISON L. YASICK

ABSTRACT

This dissertation focused on the insect order Plecoptera, and hypothesized that *Allocapnia recta* populations would have lower genetic diversity than *Leuctra tenuis* between adjacent Chagrin and Grand Rivers due to wing structure and season of terrestrial adult emergence. Genetic variations within the 16s rRNA region of mtDNA in *A. recta*, a winter emerging adult with rudimentary wing structure, and *L. tenuis*, a summer emerging adult with fully developed wings, were compared and revealed significant genetic variability between *A. recta* samples from the two rivers ($F_{ST} = 0.20$) but not between *L. tenuis* samples ($F_{ST} = 0.07$). Further genetic variation investigation used *A. recta*, populations, within and between the Chagrin River and Grand River, hypothesized that differences in populations is a function of distance, and that greater distance leads to greater genetic variability. To strengthen the robustness of this work, samples were collected from two additional watersheds, the Rocky and Cuyahoga Rivers. Genetic variation of *A. recta* populations differed significantly across all four watersheds, especially between the Cuyahoga and Grand Rivers ($G'_{ST} = 1$), Rarity of movement regardless of distance suggests that other factors have a more profound effect than previously thought – factors that include human influences.

The unresolved genetic variation of *A. recta* and potential human influence resulted in a holistic examination of macroinvertebrate community structure and ecology within the four watersheds. Both legacy land use and anthropogenic disturbance effects on seasonal variation

were examined and it was hypothesized that: (1) greatest species diversity and richness among stoneflies and other macroinvertebrates will occur during the summer months, when weather conditions in Ohio are more conducive. (2) The greatest species diversity and richness among stoneflies and other macroinvertebrates will occur where the landscape has been historically less disturbed. The results revealed inconsistencies in seasonal diversity between sites; regardless of legacy land-use and anthropogenic influence. Results of this research show the significance of examining both aquatic and terrestrial stages in order to collect accurate and robust data on macroinvertebrate community structure. Furthermore, year-long macroinvertebrate sampling must be conducted even during extreme events in order to construct a better understanding of macroinvertebrate communities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	
1.1. Biomonitoring as an Index of Stream Health	5
1.1.1 Brief History of Aquatic Entomology.....	5
1.1.2 Modern Perspectives	6
1.1.3 Macroinvertebrates in Context.....	8
1.2 Paradigmatic Evolution in Systems Studies	9
1.2.1 Land Use Dynamics: An Introduction to Historical Processes.....	10
1.2.2 The Changing Landscape: Land use and Macroinvertebrate Communities.	12
1.3. Empirical Focus	15
1.4. Plecopteran Community.....	15
1.4.1 Dispersal	16
1.4.2 Study Organisms	19
1.5. General Aquatic Quality	20
1.6. Specific Aquatic Quality.....	22
1.6.1 Biodiversity of Macroinvertebrate Communities	24
1.6.2 Spatial Perspective	25
1.6.3 Research an Organism Perspective	27
1.6.4 Temporal Perspective	28

1.6.4.1 Seasonal Weather/Storms	29
1.6.4.2 Food Availability	29
REFERENCES	32
CHAPTER II: THE EFFECTS OF DISPERSAL ABILITY IN WINTER AND	
SUMMER STONEFLIES ON THEIR GENETIC DIFFERENTIATION	
2.1. ABSTRACT.....	43
2.2 Introduction.....	45
2.3. Materials and Methods.....	46
2.4. Results.....	49
2.4.1 <i>Allocaenia recta</i>	49
2.4.2 <i>Leuctra tenuis</i>	50
2.5. Discussion	50
REFERENCES	59
CHAPTER III: DISPERSAL ANALYSIS WITHIN THE SPECIES <i>ALLOCAPNIA</i>	
<i>RECTA</i> (ORDER PLECOPTERA) BETWEEN FOUR WATERSHEDS IN	
NORTHEAST OHIO	
3.1 Introduction.....	62
3.2. Materials and Methods.....	64
3.3. Results.....	69
3.4. Discussion	74
3.4.1 Post-Glacial Migration.....	74
3.4.2 Land Use	76
3.4.3 Resource Competition.....	79

3.5.	Conclusion	80
	REFERENCES	81

CHAPTER IV: SEASONAL AND LEGACY LAND USE EVALUATION OF
MACROINVERTEBRATE COMMUNITIES IN NORTHEAST OHIO.

4.1	Introduction.....	85
4.2.	Materials and Methods.....	89
4.2.1	Water Chemistry	91
4.2.2	Habitat/Physical Characterization Assessment.....	93
4.2.3	Benthic Macroinvertebrates	94
4.2.4	Statistical Analyses and Metrics	95
	4.2.4.1 Shannon Diversity and Evenness Index	95
	4.2.4.2 Cluster Analysis	96
	4.2.4.3 Canonical Correspondence Analysis	96
	4.2.4.4 Analysis of Variance and Functional Feeding Groups	97
4.3.	Results and Discussion	98
4.3.1	ANOVA and Physical Data	99
	4.3.1.1 Seasonal Variation Within Sites	99
	4.3.1.2 Seasonal Variation Between Sites	103
4.3.2	Macroinvertebrate Evaluation.....	105
	4.3.2.1 Shannon Diversity and Evenness Index	106
	4.3.2.2 Cluster Analysis	110
	4.3.2.3 Canonical Correspondence Analysis	118

4.3.2.4	ANOVA and Functional Feeding Groups	130
4.4.	Synthesis	139
4.4.1	Seasonal Perspective.....	139
4.4.2	Land use Perspective.....	141
4.4.2.1	Past Land Use and Evaluation	144
	REFERENCES	149

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND SYNTHESIS

5.1	Generalization.....	152
5.2.	Summary of Plecopteran Dispersal and Species Comparisons	153
5.3.	Macroinvertebrate Community Structure	155
5.3.	Education	156
5.4.	Averting Methodological Error	158
5.5.	Connectivity and Dispersal	161
5.6.	Conclusion	162
	REFERNCES	164

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Haplotype Frequency Analysis of <i>Allocapnia recta</i> in the Chagrin and Grand Rivers.	54
II.	Haplotype Frequency Analysis of <i>Leuctra tenuis</i> in the Chagrin and Grand Rivers.	55
III.	List of <i>A. recta</i> Haplotypes	66
IV.	MANOVA of 16sRNA Gene Variation in <i>A. recta</i>	70
V.	Haplotype Frequencies for <i>A. recta</i> in Four Watersheds in Northeast Ohio	71
VI.	Gene Diversity Estimation	72
VII.	Pairwise Population Analysis Based on Location	72
VIII.	Pairwise Population Analysis Based on Flight Distance	73
IX.	Seasonal Macroinvertebrate Abundance by Location	101
X.	Total Number of Macroinvertebrates Collected by Site	102
XI.	Seasonal Chemical and Physical Attribute Assessment	102
XII.	Seasonal One-way ANOVA Analysis	103
XIII.	Locational One-way ANOVA Analysis	105
XIV.	CCA of Environmental Data.....	129
XV.	Functional Feeding Group Analysis: Raw Data	134
XVI.	Seasonal ANOVA Descriptive Data.....	137

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
II.1 Map of Study Area in Northeast Ohio	56
II.2. Haplotypes distribution of <i>Allocapnia recta</i> in the Chagrin and Grand Rivers	57
II.3. Haplotypes of distribution <i>Leuctra tenuis</i> in the Chagrin and Grand Rivers	58
III.1 Collecting sites of <i>A. recta</i> in four watersheds in Northeast Ohio.....	68
III.2. MEGA Phylogeny Cladogram of <i>A. recta</i>	69
III.3 Haplotype distribution of <i>A. recta</i> in Four Watersheds in Northeast Ohio	73
IV.1. Macroinvertebrate Shannon Diversity and Evenness Analysis for each Collecting Location Based on Season and Year	110
IV.2 Cluster Analysis of Macroinvertebrate Data Based on Collecting Location, Season, and Year	116
IV.3. Seasonal CANOCO Analysis with Identified Taxa.....	121
IV.4. Seasonal CANOCA Analysis without Identified Taxa.....	125
IV. 5. Collector-gather One-way ANOVA	138
IV.6. Scraper One-way ANOVA	139

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Stream biodiversity is constantly threatened by human encroachment through many complex pathways. Loss of diversity may occur as a result of land use alterations including changes in water chemistry, riparian vegetation removal, changes in light penetration, water temperature, and organic inputs. Such a loss of biodiversity can alter stream community structure. This research investigates landscape characteristics and land use effects on different scales of biodiversity from species level alpha diversity, to ecosystem level beta diversity, and finally effects on gamma diversity from a regional perspective.

In order to address questions related to alpha diversity, dispersal in two species of stoneflies were studied. Stoneflies are weak fliers as adults and have a terrestrial range limited, in general, to fifteen meters from the stream embankment (Schultheis et al., 2002). The nature of their wing structure and flight mechanics limits their aquatic-terrestrial dispersal capability and should affect their genetic diversity. By studying the genetic variability of stonefly subpopulations between watersheds, a genetic relationship

can be established and utilized as evidence of intra- and/or interconnectivity between adjacent systems (Schultheis et al., 2002; Kauwe et al., 2004). This research studies multiple watersheds that have been separated from each other by a great enough distance and for a sufficient amount of time to have genetic variation within the stonefly populations.

Previous works have recognized that *Allocaonia recta* (Claassen, 1924) emerge during winter months with a rudimentary wing structure, a flight deficiency that is not known to have a direct correlation to emergence period (Ross and Ricker, 1971). However, the time of emergence and corresponding wing structure may have an effect on genetic heterogeneity of the stonefly population. This research explores population genetics of two species of stoneflies, *Allocaonia recta* and *Leuctra tenuis* (Pickett, 1841), to determine if 1) time of year of adult terrestrial emergence and wing morphology have an effect on dispersal capability in stoneflies, and 2) if spatial distance is a factor contributing to the genetic variation within stonefly populations. It is hypothesized that between the two, *Allocaonia recta* will have the greatest genetic diversity among all sites due to its winter emergence and rudimentary wing structure and that *Leuctra tenuis* populations, a summer emergent, will be low. Alternatively, there will be no significant difference in the amount of genetic variation between either of the two species.

Secondly, it is hypothesized that the greater the distance *Allocaonia recta* populations are from each other, the greater the genetic diversity between their populations.

Alternatively, there will be no significant difference in the amount of genetic variation between *Allocaonia recta* populations regardless of distance. At the ecosystem and regional level, how does the aquatic macroinvertebrate community assemblage contribute

to the overall health and biodiversity of a stream ecosystem? Is species diversity and richness in macroinvertebrate populations affected by seasonal variation? Is there a difference in macroinvertebrate community assemblage and biodiversity in watersheds adjacent to managed land versus land currently or historically disturbed? Such understanding enables development of meaningful, empirical relationships and their use in developing more effective land management policies. In addition, a thorough understanding of stream health as a consequence of surrounding land use enables more direct actions for successful remediation, restoration, and future projects that insure the continued health and biodiversity of a stream ecosystem.

Determining whether the species diversity of stoneflies and macroinvertebrate communities is correlated to the health of stream systems and their surrounding habitats is not a trivial undertaking. While some macroinvertebrate orders, and other aquatic organisms, may remain active and even thrive in channels with poor water quality, stoneflies and similar pollution-intolerant macroinvertebrates require relatively high water quality for survival.

Less than ideal water quality, accompanied by a lack of suitable habitat, reduces species diversity and species abundance at a site. Such reductions have a direct impact on the genetic variability of the population by lowering the number of potential mates for reproduction.

Thus the third hypothesis is there will be both greater taxa diversity and richness among macroinvertebrate populations in watersheds circumvented by managed and/or designated protected lands when compared to watersheds surrounded by land use that have been demonstrated through previous research to reduce macroinvertebrate

community diversity (i.e. urban, agricultural, residential, etc.). This hypothesis is not relegated to modern land use alone. The use of land both within the watersheds and adjacent to the stream channels included in this research have a dynamic and well-documented history. The direct effect of these historic land uses on macroinvertebrate communities was not researched until the latter decades of the twentieth century, often only focused on individual species and their populations. This work expands on previous studies by exploring the current structure of macroinvertebrate communities as a direct link to historic land use.

Including the preceding hypotheses, the purpose of this research is to:

1. Conceive, develop, and execute a multidisciplinary approach to studying stoneflies and other macroinvertebrate communities through the combination of entomology, population genetics, and landscape ecology.
2. Study the significance of dispersal capacity by examining two species of stoneflies (*A. recta* and *L. tenuis*) with differing temporal emergence periods and distinctive wing structures, characteristics that have the ability to isolate unique populations despite the lack of physical boundaries.
3. Measure the habitat quality required for maintaining species richness and diversity of plecopterans in a lotic community.
4. Measure and compare the species richness and diversity of *A. recta*, *L. tenuis*, and other macroinvertebrate communities within four Northeast Ohio watersheds, each surrounded by a unique land use, to determine the overall impacts reflecting legacy land use effects and current land use practices.

1.1 Biomonitoring as an Index of Stream Health

1.1.1 Brief History of Aquatic Entomology

Many of the preliminary advances in the scientific community's knowledge of aquatic insects correspond with the global explorations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1675, Dutch anatomist Jan Swammerdam was the first to study the natural history of the burrowing Ephemeroptera (McCafferty, 1998). Swammerdam's contributions, including detailed information on the transformation of aquatic insects from naiad to adult, the identification of external gills as an important respiratory structure, and the identification of dimorphic sexual characteristics between males and females was a cornerstone for the evolution of a new discipline (McCafferty, 1998).

Building on the work of Carolus Linnaeus, John Christian Fabricius created the first insect taxonomy as an apprentice of Linnaeus during the eighteenth century (Merritt and Cummings, 1996; McCafferty, 1998). Thomas Say and Benjamin Walsh were the two most prominent American figures to emerge, both understanding and advancing the importance of aquatic entomology (Merritt and Cummings, 1996). By the late nineteenth century, aquatic entomology emerged as a formal discipline of study and had developed a firm place in American scientific research - particularly as a result of extensive Ephemeroptera research by James G. Needham of Cornell University (McCafferty, 1998).

The first use of aquatic macroinvertebrates to assess the quality of water, particularly in regards to its general health and portability, was developed in Germany during the early twentieth century (Merritt and Cummings, 1996). Newly developed methodology employing biotic factors not only enabled researchers to decree a body of water as

polluted, but also the degree to which it was polluted. Among the earliest studies conducted was an assessment of sewage outputs entering natural stream systems, a public health issue necessity heavily addressed in Europe at the time. It was recognized that an increase in sewage led to a decrease in dissolved oxygen and negative effects on aquatic life (Merritt and Cummins, 1996). These pioneering studies empirically led to the concept of indicator species as observations correlated a decrease in macroinvertebrate abundance and diversity with certain types of environmental alterations (Cairns and Pratt, 1993; Clements et al., 2013).

During the twentieth century, macroinvertebrates received a lot of attention due to their relative successes and failures in aquatic habitats related to environmental dynamics (Merritt and Cummings, 1996). Aquatic macroinvertebrates are an essential part of the aquatic food web for other organisms, including fish, amphibians, shorebirds, waterfowl, and other animals that forage on aquatic or terrestrial stage insects (McCafferty, 1998). By 1972, entomologists understood that altered conditions in a natural area, such as a stream, can lead to dire short-term and irreversible long-term effects that impact the quality and the community structure of organisms that inhabit streams.

1.1.2 *Modern Perspectives*

During the 1970s, North American aquatic ecologists shifted to quantitative methods outlining consistency in sampling techniques, replication of sample units, and the use of detailed statistical analyses (Resh and Jackson, 1993; Hauer and Lamberti, 1996; Merritt and Cummings, 1996). As biomonitoring and the use of indicator communities continue to evolve, two distinctive methodological paradigms have emerged among aquatic ecologists. In the face of both increasing financial and time constraints, one faction has

reverted to traditional qualitative approaches to water quality monitoring practices. The second, an efficient yet approachable bioassessment procedure, has introduced a more salient means of quantitative and qualitative practices (Resh and Jackson, 1993). Aquatic insects are often preferred over other aquatic organisms such as fish, algae, and protozoans (Hellowell, 1986); the importance of aquatic insects and other benthic macroinvertebrates is difficult to overestimate.

Life cycle characteristics of aquatic macroinvertebrate can be monitored to gauge both subtle and prolific changes to water quality in the systems they inhabit. Any change to the structure of macroinvertebrate communities can be measured, both quantitatively (i.e., statistical measures of taxa diversity) and qualitatively (i.e., habitat analyses), and used to determine the various degrees of suboptimal conditions; providing a clear benefit over the use of chemical and other water quality analyses alone. Whereas water chemistry analyses through traditional methods can provide a snap-shot reflecting the upstream health of a sampling site on a particular day at a particular time, macroinvertebrate biomonitoring is able to ascertain varying temporally defined pollutants –continuous, intermittent, or accidental - at any number of spatial levels ranging from a single point source to degradation across an entire region.

Just as important as the value of macroinvertebrate biomonitoring over traditional methods (water chemistry analysis) is the recognition that macroinvertebrates do not uniformly respond to all types of impacts. For some macroinvertebrate species, their distribution and abundance is a function of the physiochemical aspects of the habitat as opposed to the quality of the water alone. When using macroinvertebrates in

biomonitoring, it is considered good practice to consider both the biological and physical features of a stream to fully analyze the water quality at a site.

1.1.3 Macroinvertebrates in Context

With the development and evolution of different biomonitoring indices, such as the *Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity* (Kerans and Karr, 1994) and the *Rapid Bioassessment Protocol* (Barbour et al., 1997), larger categories of macroinvertebrates as bioindicators for quickly identifying stream quality have been developed. Aquatic macroinvertebrates are routinely used to determine the extent of certain pollutants such as organic and inorganic compounds from urban, agricultural, and industrial wastes in lotic system. Aquatic macroinvertebrate life cycles are impacted by changes in water chemistry, benthic habitat availability, and surrounding land use patterns making them excellent biological indicators (Koop et al. 2008). Several advantages of using macroinvertebrates include: (a) they are widespread and affected by a wide range of environmental stressors, (b) communities typically contain a diverse group of species which offers a wide range of stress responses, (c) in the aquatic life stage macroinvertebrates are not very mobile - allowing for spatial examination of disturbance effects; and (d) they have a relatively long life cycle that allows for temporal examination of disturbance effects (Gaufin, 1973; Hellowell, 1986; Rosenberg and Resh, 1993; McCord et al, 2007). Researchers can predict responses to remediation efforts by identifying changes in the biomass of macroinvertebrate populations, especially benthic forms, due to their sensitivity to pollutants (Letterman and Mitsch, 1978; Johnson et al., 1993; Death and Winterbourne, 1995). These advantages, coupled with regard for the scientific integrity and cost-effectiveness of evaluating the quality of stream habitats, enable and justify qualitative

sampling and analysis of aquatic macroinvertebrates (Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, 2000).

1.2 Paradigmatic Evolution in Systems Studies

Throughout the past two decades, there has been an evolution in how scientists and natural resource managers examine entire lotic ecosystems. The traditional paradigm was that community-level organisms were influenced by rapidly changing events and that only physical characteristics directly adjacent to the stream affected the biota. However, more recent methodological constructs in macroecology incorporate a more balanced view of biodiversity and community structure; linking them to a combination of ecological and historical processes (Williams et al., 2003). Evolving ecological perspectives acknowledge the importance of physical and biological relationships in aquatic ecosystems, relationships that are both dependent on spatial and temporal factors (Gorman and Karr, 1978; Williams et al., 2003). How these evolving ecological perspectives neglect the importance of both spatial and temporal attributes in favor of one or the other is not clearly understood. Ecologists that study the complexity of factors impacting stream systems continue to largely neglect historical factors that act as filters for fauna on a regional scale, and are capable of predetermining the species diversity within a watershed (Tonn, 1990; Hugueny, 1997; Ricklefs et al., 1999; Williams et al., 2003; Allan, 2004) – factors that have the most influence on the distribution of aquatic organisms. It is clear that in order to understand a stream's ecosystem; systemic studies cannot be isolated to assessments of diversity at a community level alone (Baattrup-Pederson, et al. 2008). Researchers must necessarily include the study of stream morphology and population structure as it relates to the surrounding landscape, both

historically and in the present, on a spatial and temporal level (Yasick et al., 2007; Houghton and Wasson, 2013). This link has been traditionally underrepresented and needs to become a significant part of lotic system assessments.

1.2.1 Land Use Dynamics: An Introduction to Historical Processes

Multiple human activities have and continue to bring about changes in the geomorphology of the landscape due to complex and lasting alteration in the physical structure and hydrology of river systems that may never be completely restored (Allan, 2004). Applied historical studies of land use continue to evolve, the consensus of ecologists today is that, at a minimum, it is important to know and understand the historical land use to properly monitor ecosystems in the future (Swetnam et al., 1999). Distinguishing between past and present land use and its impact on ecosystems is cloaked under the de-notation of *legacy effects* (Allan, 2004). For example, agriculture has taken on a smaller role in the local economy in the southern region of the Appalachian Mountains (Allan, 2004). As the value of land for agrarian purpose has waned, the abandonment has resulted in natural dynamics of land reverting back to forests. Even with this natural change in land, studies continue to show that the flora and fauna within and surrounding such a region is more similar to streams in agricultural areas than present-day primary forested areas (Maloney and Weller, 2011). Land evaluation becomes more complicated when the land use surrounding riverine systems becomes cyclic, such as when primary forested landscapes are converted to agricultural lands and then later converted to urban landscapes or back to forests (Harding et al., 1998; Allan 2004; Maloney et al., 2008).

Legacy effects rarely result from natural processes (deforestation due to natural fires, riparian destruction or stream modification from extreme flood events, etc.). Harding (2003) implicated humans as the primary cause of the irreversible loss of taxonomic diversity due to historical manipulation in most of the endemic vertebrates in terrestrial, marine, and lake systems of New Zealand (Harding et al. 1998 ;Harding et al., 1998) revealed that the practice of repetitive burning destroyed the landscape vegetation, to clear large tracts of land that included increased erosion in riparian zones, and eliminated soil seed banks when humans colonized present-day New Zealand more than 1000 years ago. The physical effects that riparian zone removal has on stream ecosystems - alteration of bank stability, alteration of substrate characterization, and increased temperature regime – is well understood. But the lasting effects on the regional flora and fauna as a consequence of riparian removal throughout an entire watershed is yet to be completely comprehended (Roth et al., 1996; Wang et al., 1997; and Harding et al., 1998); particularly given the innumerable combinations of land use change that has occurred over space and time (Harding, 2003; Bojkova et al., 2012).

Many legacy effects are remnants of forest clear-cutting, a land management practice nearly as old as civilization itself. Clear cutting, was often performed near riverine systems where the channel served as a means of transporting fallen timber. This practice led to the removal of thousands of square kilometers of riparian vegetation and has had a lasting effect on the diversity of present-day aquatic biota. The more ubiquitous effects include bank instability and increased sedimentation, the introduction of more competitive invasive species, and water contamination (Harding, 2003; Allan, 2004; Burcher and Banfield, 2006).

Macroinvertebrate species diversity and populations that depend on relatively stable conditions, low sedimentation, and forested habitats become extinct or migrate from riverine systems subjected to clear-cutting. Stone and Wallace (1998) discovered that the aquatic biota was low in species abundance, taxonomic richness, and biomass. The most pollution intolerant taxa, Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera (EPT) abundance remained much lower when compared to pre-logging levels sixteen years after logging was halted and reforestation started to return around a North Carolina stream. These legacy effects were predicted to last several more decades.

Despite the fact that an area of land may return to its natural condition through cycles of deforestation/riparian vegetation removal and reforestation, it is not certain that the biota will recover at the same rate or at all. In addition, such cycles do not guarantee that a reforested tract of land will function in the same manner that it did prior to reforestation. The age and size of forests plays an important role in organismal community structure (Foster et al., 2003). Once displaced from their original habitat, populations re-establish very slowly. If there are large physical structures – dams, bridges, artificial waterfalls, etc. – as a consequence of land management, recolonization as a consequence of land management practices, may never occur (Foster et al., 2003).

1.2.2 The Changing Landscape: Land Use and Macroinvertebrate Communities

One way of defining macroinvertebrate communities in stream systems is by organizing macroinvertebrates into functional feeding groups – those with the greatest potential of relaying important information about the process-level aquatic ecosystem attributes (Rawer-Jost et al., 2000). Vannote et al. (1980) developed the *River Continuum Concept* (RCC) in an undisturbed stream, a theory that predicts key

ecosystem properties along a continuum of the stream system. Although the RCC was developed for forested riverine systems, the concept can be modified to fit other forms of lotic ecosystems because it illustrates the response of macroinvertebrate communities to changes in their food resources. Changes in the functional feeding groups can be used to monitor shifts in the relative abundance of defined macroinvertebrate functional feeding groups - particularly in response to land use change.

In the insatiable pursuit of land acquisition, humans are rapidly converting once undisturbed landscapes into urbanized and agricultural regions. This practice of land conversion contributes to a variety of dynamics affecting nutrient loading, erosion, animal grazing, chemical contamination, and building human infrastructures within cities and suburban regions (Burcher and Benfield, 2006). A significant problem with streams in urbanized and agricultural regions is the creation of impervious surface leading to an increase in overland flow. This increases the frequency and intensity of run off and leads to increased water level fluctuations and flash flooding (Moglen, 2000; Moore and Palmer, 2005). Furthermore, in agricultural streams, erosional dynamics and a decrease in riparian vegetation are two of the most significant concerns affecting streams. The increase in fine sedimentation in the substrate can lead to elevated in-stream embeddedness and shallower streams (Wang et al., 2002; Vondracek et al., 2005). Shallower streams, in conjunction with the loss of riparian vegetation, experience an increase in water temperature; a changing dynamic inversely proportional to dissolved oxygen concentrations. Whereas these negative effects due to changing land use are most traditionally related to urbanization, agricultural areas are fully capable of acting like urbanized areas when impervious surfaces result from large areas of compacted soils.

While traditional studies of negatively impacted riverine systems and land use change have focused on the industrialization and urbanization impacts of the past century, preliminary studies have demonstrated measurable human impairment – often with more abstract impacts resulting from historical and modern agricultural land use (Vitousek, 1994; Bruns, 2005). Studies that include biological examination of agricultural conditions are done so within the context of gradients of agricultural land use and intensity, as opposed to unmodified, virgin land (Reynoldson et al. 1997; Genito et al., 2002; Louhi et al. 2011). Biological integrity and habitat quality are negatively correlated to the intensity of agricultural land use upstream from study sites (Roth et al., 1996; Herbst, et al. 2012). A study conducted by Harding et al. (1999), in a New Zealand river, showed replacement of pollution sensitive (EPT) orders with those that are pollution tolerant is a common community response in riverine systems subjected to agriculturally derived pollutants.

Currently, the greatest concerns in water quality are those due to non-point source pollutants (Chambers et al., 2006). Throughout the past few decades, much work has been done to eliminate point-source pollution by upgrading old industrial or sewage treatment operations and incorporating design improvements. The greatest concentrations of non-point pollutants commonly detected in and around agricultural areas are those from nutrient and organic matter loading, sedimentation, and contaminates (i.e. herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers) (Lenat, 1994; Vondracek et al., 2005; Palmer et al. 2010). Increasing nitrogen and phosphorus can cause excessive aquatic plant growth, loss of plant species, depletion of oxygen, and deleterious changes in the abundance and diversity of macroinvertebrates, fish and other organisms that depend on,

or part of, a stream ecosystem (Smith et al., 1999; Chambers et al., 2006 Robinson, 2012; Zhang et al. 2012). In order to mitigate human impact on lotic ecosystems, it is essential to understand and relate the patterns of land cover changes to the process of changes in land use and relate those changes to within the freshwater ecosystem (Bruns, 2005).

1.3 Empirical Focus

Stoneflies are weak fliers as terrestrial adults (Schultheis et al., 2002) and the nature of their wing structure and flight mechanics limits their aquatic-terrestrial dispersal capability. Species with high dispersal (i.e. gene flow) have little genetic differentiation among their populations. Thus, the measure of genetic differentiation among populations is a good indicator of dispersal among populations. Genetic diversity within and among populations is affected by the degree of population isolation, population size, length of isolation, and environmental differences between sites (Hughes et al., 1999). Where dispersal is confined, the amount of genetic homogeneity among different populations begins to decrease and genetic drift, selection, and mutation within the separate groups can lead to greater genetic variability (Hedrick, 2000).

1.4 Plecopteran Community

Stoneflies are a small order of exopterygote insects including about 2000 species worldwide (500 species in North America). They have a relatively long, but fragmented, fossil record dating back to the Permian Period (Cushing & Allan, 2001). Members of the Plecoptera spend the majority of their life as aquatic naiads. The naiads emerge as terrestrial adult insects throughout the year and may live anywhere from several hours to several weeks. The length of time an individual remains in either stage is species specific (Schmidt et al., 1995). Furthermore, time of year for the adult phase is also species

specific. As terrestrial adults, stoneflies are sexually mature and seek out mates. Once a male impregnates a female, the female will return to the water to lay her eggs. Due to their dependence on the aquatic environment, stoneflies do not fly far from a water source (Cushing and Allan, 2001).

1.4.1 *Dispersal*

Stoneflies live most of their life in their immature naiad stage, inhabiting streams and swimming for dispersal. Their adult, terrestrial lives are short-lived and primarily isolated to their natal riparian zone. Plecopteran species show significant variability in wing morphology and musculature, and variability in flight as adults (Malmqvist, 2000; Winterbourne, 2005). This variability in flight, and hence dispersal range, can be categorized among plecopterans through extremes from full wing, full flight capabilities to apterous and flightless. Dispersal is measured as the distance from an organism's natal habitat to the breeding habitat among individuals of a species (MacNeale et al., 2005). Dispersal among plecopterans may be passive (e.g. migrating as a result of wind directionality, hydrologic gradient in open channel stream systems, etc.), but it is more likely the result of intentional movement leading to more desirable attributes conducive to survival. The outcome of dispersal causes the population, as a whole, to spread out spatially and is critical – in fact, a necessity – for the long-term survival of the species.

The role of dispersal is critical. Highly specialized behaviors have evolved among insects for dispersal, and those behaviors have become part of the physiology and ecology of a species. Among the most important of these physiological behaviors is the development of flight; enabling greater access to resources, mate acquisition, and predator avoidance. As a result of dispersal, many species variables are affected –

including natal population demographics, the populations of adjacent habitats, colonization of new or previously uninhabited regions, and the rates at which populations become genetically distinct from each other (Briers et al., 2003). Malmqvist (2000) suggested that in addition to species population variables, such as population size, length of isolation, etc., colonization and range size may lead to the commonality or rarity of a species. Insects with long wings are good dispersers and potentially good colonizers, whereas some species become rare as a result of short wings and poor colonization ability. However, even with all of its advantages, flight has been lost repeatedly among insects (McCulloch et al., 2009).

Plecopterans have two dispersal mechanisms: adult flight and larval drift. Huntsman et al. (1999) showed that flying insects, in general, could disperse long distances either by muscular powered flight or by wind action. Even in species like stoneflies that are not strong fliers, flying still gives the insect a greater dispersal advantage than insects that do not fly. Dispersal is also achieved through larval drift where stoneflies move downstream with the accompanying current. Stoneflies also have the ability to actively swim upstream either in search of food or for predator avoidance. Unfortunately, the significance of adult flight and larval drift as mechanisms of dispersal is difficult to quantify with concrete data (Brederveld et al., 2011).

While not all macroinvertebrates have the affinity to drift, extreme biological and physiological disturbances are a major seasonal variant affecting their assemblages (Muller, 1974). Most drift studies have only addressed the daily movement of macroinvertebrates and few studies have documented their seasonal movement or investigated the levels at which a disturbance can disrupt the normal pattern of drift

(Brittan and Eikeland, 1988; Tockner and Waringer, 1997; Robinson et al., 2002). A greater intensity of studies related to drift and seasonal disturbance can lead to a better understanding of the alternative aspects of lotic ecosystem function (Robinson et al., 2002). Seasonal changes in macroinvertebrate drift have important implications for both organic matter exchanges with the floodplain channels and organism dispersal/migration (Romito et al. 2010)

Plecoptera mobility in the naiad stage has always been relegated to swimming. The most rudimentary form of stonefly flight began with surface skimming before evolving into more complex flight patterns; increasing flight velocity at each stage. In *surface skimming*, thrust is provided by wing flapping and maintaining continuous contact with the water surface, removing the need for total aerodynamic weight support. Several variants of flight connected to surface skimming led Marden et al. (2000) to index the evolution of surface skimming into five distinct stages, swimming/swimming-skimmer, six-and four-leg skimmers, hind-leg skimming and jumping , with each stage of evolution leading to full flight capability. Wing variability results from a variety of factors ranging from habitat stability to elevation and ambient air temperature. While the general environmental factors affecting flight are understood, there still remains uncertainty regarding the interrelationship of environmental factors and flight capability. The main argument for reduced wing structure and flight capabilities, as presented by Malmqvist, 2000, is the relationship of wing development and fecundity. Because egg production and wing development depend on the same metabolic energy resources, population members may choose to disproportionately allocate metabolic energy towards one or the other; respectively leading to greater reproduction capability or dispersal capability.

Consistent observation of plecopteran flight – whether active (full flight mechanisms) or passive (variations of surface skimming) – reveals a consistent directional pathway of movement upstream from the site of emergence. McNeale et al. (2005) studied the direction and distance that *Lectura ferruginea* traveled through analytical assessment using the stable isotope ^{15}N . By incorporating the isotope in four stream systems over a period of four years, enriching the ^{15}N nutrient concentration in *L. ferruginea* naiads, captured emerging adults were assessed for N-enrichment. The results supported qualitative observations that *L. ferruginea*, which are strong fliers, had flight vectors oriented upstream; in some cases with head winds nearing 5km/hr.

Whereas the directionality of emerging plecopterans continues to be studied and better understood, questions continue to surround the reason(s) for these flight patterns. One current theory is that upstream movement and female oviposition of eggs is an adaptive trait that has evolved in plecopterans (Winterbourne and Crowe, 2001). Other research suggests that upper reaches of a stream have greater productivity and biomass availability (Hall et al., 2001). Among the favorable conditions that may facilitate upstream directionality is a decrease in predation and interspecies competition, as well as favorable physical factors like lower pollutant levels, sedimentation, and other anthropogenic factors.

1.4.2 Study Organisms

This research is focused on two species of Plecoptera: *Allocapnia recta* (Claassen 1924) from the family Capnidae and *Leuctra tenuis* (Pictet 1841) from the family Leuctridae, and general assemblages of aquatic macroinvertebrates. *Allocapnia recta* and *L. tenuis* were chosen due to the difference in time of the calendar year that they emerge

as terrestrial adults. *Allocapnia recta* and *Leuctra tenuis* emerge at nearly opposite times of the year and are faced with contrasting environmental factors related to the time of year. Specific habitat requirements for plecopterans, both as naiads and adults, include pristine water conditions with a high oxygen concentration and little to no anthropogenic impact.

The dispersal potential of *Allocapnia recta* and *Leuctra tenuis* will be measured indirectly using the genetic markers, mitochondrial deoxyribose nucleic acid (mtDNA). Insect mtDNA contains thirteen protein-coding regions, twenty-two transfer ribose nucleic acid (tRNA) genes, two ribosomal RNA (rRNA) genes and one non-coding region (the origin of mtDNA replication) (Simon, 1991; Schultheis, 2002). Genetic variation within and between species populations arises more quickly in mtDNA than in the nuclear genome due to its faster rate of nucleotide substitution, maternal mode of inheritance and lack of recombination. Moreover, patterns of evolutionary relationships are easier to trace in uniparental systems than in nuclear DNA. Moritz et al. (1987), along with Murdoch and Herbert (1997), validate mtDNA analysis as one of the most powerful means of genetic analysis available to examine patterns of phylogeographic relationships.

1.5 General Aquatic Quality

Analysis of landscape patterns show that all ecosystems elements, whether terrestrial or aquatic, respond to disturbances differently depending on how the alterations occur, intensity and duration of the disturbance, and patterns or conditions under which the ecosystem is to recover (Burcher et al., 2007; Louhi et al. 2011). As aquatic ecologists learn more about the co-variable interactions between the aquatic and terrestrial

environment, it becomes too complex to detangle the relationships that exist between each of the variables (Richards et al., 1996; Wang et al., 1997; Vondracek et al., 2005). Johnson et al. (2007) stated that watershed land cover contributes materials and energy to the stream, which together determine the cumulative stressor load to which a stream ecosystem is subjected at any given time. Van Sickle (2003) and King et al (2005) also commented on the relationship between land and water variables by illustrating two seemingly independent factors, such as benthic substrate and allochthonous coarse particulate matter, function dependently to affect nutrient availability and habitat parameters. In addition, these two factors function together to determine the diversity and abundance of the macroinvertebrate community found within the ecosystem. Ruhl (1995) determined that land use practices, vegetation, geology, and soil structure all attribute to the biological response and chemical and physiological factors of a stream system. These biological responses include degree of susceptibility to chemical and organic pollutants entering waterways, habitat loss and degradation due to changing land-use activities, local extinctions triggered by the loss of key predators, the spread of predatory or competitive invasive species, and response to climate change (Allan and Flecker, 1993; Harding, 2003).

Historically, streams have been assessed through spatially or temporally constrained water quality inferences, a practice that, in large part, continues today. Understanding the impact of historical and land use legacy effects and the consequence of modern land use alterations on riverine systems is a task of monumental proportion. The current rate at which land reclassification occurs has escalated well beyond the current systemic understanding of the stream systems and watersheds they directly impact (Pond, 2012).

1.6 Specific Aquatic Quality

Riverine system investigators realize that the health and maintenance of stream biodiversity is constantly threatened by human encroachment through many complex pathways; complexities affecting the ecological integrity of the ecosystem, habitat health, water quality, and the local biota (Sponseller et al., 2001; Megan et al., 2007). Land use alterations are known to be a dominant stressor, particularly, but not exclusively on freshwater ecosystems, with the greatest impacts associated with watershed modifications (i.e. substrate alterations and increase water temperature) and human contamination of aquatic resources (i.e. organic and inorganic input) (Carpenter et al., 1992; Bruns, 2005; Kruse et al. 2013). Such encroachment within a watershed also presents implications for the downstream ecological integrity and may compromise the viability of the ecosystem (Norris et al., 2007). Water chemistry, light penetration, organic inputs, and water temperature (Megan et al., 2007) among others, become increasingly vulnerable as the ecological integrity of the ecosystem is affected; with temperature change as a primary consequence of riparian vegetation removal (Scrimgeour et al. 2013).

The loss of streamside vegetation, such as the conversion of a forested landscape into agriculture land, increases the amount of solar radiation reaching the stream channel, subsequently leading to increased water temperatures. Alteration of the thermal regimes in a stream habitat is critical to the natural history and ecology of macroinvertebrates (Vannote & Sweeney, 1980 and Quinn et al., 1994). The premature development of macroinvertebrates, brought on by a rise in water temperature has many negative effects including compromising mate acquisition for both male and females, female fecundity, and egg development.

In addition to changes in thermal regime, loss of riparian vegetation often leads to an increased percentage of impervious surfaces. Whether riparian alterations lead to agricultural land use or more conventional urban constructs, increased impervious surface reduces levels of evapotranspiration and infiltration, altering natural flow regimes and catalyzing bank erosion (Maloney et al. 2009). As a consequence of escalated bank erosion, sedimentation rates increase and the substrate embeddedness is negatively impacted - often reducing macroinvertebrate species diversity and densities (Lenat and Crawford, 1994; Quinn et al., 1997; Sponseller et al., 2001; Maloney et al., 2009).

Allan (1997) demonstrated that while water chemistry and sediment yield are primarily governed by geology, hydrology, soils, and vegetation at the watershed level, it is riparian vegetation that mediates water quality and quantity, sedimentation, and nutrient sinks and/or sources. The riparian vegetation affects the timing and amount of discharge, in-stream temperature, influences habitat structure, hydraulic complexity, channel morphology, and nutrient input. However, the ability of vegetation to act as a sink in agricultural areas is limited (Lowrance et al., 2001).

Land cover/land use level investigations have repeatedly shown that species numbers and composition are relatively dependent on the environmental factors to which the communities are exposed. Very few species are collected in areas where environmental factors beyond optimum requirements, resulting not only in loss of taxonomic richness, but also genetic diversity (Ruse, 2000; Probst et al., 2005). Through their research in an Australian stream, Townshed et al. (1997) showed that population density of burrowing macroinvertebrates was greater in reaches below pasteurized land than in reaches downstream of forested areas. In a similar study conducted by Delong and Brusven

(1998), scrapers were the dominant feeding group downstream of agricultural land, where there was less canopy cover and more light penetration in the stream allowing for increased algae growth, the main food resource for scrapers. The authors found shredders, however, dominated in reaches downstream of forests. Shredders thrive on the increase allochthonous material (leaf litter). Presence of these functional feeding types illustrates the greater reliance on autotrophic food sources in altered landscapes due to the effect of riparian vegetation modification in agricultural/pasteurized land in contrast to original forested habitats (Vannote et al., 1980; Genito et al., 2002; Utz, 2009).

1.6.1 Biodiversity of Macroinvertebrate Communities

Assessing biodiversity of macroinvertebrates in lotic systems is an essential component of basic ecological inquiry and applied ecological assessments (Ward and Tockner, 2001). Aspects of taxonomic diversity and composition in aquatic ecosystems are used to quantify water quality and measure the efficacy of remediation and restoration efforts. Aquatic ecologists realize that the health and maintenance of stream biodiversity is constantly threatened by human encroachment through complex pathways; complexities affecting the ecological integrity of the ecosystem, habitat health, water quality, and local biota. Land use alterations are known to be a dominant stressor on the reduction of stream biodiversity, with the greatest impacts associated with watershed modifications and human contamination of aquatic resources (Ward and Tockner 2001; Evan-White et al., 2009).

Agricultural practices illustrate the loss of biodiversity through human impact better than most other examples. Reduced biodiversity in streams with high nutrient levels is thought to be caused by direct nutrient toxicity from non-point source pollution, which

can lead to indirect alteration of physical and biological factors such as increase in primary production and reduced dissolved oxygen concentrations. Furthermore, the increase in suspended sediment by increased livestock grazing in and around the river will also have a negative impact on the biodiversity of stream macroinvertebrates (Evans-White et al., 2009). Suspended sediments can cause significant respiratory problems among macroinvertebrates. The sediments can settle on the bottom of the stream and coat the external gills of the more sensitive taxa (i.e. EPT). Increases in stream temperature associated with removal of riparian trees can also cause respiratory stress in macroinvertebrates and reduce their success at survival, or alter their growth and development. Each of these mechanisms plays a role in reducing macroinvertebrate diversity in nutrient-enriched streams (Evans-White et al., 2008; Pfrender et al., 2010). Faced with loss or displacement of biodiversity, populations of macroinvertebrates exhibit either resilience or resistance (Southwood 1977). Resilient species have the capacity of returning to their prior taxon richness and density after disturbance. Their resilience resides in their ability to reproduce at an early age, their short reproductive cycles, regeneration potential, and their ability to recolonize from refugia (Southwood, 1977). Resistant species have the ability to withstand the disturbance without significant loss of taxon richness or density. Their resistance is facilitated by their ability to create a firm attachment to the substrate, a streamlined body form, and invulnerable life stages (i.e. diapause or hibernation during peak weather extremes) (Townshed et al., 1997; Stutzner and Beche, 2010; Demars et al., 2012).

Aquatic macroinvertebrates are best known for their use as indicator organisms in aquatic ecosystems. They are an important food resource for fish, amphibians, and

waterfowl, and their involvement in the breakdown and recycling of organic matter and nutrients make them critical components of stream ecosystems. Their distinction as indicators also includes their invaluable usage in assessing the health of riverine systems and they are used more often than any other assemblage of aquatic organisms.

1.6.2 Spatial Perspective

Riverine ecologists recognize that rivers and streams are complex patches of habitat and environmental gradients that characterize aquatic and terrestrial connectivity and spatial complexity (Schlosser, 1991; Fausch et al., 2002; Allan, 2004; Norris et al., 2007). The systemic interdependence linking macroinvertebrates to their aquatic and terrestrial surroundings enables scientists to use changes in stream environments that lead to shifts in the macroinvertebrate community, such as changes in substrate, dissolved oxygen concentrations, water temperature and allochthonous input as a measure of disturbance levels.

Currently, the practice of embedding forested land parcels within agricultural landscapes is a short-term remedy. The forest fragments increase allochthonous input, stable stream morphology, reduce flow variation, and buffer water chemistry factors known to increase benthic macroinvertebrate community diversity and stability (Nakamura and Yamada, 2005; Harding et al., 2006). However, Harding et al. (2006) illustrated that fragmented forests represent an intermediate habitat. The researchers found that the size of the fragment and vegetation type were the most significant factors in the success of maintaining a refuge for macroinvertebrates between the forested and agricultural landscapes (Harding et al., 2006). However, in a study of community structure in the family Formicidae, Ivanov and Keiper (2010) observed that even though

species richness increased at the interface between forested and urban land use, the increase was due to increases in opportunistic and generalist species. Similar patterns are found in fragmented landscapes surrounding stream ecosystems. Although total numbers and diversity of macroinvertebrates may increase at the edge of forested and agriculture/urban land cover (i.e. dipterans), there are losses in species diversity, especially among the more sensitive orders (i.e. ephemeropterans, plecopterans, and trichopterans). As demand for landscapes as areas of agriculture, urban, and industrial land increases on a global scale, land fragments may be the most reasonable solution, though not the best ecological alternative.

1.6.3 Reach and Organism Perspective

Historically, riverine system processes have been studied from a reach perspective (Sponseller et al., 2001; Allan, 2004; Johnson et al., 2007; Norris et al., 2007). Reach-scale perspective analyses, while efficient due to their small scale, are spatially constrained, raising concerns that lotic communities and populations are studied at a scale far too small to develop an adequate understanding of organisms and the processes in which they are an integral part. The aquatic organism perspective, also known as the organism-centered view, examines a riverine system from the perspective of individual organisms and recognizes aquatic landscapes as a variety of microhabitats – leaf litter, stands of macrophytes, and streambed substrate – essential to macroinvertebrate species diversity (Lancaster and Belyea, 1997).

Plecopterans and other aquatic macroinvertebrates exhibit a vast array of morphology, physiology, and behavior adaptations that enable them to exist in many aquatic ecosystems; including temporal and aestival pools, cold and hot springs, running

and standing waters, intermittent streams, and saline lakes. Rarely are the aquatic conditions and habitat so extreme that macroinvertebrates are absent (Ward, 1992; Utz et al., 2009). Seventy to ninety percent of all macroinvertebrates collected at a stream are of the class Insecta (Voshell, 2005). Within the class Insecta, thirteen orders contain species with aquatic or semi-aquatic life stages; five orders (Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, Trichoptera, Odonata, and Megaloptera) have aquatic stages possessed by all species in the order (Hauer and Lamberti, 1996). The remaining eight orders contain both aquatic and terrestrial representatives. With rare exceptions, species in the Coleoptera and Hemiptera (suborder Heteroptera) contain immature and adult aquatic stages while all other orders are amphibiotic - characterized by terrestrial adults (Ward, 1992).

1.6.4 Temporal Perspective

The spatiality of macroinvertebrate settings - including the location of the watershed, stream orders within its basin, the relative proportions of various land uses combined with topography, and physical features of the system - can relay important systems information to aquatic ecologists (Megan et al., 2007). However, stream dynamics are not limited to spatial variations; many streams experience networks of annual expansion and contraction (Stanley et al., 1997; Robinson et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2012) leading to temporal variations directly related to disturbance patterns of a riverine system. As the streams experience networks of annual physical change, benthic communities experience change on a more temporal, seasonal level (Hynes, 1970; Death, 1995; Reece et al., 2001; Romito et al., 2010) - particularly those changes affecting the availability of food, stability of habitat, and drift. These within-stream seasonal variations, among others, are

known to contribute to the variability of macroinvertebrate assemblages within a stream system.

1.6.4.1 Seasonal Weather/Storms

Research by Townshed and Hildrew (1994) demonstrated the potential impact of a second important temporal variant: seasonal weather patterns and accompanying storm events. The frequency of intense storm events has the potential of changing stream patterns from minor to major degrees. In their 1994 publication, Townshed and Hildrew's study of weather patterns and storm events supported the long held perception that the disturbance of a stream is a constituent of the temporal regime as opposed to the spatial regime. Disturbance, or stress, was defined as an event that caused removal of residential organisms with time.

1.6.4.2 Food availability

Aquatic macroinvertebrate diversity and composition in a stream ecosystem is largely dependent on surrounding environmental factors to which the community is exposed and their function as nutrient recyclers; representing their linkage between lower and higher trophic levels, and as a food resource for fish and amphibians (Megan et al., 2007; Ferreira et al., 2013). As nutrient recyclers, macroinvertebrates are essential to riverine systems. Of prime importance is the effect shredders have on recycling carbon back into the system through the breakdown of large particulate organic carbon in the form of autochthonous and/or allochthonous materials. In addition, grazers, deposit, and suspension feeders use nutrients in the form of dissolved organic material and biofilms composed of algae, protozoans, bacteria, and/or fungus build up. While in lower order streams or headwater streams, macroinvertebrate predators may be at the top of the food

chain, preying on such organisms as other macroinvertebrates, fish fry, and salamander eggs (Wallace and Webster, 1996; Huryin and Wallace, 2000; Malmqvist, 2002).

The constituents of a macroinvertebrate community in any system are directly related to the availability of food. In regions dominated by deciduous foliage, there is an increase in both the quantity and quality of coarse particulate organic matter (CPOM) during the autumn season. During this season, CPOM levels enable shredders to dominate (Murphy and Giller, 2000). As autumn transitions to winter and CPOM is broken down into fine particulates, filter feeders dominate until the season changes once again and increased solar intensity - facilitated by a sparse canopy – leads to algal blooms and a riverine system dominated by grazers and collector-gathers.

In order to determine the relationship between diversity in macroinvertebrate community structure and surrounding environment towards achieving the best overall predictive models for biomonitoring, a combination of both spatial knowledge and temporal knowledge of the entire watershed is required. A study conducted by Murphy and Giller (2000) illustrates this by demonstrating the direct dependence of quantity and quality of detritus for macroinvertebrate consumption (temporal perspective) on the type of land use (spatial perspective), and more importantly, riparian vegetation bordering the streams. This research, an extension of the dietary continuum (Petersen and Cummins, 1974), designed predictive models of macroinvertebrate assemblages based on the decay rate of specific types of detritus. The model revealed that detritus from each classification reaches palatability after a sequentially longer period in the stream; classifying decay rates under the general constructs slow, medium, and fast. The conclusions showed that the more diverse the riparian vegetation, and consequently the

range of detritus decay, the longer the sustainability of food availability for detritivours well beyond coarse particulate matter (CPOM) and the autumn leaf fall.

In order to better understand the effects of temporal variation, legacy land use, and current land use practices on macroinvertebrate community and functional feeding group diversity at the at the local and regional level, this study investigated the macroinvertebrate communities of four Northeast Ohio watersheds on a seasonal basis between January 2004 and December 2005, while comparing past and present land use conditions to the current macroinvertebrate community..

REFERENCES

- Allan, JD. 2004. Landscapes and Riverscapes: The influence of land use on stream ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 35: 257-284.
- Allan, JD. 1997. *Stream Ecology: Structure and Function of Running Waters*. Chapman & Hall, London and New York.
- Allan JD. and AS Flecker. 1993. Biodiversity conservation in running waters. *Bioscience*. 43: 32-43.
- Baathrup-Pedersen, A., Spring, G., Riis, T., Lasen, SE., Sand-Jensen, K., and Larsen, LMK. 2008. The search for reference conditions for stream vegetation in northern Europe. *Freshwater Biology*. 53(9): 1890-1901.
- Barbour, MT., J. Gerritsen, BD. Synder, and JB Stribling. 1997. *Revision to Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for use in streams and Rivers. Periphyton, Benthic Macroinvertebrate and Fish*.
[Http://www.epa.gov/owow/wtr/monitoring/AWPD/RBP/html](http://www.epa.gov/owow/wtr/monitoring/AWPD/RBP/html).
- Brederveld, RJ., Jahnig, SC., Lorenz, AW., Brunzel, S., and Soons, MB. 2011. Dispersal as a limiting factor in the colonization of restored mountain streams by plants and macroinvertebrates. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 48: 1241-1250.
- Briers, RA., Cariss, HM., and Gee, JHR. 2003. Flight activity of adult stoneflies in relation to weather. *Ecological Entomology*. 28. 21-40.
- Brittain, JE., and TJ. Eikeland. 1988. Invertebrate drift – a review. *Hydrobiologia*. 166-77-93
- Bojkova, J., Komprdova, K., Soldan, T., and Zahradkova, S. 2012. Species loss of stoneflies (Plecoptera) in Czech Republic during the 20th Century. *Freshwater Biology*. 57: 2550-2567.
- Bruns, DA. 2005. Macroinvertebrate response to land cover, habitat, and water chemistry in a mining – impacted river ecosystem: a GIS watershed analysis. *Aquatic Science*. 67: 403-423.
- Burcher, CL. and Benfield, EF. 2006. Physical and biological responses of streams to suburbanization of historically agricultural streams. *Journal of North American Benthological Society*. 25: 356-369.
- Burcher, CL., Valett, HM., and Benfield ,EF.. 2007. The land-cover cascade: relationships coupling land and water. *Ecology*. 88: 228-242.

- Cairns Jr, J. and Pratt, JR. . 1993. A history of biological monitoring using benthic macroinvertebrates. pp. 10-27. In: DM Rosenberg and VH Resh (eds.) *Freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates*. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY.
- Carpenter, SR., Fisher, SG. , Grimm, NB., and Kitchell, JF. 1992. Global change and freshwater ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. 23: 119-139.
- Clements, WH., Cadmus, P., and Brinkman, SF. 2013. Responses of Aquatic insects to Cu and Zn in stream microcosms: understanding differences between single species tests and field responses. *Environmental Science & Technology*. 47: 7560-7513.
- Cushing, CE. and Allan, JD. 2001. *Streams: Their Ecology and Life*. Academic Press, London, UK.
- Death, RG. 1995. Spatial patterns in benthic invertebrate community structure: products of habitat stability or are they habitat specific? *Freshwater Biology* 33: 455-467.
- Death, RG. and Winterbourne, MK. . 1995. Diversity Patterns in Stream Benthic Invertebrate Communities: The Influence of Habitat Stability. *Ecology* 76:1446-1461.
- Delong, MD. and Brusven, MA. 1998. Macroinvertebrate community structure along the longitudinal gradient of an agriculturally impacted stream. *Environmental Management*. 22. 445-457.
- Demars, BOL. Kemp, JL., Friberg, N. Usseglio-Polatera, P., and Harper, DM. 2012. Linking biotopes to invertebrates in rivers: Biological traits, taxonomic composition and diversity. *Ecological Indicator*. 23: 301-311.
- Evans-White, MA., Dodds, WK., Huggins, DG., Baker, DS. 2009. Thresholds in macroinvertebrate diversity and stoichiometry across water quality gradients in Central Plains (USA) streams. *Journal of North America Benthological Society*. 28: 855-868.
- Fausch, KD., Torgersen, CE., Baxter, CV , and Li, HW. 2002. Landscape to riverscapes: bridging the gap between research and conservation of stream fishes. *BioScience*. 52: 483-498.
- Ferreira, V., Lirio, AV., Rosa, J., and Canhotto, C., 2013. Annual organic matter dynamics in a small temperate mountain stream. *Annales de Limnologie - International Journal of Limnology*. 49: 13-19.

- Foster, D., Swanson, F. , Aber, J. , Burke, I., Brokaw, N., Tilman, D. , and Knapp, A. 2003. The importance of land-use legacies to ecology and conservation. *Bioscience*. 53: 77-88.
- Gaufin, AR. 1973. *Water quality requirements of aquatic insects*. United States Environmental Protection Agency; Government Publishing Office, Washington DC.
- Genito, D., Gburek, WJ. , and Sharpley, AN. 2002. Response of stream macroinvertebrates to agricultural land cover in a small watershed. *Journal of Freshwater Ecology*. 17: 109-119.
- Gorman, OT. and Karr, JR. 1978. Habitat structure and stream fish communities. *Ecology*. 59: 507-5:15.
- Hall, RO., Likens, GE., and Malcom HW. 2001. Trophic basis of invertebrate production in two streams at the Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*. 20. 432-447.
- Harding, JS. 2003. Historic deforestation and the fate of endemic invertebrate species in streams. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*. 37: 333-345.
- Harding, JS., Benfield, EF., Bolstad, PV., Helfman, GS., and Jones, EBD. 1998. Stream biodiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*. 95: 14843-14847.
- Harding, JS., Claassen, K. , and Evers, N. 2006. Can forest fragments reset physical and water quality conditions in agricultural catchments and act as refugia for forest stream invertebrates? *Hydrobiologia*. 568: 391-402.
- Harding, JS., Yound, RG. , Hayes, JW. ,Shearer, KA., and Stark, JD.. 1999. Changes in agricultural intensity and river health along a river continuum. *Freshwater Biology*. 42: 345-357.
- Hauer, FR. and Lamberti, GA. Lamberti 1996. *Methods in Stream Ecology*. Academic Press, London, UK.
- Hellawell, JM. 1986. *Biological indicators of freshwater pollution and environmental management*. Elsevier Publishing Company, London, UK.
- Hedrick, PW. 2000. *Genetic Populations* 2nd edition. Jones and Bartlet Publishing Inc. Sudbury, MA.
- Herbst, DB., Bogan, MT., Roll, SK., and Safford, HD. 2012. Effects of livestock exclusion on in-stream habitat and benthic invertebrate assemblages in montane streams. *Freshwater Biology*.57: 204-217.

- Hildrew, AG. and Giller, P.S. . 1994. Patchiness, species interactions and disturbance in stream benthos. In: *Aquatic Ecology: Scale, Pattern and Process*. (Eds. P.S. Giller and AG Hildrew) pp. 21-62. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Houghton, DC., and Wasson, JL. 2013. Abrupt biological discontinuity in a small Michigan (USA) stream due to historical canopy loss. *Journal of Freshwater Biology*. 28(3): 293-306.
- Hughes, JM., Mather, P. , Sheldon, AL , and Allendorf, FW. 1999. Genetic structure of the stonefly, *Yoraperla brevis*, populations: the extent of gene flow among adjacent montane streams. *Freshwater Biology*. 41: 63-72
- Huntsman, BO. Baumann, RW. , and Kondratieff, BC.. 1999. Stoneflies (Plecoptera) of the Black Hills of South Dakota and Wyoming, USA: Distribution and zoogeographic affinities. *The Great Basin Naturalist*. 59: 1-17.
- Hugueny, B. 1997. The relationship between local and regional species richness: Comparing biotas with different evolutionary histories. *Oikos*. 80:583-587.
- Huryn, AD., and Wallace, JB. 2000. Life history and production of stream insects. *Annual Review of Entomology*. 45: 83-110.
- Hynes, HBH. 1988. Biogeography and origins of the North American stoneflies (Plecoptera). *Memoirs of the Entomological Society of Canada* 114: 31-37.
- Hynes, HBH. 1970. *The Ecology of Running Waters*. University of Liverpool Press, Liverpool, UK.
- Ivanov, K., and Keiper, J., 2010. Ant (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) diversity and community composition along sharp urban forest edge. *Biodiversity Conservation*. 19: 3917-3933.
- Kauwe, JSK, Shiozawa, DK., and Evans, RP. 2004. Phylogeographic and nested clade analysis of the stonefly *Pteronarcys californica* (Plecoptera: Pteronarcyidae) in the western USA. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*. 23: 824-838.
- Kerans, BL. and Karr, JR. 1994. A benthic index of biological integrity (B-IBI) for rivers of the Tennessee Valley. *Ecological Applications* 4: 768-785.
- King, RS., Baker, ME., Whigham, DF. , Weller, DE. , Jordan, TE. , Kazyak, PF. , and Hurd, MK. 2005. Spatial considerations for linking watershed land cover to ecological indicators in streams. *Ecological Applications*. 15: 137-153.

- Koop, JHE., Schaffer, M., Ortmann, C., and Winkelmann, C. 2008. Towards environmental assessment of river ecosystems by analyzing energy reserves of aquatic invertebrates. *Limnological* 38: 378-387.
- Kruse, NA., Derose, L., Korenowsky, R., Bowman, JR., Lopez, D., Johnson, K., Rankin, E. 2013. The role of remediation, natural alkalinity sources and physical stream parameters in stream recovery. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 128: 1000-1011.
- Lancaster, J., and Belyea, LR . 1997. Nested hierarchies and scale-dependence of mechanisms of flow refugium use. *Journal of North American Benthological Society*. 16: 221-238.
- Louhi, P., Mykra, H., Paavola, R., Huusko, A., Vehanen, T., Maki-Petays, A., and Muotka, T. 2011. Twenty years of stream rotation in Finland: little response by benthic communities. *Ecological Application*. 21: 1950-1961
- Lowrance, R., Williams, RG. , Inamdar, SP , Bosch, D. , and Sheridan, JM.. 2001. Evaluation of coastal plain conservation buffers using the riparian ecosystem management model. *Journal of American Water Resources Association* 37: 1445-1455.
- Lenat DR., and Crawford, JK. . 1994. Effects of land use on water quality and aquatic biota of three North Carolina Piedmont streams. *Hydrobiologia*. 79: 185-199.
- Letterman, RD. and Mitsch, WJ. 1978. Impact of mine drainage on a mountain stream in Pennsylvania.: *Environmental Pollution*. 17: 53-72.
- Malmqvist, B. 2000. How does wing length relate to distribution patterns of stoneflies (Plecoptera) and mayflies (Ephemeroptera)? *Biological Conservation*. 93. 271-276.
- Malmqvist B. 2002. Aquatic invertebrates in riverine landscapes. *Freshwater Biology*. 47: 679-694.
- Maloney, KO., Feminella, JW., Mitchel, RM., Miller, SA., Mulholland, PJ., and Houser, JN. 2008. Land use legacies and small streams: identifying relationships between historical land use and contemporary streams conditions. 27: 280-294.
- Maloney, KO. and Weller, DE. 2011. Anthropogenic disturbance and streams: land use and land-use change affect stream ecosystems via multiple pathways. *Freshwater Biology*. 56: 611-626.
- Maloney, KO., Weller, DE., Russel, MJ., and Hothorn, T. 2009. Classifying the biological condition of small streams: an example using benthic macroinvertebrates. *Journal of North America Benthological Society*. 28: 869-884.

- Marden, JH., O'Donnell, BC., Thomas, MA. and Bye JY. 2000. Surface-skimming stoneflies and mayflies: The taxonomic and mechanical diversity of two-dimensional aerodynamic locomotion. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*. 73. 751-764.
- McCafferty, WP. 1998. *Aquatic Entomology: The Fishermen's and Ecologists' Illustrated Guide to Insects and Their Relatives*. Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Sunbury, MA.
- McCord, SB., Guha, GS., and Gippo, RS. . 2007. Effects of subsample size on seasonal and spatial comparisons of stream macroinvertebrate communities. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 135: 409-422.
- McCulloch, GA., Wallis, GP., and Waters, JM. 2009. Do insects lose flight before they lose their wings? Population genetic structure in subalpine stoneflies. *Molecular Ecology*. 18. 4073-4087.
- McNeale, KH., Peckarsky, BL., and Likens, GE. 2005. Stable isotopes identify dispersal patterns of stonefly populations living along stream corridors. *Freshwater Biology*. 50. 1117-1130.
- Megan, MS., MS. Nash, AC. Neale, and AM. Pitchford 2007. Biological integrity in Mid-Atlantic coastal plains headwater streams. *Ecological Monitoring and Assessment*. 124: 141-156.
- Merritt, RW. and Cummins, KW.. Eds. 1996. *An Introduction to the Aquatic Insects of North America 3rd Edition*. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company; Dubuque, IA.
- Moglen, GE. 2000. Urbanization, stream buffers, and stewardship in Maryland. *Watershed Protection Techniques*. 3: 676-680.
- Moore, AA. and Palmer, MA. . 2005. Invertebrate biodiversity in agricultural and urban headwater streams: implications for conservation and management. *Ecological Applications*. 15: 1169-1177
- Moritz, C., Dowlington , TE., and Brown, WM. . 1987. Evolution of animal mitochondrial DNA: relevance for population biology and systematic. *Annual Review of Ecological Systems* 18: 269-292.
- Muller, K. 1974. Stream drift as a chronobiological phenomenon in running water ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. 5: 309-323.
- Murdoch M H., and Herber, PDN. . 1997. Mitochondrial DNA evidence of distinct glacial refugia for brown bullhead (*Ameriurus nebulosus*) in the Great Lakes. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 54: 1450-1460.

- Murphy, JF., and Giller, PS. . 2000. Seasonal dynamics of macroinvertebrate assemblages in the benthos and associated with detritus packs in tow low-order streams with different riparian vegetation. *Freshwater Biology*. 43: 617-631.
- Nakamura, F. and Yamada, H. . 2005. Effects of pasture development on the ecological functions of riparian forests in Hokkaido in northern Japan. *Ecological Engineering*. 24: 539-550.
- Nebeker, AV., and Gaufin, AR.. 1967 Factors affecting wing length and emergence in the winter stonefly *Capnia nana*. *Entomological News*. 85-92.
- Norris, RH., S. Linke, I. Prosser, WJ. Young, P. Liston, N. Bauer, N. Sloane, F. Dyer, and M. Thoms. 2007. Very-broad-scale assessment of human impacts on river conditions. *Freshwater Biology*. 52: 959-976.
- Ohio Environmental Protection Agency: Division of Surface Water 2000. *Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Middle Cuyahoga River Final Report* <http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/tmdl/MidCuyFinalTMDL.pd> Accessed on 6 June 2009.
- Petersen RC. and Cummins, KW. . 1974. Leaf processing in a woodland stream. *Freshwater Biology*. 4: 343-368.
- Pfrender, ME., Hawkins, CP., Bagley, M., Courtney, GW., Creutzburg, BR., Epler, JH., Fend, S., Ferrington, Jr., LC., Hartzell, PL., Jackson, S., Larsen, DP., Levesque, CA., Morse, JC., Petersen, MJ., Ruiter, D. 2010. Assessing macroinvertebrate biodiversity in freshwater ecosystems: Advances and challenges in DNA-based approaches. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*.85: 319-340.
- Pond, GJ. 2012. Biodiversity loss in Appalachian headwater streams (Kentucky, USA): Plecopteran and Tricopteran communities. *Hydrobiologia*. 697: 97-117.
- Probst, M., Berenzen, N., Lentzen-Godding, A., Schultz, R., and Liess, M. . 2005. Linking land use variables and invertebrate taxon richness in small and medium-sized agricultural streams on a landscape level. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*. 60: 140-146.
- Quinn, JM., Cooper, AB., Davies-Colley, RJ., Rutherford, JC., and Williamson, RB.. 1997. Land use effects on habitat, water quality, periphyton, benthic invertebrates in Waikato, New Zealand hill country streams. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*. 31: 387-409.

- Quinn, JM, Steele, GL. Hickey, CW. , and Vickers, ML. . 1994. Upper thermal tolerance of twelve common New Zealand stream invertebrate species. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*. 28: 391-397
- Rawer-Jost, C., Bohmer, J. , Blank, J. , and Rahmann, H. . 2000. Macroinvertebrate functional feeding group methods in ecological assessment. *Hydrobiologia*. 422/423: 225-232.
- Resh, VH., and Jackson, JK. . 1993. Rapid assessment approach to biomonitoring using benthic macroinvertebrates. pp. 195-233. In: DM Rosenberg and VH Resh (eds.) *Freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates*. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY.
- Ricklefs, RE., Latham, RE., and Qian, H.. 1999. Global patterns of tree species richness in moist forests: Distinguishing ecological influences and historical contingency. *Oikos*. 86: 369-373.
- Richards, C., Johnson, LB. , and Host, GE. . 1996. Landscape-scale influences on stream habitats and biota. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* (suppl 1): 295-311.
- Rosenberg DM., and VH Resh. 1993 Introduction to freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates. pp 1-9. In: DM Rosenberg and VH Resh (eds.) *Freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates*. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY.
- Robinson, CT. Tockner, K. , and BurgherrP. . 2002. Seasonal patterns in macroinvertebrate drift and seston transport in streams of alpine glacial flood plain. *Freshwater Biology*. 47: 985-993.
- Romito, A.M., Eggert, S.L., Diez, J.M., and Wallace, J.B. 2010. Effects of seasonality and resource limitation on organic matter turnover by Chironomidae (Dipteran) in southern Appalachian headwater streams. *Limnological and Oceanography*: 55 1083-1902.
- Roth, NE., Allan, J.D. , and Erickson, DL. . 1996. Landscape influences on stream biotic integrity assessed at multiple spatial scales. *Landscape Ecology*. 11: 141-156.
- Ross, HH., and Ricker, WE. . 1971. The classification, evolution, and dispersal of the winter stonefly *Allocapnia*. *Illinois Biological Monogram* 45: 1-166.
- Ruhl, PM. 1995. Surface water quality assessment of the upper Illinois River basin in Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin; analysis of relations between fish community structure and environmental conditions in the Fox, Des Plaines, and Du Page River basins in Illinois, 1982-84. *United States Geological Survey, Water Resources Investigations Report*. 94-4094.

- Ruse, LP. 2000. Multivariate techniques relating macroinvertebrates and environmental data from a river catchment. *Water Resources*. 30: 3017-3024.
- Schlosser, IJ. 1991. Stream fish ecology: a landscape perspective. *BioScience*. 41: 704-712.
- Schmidt, SK., Hughes, JM. , and Bunn, SE. . 1995. Gene flow among conspecific populations of *Baetis sp.* (Ephemeroptera): adult flight and larval drift. *Journal of North America Benthological Society*. 14: 147-157.
- Schultheis A. S., Hedricks, AC. , and Weigt, LA. . 2002. Gene flow, dispersal, and nested clade analysis among populations of the stonefly *Peltoperla tarteri* in the southern Appalachians. *Molecular Ecology* 11: 317-327
- Scrimgeour, G., Jones, N., and Tonn, WM. 2013. Benthic macroinvertebrates response to habitat restoration in a constructed Arctic stream. *River Restoration Application*: 68(8): 2399-2407.
- Simon, C. 1991 Molecular systematic at the species boundary: exploiting conserved and variable regions of mitochondrial genome of animals via direct sequencing from amplified DNA. In *NATO ASI Series vol. 57 Molecular Techniques in Taxonomy*. (Hewitt, G.M., Johnston, A.W., and Young, J.P. W. eds.) pp. 33-71. Springer-Verlag New York, NY.
- Smith VH., Tilman, GD. , and Nekola, JC. . 1999. Eutrophication: impacts of excess nutrient inputs on freshwater, marine, and terrestrial ecosystems. *Environmental Pollution*. 100: 179-196.
- Southwood, TRE. 1977. Habitat, the template for ecological Strategies. Presidential address to the British Ecological Society. *Journal of Animal Ecology*. 46: 337-365.
- Stanley, EH., Fisher, SG. , and Grimm, NB. . 1997. Ecosystem expansion and contraction: a desert stream perspective. *BioScience*. 47: 427-436.
- Statzner, B. and Beche, LA. 2010. Can biological invertebrate traits resolve effects of multiple stressors on running water ecosystems? *Freshwater Biology*. 55(Supplement 1) 80-119.
- Stone, MK. and JB. Wallace. 1998. Long-term recovery of mountain streams from clear-cut logging: the effects of forest succession on benthic macroinvertebrate community structure. *Freshwater Biology*. 39: 151-169.
- Swetnam, TW. Allen, CD. , and Betancourt, JL. 1999. Applied historical ecology: Using the past to manage the future. *Ecological Applications*. 9: 1189-1206.

- Tockner, K. and Waringer, JA. . 1997. Measuring drift during a receding flood: results from an Austrian mountain brook. *International Revue Gesamten Hydrobiologie*. 82: 1-13.
- Tonn, WM. 1990. Climate change and fish communities: A conceptual framework. *Transactions of the American Fish Society*. 119: 337-352.
- Townshed, CR., Arbuckle, CJ., Crowl, TA , and Scarsbrook, MR. 1997a. The relationship between land use and physicochemistry, food resources, and macroinvertebrate communities in tributaries of the Taieri River, New Zealand: a hierarchically scaled approach. *Freshwater Biology* 37: 177-191.
- Townshed CR., and Hildrew, AG. 1994. Species traits in relation to a habitat template for river systems. *Freshwater Biology*. 31: 265-275.
- Utz, RM., Hildebrand, RH., Boward, DM. 2009. Identifying regional differences in threshold responses of aquatic invertebrates to land cover. *Ecological Indicators*.9(3): 556-567.
- Van Sickle, J. 2003. Analyzing correlations between stream and watershed attributes. *Journal of American Water Resources Associations*. 39: 717-726.
- Vannote, RL. Minshall, GW., Cummins, KW. , Sedell, JR. , and Cushing, CE. . 1980. The river continuum concept. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 37: 130-137.
- Vannote, RL., and Sweeney, BW.. 1980. Geographical analysis of thermal equilibria: a conceptual model for evaluating the effects of natural and modified thermal regimes on aquatic insect communities. *American Naturalist*. 115: 667-695.
- Vitousek, PM. 1994. Beyond global warming: Ecology and global change. *Ecology*. 75: 1861-1876.
- Vondracek, B., Blann, KL, Cox, CB. , Nerbonne, JF. , Mumford, KG. , and Nerbonne, BA. . 2005. Land use, spatial scale, and stream systems: lessons from an agricultural region. *Environmental Management*. 36: 775-791.
- Voshell Jr, JR. 2005. *A Guide to Common Freshwater Invertebrates of North America*. The McDonald and Woodward Publishing Company, Blacksburg, VA.
- Wallace, BJ. and Webster, JR.. 1996. The role of macroinvertebrates in stream ecosystem function. *Annual Review of Entomology*. 41: 115-139.
- Wang, L., Lyons, J. , Kanehl, P. , and Gatti, R. . 1997. Influences of watershed land use on habitat quality and biotic integrity in Wisconsin streams. *Fisheries*. 22: 6-12.

- Wang, L. Lyons, J., and Kanehl, P.. 2002. Effects of watershed best management practices on habitat and fish in Wisconsin streams. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 38: 663-680.
- Ward, JV. 1992. *Aquatic Insect Ecology*. John Wiley and Sons Inc. New York, NY.
- Ward, JV. and Tockner, K. 2001. Biodiversity: towards a unified theme for river ecology. *Freshwater Biology*. 46: 807-819.
- Williams, LR., Taylor, CM., Warren, Jr., ML. , and Clingenpeel, A. 2003. Environmental variability, historical contingency, and the structure of regional fish and macroinvertebrate faunas in Ouachita Mountain stream systems. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*. 67: 203-216.
- Winterbourne, MJ. 2005. Dispersal, feeding, and parasitism of adult stoneflies (Plecoptera) at a New Zealand forest stream. *Aquatic Insects*. 27. 155-166.
- Winterbourne MJ. and Crowe, ALM. 2001. Flight activity of insects along a mountain stream: is directional flight adaptive? *Freshwater Biology*. 46. 1479-1489.
- Yasick, AL., Krebs RA., and Wolin, JA. . 2007. The effect of dispersal ability in winter and summer stoneflies on their genetic differentiation. *Ecological Entomology*. 32: 399-404.
- Zhang, Y., Wang, B., Han, M., and Wang, L., 2012. Relationships between the seasonal variations of macroinvertebrates, and land uses for biomonitoring in the Xitiaoxi River Watershed, China. *International Review of Hydrobiology*. 97(3): 184-199

CHAPTER II
THE EFFECTS OF DISPERSAL ABILITY IN WINTER AND SUMMER
STONEFLIES ON THEIR GENETIC DIFFERENTIATION

Published 2007 *Ecological Entomology*

2.1 ABSTRACT

1. Plecopteran species disperse less than most other aquatic insects. Within stoneflies, members of different families vary in the degree of wing morphology and season of adult emergence.

2. The dispersal limitations were tested to determine if there were increased differences among nearby populations by comparing genetic variation within the 16s rRNA region of mitochondrial DNA in two stoneflies: *Allopnia recta*, which emerges in winter and often has rudimentary wings, and *Leuctra tenuis*, which emerges in summer with fully developed wings.

3. There was significant genetic variability between the samples of *A. recta* from two adjacent rivers ($F_{st} = 0.20$), but not between samples of *L. tenuis* ($F_{st} = 0.07$).

4. Distinct clades in *A. recta* were found to occur within the minimum spanning tree specific to the Chagrin River, contributing to a significant difference in gene diversity between the two rivers. Haplotypes in *L. tenuis* appeared randomly distributed between the two rivers; however, nucleotide diversity was significantly less in samples from the Grand River.

5. Further investigation is required to determine if these species migrated into both watersheds and populations have since diverged by genetic drift, or whether their poor dispersal potential led to different genetic lineages entering each stream.

Key Words: dispersal, genetic drift, 16s rRNA region, *Allocaonia recta*, *Leuctra tenuis* haplotype diversity, stoneflies

2.2 Introduction

Dispersal ability of organisms is a key ecological factor that influences the structure of a population (Miller *et al.* 2002). In freshwater communities, genetic divergence may arise because a stream system flows through several habitats, each habitat acting effectively as a biogeographic barrier from either a location within the stream or other near-by watersheds (Monaghan *et al.*, 2002; Monaghan *et al.*, 2005). Isolation by physical barriers in combination with genetic drift, or differing pressures of natural selection within each habitat has the potential of increasing genetic divergence between streams (Monaghan *et al.* 2002).

Most flying aquatic insects can navigate between adjacent rivers (Petersen *et al.*, 2004). However there are some species that possess wings, but have limited flight. Sanderson *et al.* (2005) noted that the composition of the community from neighboring streams were generally similar, with some differences observed in weak dispersers such as Ephemeroptera. Smith *et al.* (2006) similarly reported population divergence in mayflies across catchments, although differences between adjacent streams were less.

However, stoneflies (Order: Plecoptera) are weak fliers (Nebeker & Gaufin, 1967) even compared to mayflies and therefore their movement among river systems is more likely to be inhibited by habitat fragmentation than that of stronger flying insects. Schultheis *et al.* (2002) identified greater movement of *Peltoperla tarteri* (Stark & Kondratieff 1987) within streams as opposed to among streams in the Southern Appalachians. In western Montana, Hughes *et al.* (1999) similarly identified population variation in *Yoraperla brevis* (Ricker). High gene flow within streams is possible because larvae can disperse downstream, but long distance dispersal between streams

requires adult flight (DePietro *et al.*, 1997; Hughes *et al.*, 1999). Therefore, understanding a stream's ecosystem requires not only the assessment of diversity on a community level, but also knowledge of population structure and morphology as they relate to the landscape (Bohonak & Jenkins, 2003).

To test the structure, genetic divergence was examined in *Allocaonia recta* (Claassen) and *Leuctra tenuis* (Pictet), two Plecopteran species that vary in wing morphology and emergence period (Gaston 1994 and Malmqvist 2000). *Allocaonia recta* emerge during the, coldest time of year between November and March. Although some males and females of *A. recta* have wings the full length of their body, they are commonly collected as apterous or with rudimentary wing structure (Frison, 1942; Nebeker & Gaufin, 1967; Stark *et al.*, 1998). *Leuctra tenuis* emerge between July and September, when the weather is warmer and adults in the family Leuctridae are relatively strong fliers at these temperatures than other stonefly species. When ambient air temperatures are cooler than 13°C, *Leuctra* species have been observed to move upstream skimming across the water surface with their hind-legs (Marden *et al.*, 2000). Although *L. tenuis* is a poor flying insect in comparison to other insects, it is predicted to have a greater dispersal potential than *A. recta* for movement among watersheds (Briers *et al.*, 2004).

2.3 Materials and Methods

Adult specimens of *Allocaonia recta* (Family Capniidae) and *Leuctra tenuis* (Family Leuctridae) were collected along the Chagrin and Grand Rivers, two adjacent tributaries of Lake Erie on Ohio's north coast (Figure II.1). Collections were made between 2003 and 2005. *Allocaonia recta* was obtained from November to February and *L. tenuis* from

June to August. Specimens were collected within 15 m of the stream. Specimens of *Allocapnia recta* were collected as the insects were observed crawling on the snow. A beating sheet was used to collect *L. tenuis* from low hanging tree limbs or from ground vegetation.

Each individual specimen was placed in a 1.5 ml microcentrifuge tube containing 95% ethanol. If a male and female were captured in copula, the mating pair was placed in the same tube. In the laboratory, the old ethanol was replaced with fresh 95% ethanol for optimal preservation of the insect.

Collected specimens were identified to species based on the structure of the male genitalia (Ross & Rickter, 1974). The lower abdomen was removed from the male specimens and stored for species documentation. The only females used in this study were those found associated with a male in the field.

Each stonefly, less the lower abdomen, was soaked in distilled water for ten minutes to remove ethanol. DNA was isolated using the QIAGEN DNeasy® Tissue kit and applying the *rodent tail tissue protocol* (following methods from Schultheis *et al.*, 2002). An elution of 100µl was used to increase DNA concentration.

The 16s rRNA gene, which codes for the large mitochondrial ribosomal subunit, was used to assess levels of genetic differentiation at the population level. Universal animal primers of the 16s rRNA gene amplified an approximate 500 base pair-long region of the mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA). The forward primer (16sB) was 5'- CCG GTT TGA ACT CAG ATC ATG T -3' and the reverse (16sA) was 5' - CGC CTG TTT AAC AAA AAC AT -3' (Palumbi, 1997; optimized for insect use). In the stonefly specimens, the universal primers produced a faint 100-200bp secondary product that

interfered with sequencing quality. Therefore, internal primers were developed specifically for each species to improve sequencing. For *A. recta* the forward primer was (SF_arF) 5'- TCG AAC AGA CCT AAA CTT TG -3' and the reverse was (SF_arR) 5'- AAT AAT TTA AAG TCT GAC CTG C -3'. For *L. tenuis* the forward primer read as (SF_ltF) 5'- GAA CAT CTA CAC CCA AAA TYA C -3' and the reverse as (SF_ltR) 5'- TCT GAC CTG CCC GCT GAT TA -3'.

Each polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for both stonefly species was set up in 50µl as follows: 16µl of deionized water; 5µl of each primer (2.5µM); 5µl of dNTP's; 10µl of MgCl₂ (2.5µM); 0.2µl of FisherBiotech *Taq* DNA polymerase (concentration of 5U/µl with 5µl of 10X Assay Buffer A), and 2µl of template DNA. PCR reactions were cycled 40 times in a Perkins Elmer GeneAmp PCR system 2400. The PCR conditions were set with an initial denaturation phase of 5 minutes at 94°C and all subsequent denaturation for 30 seconds. The annealing phase was 30 seconds at 49°C, and extension was at 72°C for 30 seconds. After all cycles were completed a final extension for 7 minutes at 72°C was performed.

The amplified DNA region was sequenced at Cleveland State University's DNA sequencing facility on a Beckman CEQ-8000 capillary autosequencer. All sequences were run in both the forward and reverse directions. Mitochondrial DNA sequences were aligned and read using the Sequencher software package (Sequencher v. 4.0, Gene Codes Corp.) and conservatively screened by eye to eliminate any ambiguous scoring. Therefore, it was not likely to miss one variation present or to score a new haplotype. Analysis of variation among haplotypes was performed with Arlequin v.3.01 (Excoffier

et al., 2005), and the minimum spanning trees were produced by Network v. 4.1.1.2 (Fluxus Technology Limited).

2.4 Results

Tables I and II illustrate the diversity of haplotypes in both species for which gene and nucleotide diversity levels were similar. Distinct polymorphisms were common within the 16s rRNA region in both *Allocapnia recta* and *Leuctra tenuis* (DQ915179-DQ915181). Between the Chagrin and Grand Rivers, the internal primers enabled accurate sequencing of a 492 base pair region of the mtDNA in 36 *A. recta* specimens and of 459 bases from 30 individuals of *L. tenuis*. A Blast search (Altschul et al., 1997) in GenBank using the most frequent haplotypes of both *A. recta* and *L. tenuis* best matched *Pteronarcys princeps*, the ebony salmonfly (accession number AY687866), which is a stonefly of the western US followed by insects from other related orders.

2.4.1 *Allocapnia recta*

Wright's F_{ST} scores for *A. recta* indicated that separation of samples between the two watersheds can explain 20% of the variation in haplotype diversity (Table I, $F_{ST} = 0.20$; p -value >0.0). This difference between samples from the Chagrin and Grand Rivers was significant. Over half of the specimens possessed one of two haplotypes (Table I). The most common haplotype (H01) occurred frequently in both watersheds, but haplotype H02 was collected only once in the Chagrin River. Conversely haplotype H03 ($n = 5$) was only observed in the Chagrin River. All other haplotypes were found once in one of the rivers. Overall gene and nucleotide diversities across the two watersheds were 0.83 and 0.67 respectively. Both gene and nucleotide diversities were consistently greater in the Chagrin River than in the Grand River (Table I). This pattern is apparent in

the minimum spanning tree where Chagrin River samples derived from one large and divided clade (Figure II.2).

2.4.2 *Leuctra tenuis*

In contrast to the results observed in *A. recta*, the FST score for samples of *L. tenuis* was just 0.065 (p-value = 0.14), a result not significantly different from zero (Table II). The two most prevalent haplotypes were identified in samples from both watersheds, indicated that haplotypes in *L. tenuis* were randomly distributed between the rivers. Therefore, gene diversity varied little and no distinct clades occurred within the minimum spanning tree specific to either watershed (Figure II.3).

The measure of nucleotide diversity in *L. tenuis* from each river, however, gave an unexpected result. Individuals of *L. tenuis* from the Chagrin River showed a significantly higher level of nucleotide diversity (0.95) than did specimens from the Grand River (0.38) (Table II).

2.5 Discussion

The winter stonefly varied genetically between the neighboring Chagrin and Grand Rivers in north-east Ohio, whereas the summer stonefly did not. Therefore the time of emergence or the reduced wing structure of *A. recta* a much weaker flier (Marden *et al.*, 2000), likely contributes to the limited ability of this species to disperse between the watersheds. The ability of some stoneflies to disperse long distances is likely a function of wind speed. *Allocapnia* species have been observed to sail on the surface of the water using wind power to propel themselves from one location to another. As the adults emerge on mid-stream rocks or ice, they stand on top of the water surface tension, and raise their wings in response to gusts of wind, thus sailing to the shore (Marden &

Kramer 1995). Some members of the genus *Allocapnia* may also glide down from trees and other riparian vegetation during strong winds. Marden and Kramer (1995) determined that an insect with rudimentary wing structures such as *A. recta*, sailing across the water surface is more effective than gliding. Furthermore, temperature has an effect on the dispersal of winter stoneflies. Adult *Allocapnia* species were in higher abundance on sunny days when temperatures exceeded 5 °C, with limited wind; during the harsher and colder days of winter, fewer adults were observed crawling along the snow (pers. obs.). Most sought cover under piles of dead vegetation, woody debris, or snow packs on days of extreme cold temperatures.

Leuctra tenuis can disperse farther than *A. recta*. When summer air temperatures are less than 13 °C, *Leuctra* stoneflies can use a hind-leg skimming mechanism to raise the body, and reduce drag on the water surface (Kramer & Marden, 1997). On warmer days, *L. tenuis* flew over the stream searching for mates (pers. obs.). In addition to the mechanism of flight and temperature, the sample sites within the Chagrin and Grand Rivers are deeply incised channels, making transportation between streams difficult for even the stronger flying stoneflies.

Regardless of flight proficiency, few individuals will migrate across watersheds because adult gravid females remain near their natal streams to deposit their eggs after mating, while males will either search for other females for mating or die. This tendency not to disperse may restrict gene flow. While neonates, after hatching, may immediately start to swim downstream in search of food and to avoid predators (Kuusela & Huusko, 1996), their movement is limited due to their size and they need not cross between rivers (Hughes *et al.* , 1999; Schultheis *et al.* , 2002).

One caveat of the results is the possibility that cryptic species were encountered that vary in mtDNA sequences rather than variation within each species. In *A. recta*, three haplotype clades occurred in the samples from the Chagrin River, but only two in the Grand River, and in *L. tenuis*, Grand River samples predominantly possessed haplotypes basal within the observed clade. If a cryptic sibling species was present in the Chagrin River that was responsible for the apparent population structure, conclusions about dispersal would be unchanged; variation in *Allocapnia* instead would suggest structure at a community rather than a population level.

As a final note, in salamanders, fish and arthropods, populations in previously glaciated regions tend to have less genetic variation than their populations of origin (Tilley, 1997; Bernatchez & Wilson, 1998; Reiss *et al.* 1999), a pattern consistent with the lower genetic variation found in the Grand River than in the Chagrin River samples.

Table I. Haplotype frequencies for *Allocapnia recta* as they relate to location. Single haplotypes were pooled. Gene diversity was estimated using Nei (1987), and nucleotide diversity was calculated using Arlequin v.3.01 (Excoffier *et al.*, 2005). ((H01, 02, etc. refers to haplotype number, h (gene diversity), and π (haplotype diversity) SE (standard error))

Site	H01	H02	H03	H04	H05	Pooled Single Haplotypes (H06-H12)	Totals	h	SE	π x100	SE x 100
Chagrin River	7	1	5	2	0	5	20	0.85	0.01	0.68	0.09
Grand River	5	7	0	0	2	2	16	0.73	0.02	0.52	0.08
Totals	12	8	5	2	2	6	36	0.83	0.01	0.67	0.07
Haplotype Frequencies	0.33	0.22	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.03/each					

Table II Haplotype frequencies for *Leuctra tenuis* as they relate to location. Single haplotypes were pooled. Gene diversity was estimated using Nei (1987), and nucleotide diversity was calculated using Arlequin v.3.01 (Excoffier *et al.*, 2005). ((H01, 02, etc. refers to haplotype number, h (gene diversity), and π (haplotype diversity), SE (standard error))

Site	H01	H02	H03	Pooled Single Haplotypes (H04-H10)	Totals	h	SE	$\pi \times 100$	SE $\times 100$
Chagrin River	6	5	0	4	15	0.76	0.02	0.95	0.14
Grand River	7	1	4	3	15	0.74	0.02	0.38	0.07
Totals	13	6	4	7	30	0.77	0.01	0.64	0.07
Haplotype Frequencies	0.43	0.20	0.13	0.03/each					

Figure II.1. Map of study area in Cuyahoga, Lake, and Geauga counties, Ohio, USA. Circles represent sampling locations.




Figure II.2 Haplotypes of *Allocapnia recta* in the Chagrin and Grand Rivers. Circle diameter represents the sample size of each haplotype and levels of shading denote the frequency either in the Chagrin River (black) or Grand River (gray). Numbers indicate the base position changed in the sequence.





Figure II.3 Haplotypes of *Leuctra tenuis* in the Chagrin and Grand Rivers. Circle diameter represents the sample size of each haplotype and levels of shading denote the frequency either in the Chagrin River (black) or Grand River (gray). Numbers indicate the base position changed in the sequence.



REFERENCES

- Altschul, S. F., Madden, T. L., Schäffer, A. A., Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., Miller, W., and Lipman, D. J. (1997) Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **25**, 3389-3402.
- Bernatchez, L., and Wilson, C.C. (1998) Comparative phylogeography of Nearctic and Palearctic fishes. *Molecular Ecology.* **7**, 431-452.
- Bohonak, A.J., Jenkins, D.G. (2003) Ecological and evolutionary significance of dispersal by freshwater invertebrates. *Ecological Letters* **6**, 783-796.
- Briers, R.A., Gee, J.H.R., Cariss, H.M., and Geoghegan, R. (2004) Inter-population dispersal by adult stoneflies detected by stable isotope enrichment. *Freshwater Biology.* **49**, 425-431.
- DePietro, R., Lombardo, B.M., and Viglianisi, F. (1997) Genetic diversity in some species of *Hydropsyche* (Tricoptera, Hydropsychidae) in central and southern Italy. *Italian Zoology.* **64**, 31-39.
- Excoffier, L. G. Laval, G. and Schneider, S. (2005) Arlequin version 3.0: An integrated software package for population genetics data analysis. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics Online* **1**, 47-50.
- Ford, J.P. (1987) *Glacial and surficial geology of Cuyahoga County, Ohio*. State of Ohio, Department of Natural Resources Division of Geological Survey. Report number 134. 29 pp.
- Frison, T.H. (1942) Studies of North American Plecoptera: with special references to the fauna of Illinois. *Illinois Bulletin* **22**, 235-355.
- Gaston, K.J. (1994) *Rarity*. Chapman and Hall, London. 220pp
- Hughes, J.M., Mather, P., Sheldon, A.L., and Allendorf, F.W. (1999) Genetic structure of the stonefly, *Yoraperla brevis*, populations: the extent of gene flow among adjacent montane streams. *Freshwater Biology.* **41**, 63-72
- Kramer, M.G. and Marden, J.H. (1997) Almost airborne. *Nature* **385**, 403-404.
- Kuusela, K. and Huusko, A. (1996) Post-emergence migration of stoneflies (Plecoptera) into the nearby forest. *Ecological Entomology* **21**, 171-177.
- Malmqvist, B. (2000) How does wing length relate to distribution patterns of stoneflies (Plecoptera) and mayflies (Ephemeroptera)? *Biological Conservation.* **93**, 271-276.
- Marden, J.H. and Kramer, M. G. (1995). Locomotor performance of insects with rudimentary wings. *Nature.* **377**, 332-334.

- Marden, J.H., O'Donnell, B.C., Thomas, M.A., and Bye, J.Y. (2000) Surface skimming stoneflies and Mayflies: The taxonomic and mechanical diversity of two-dimensional aerodynamic locomotion. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*. **73**, 751-764.
- Miller, M.P., Blinn, D.W., and Keim, P. (2002) Correlations between observed dispersal capabilities and patterns of genetic differentiation in populations of four aquatic insect species from the Arizona White Mountains, U.S.A. *Freshwater Biology*. **47**: 1660-1673.
- Monaghan, M.T., Spakk, P., Robinson, C.T., and Ward, J.V. (2002) Population genetic structure of three alpine stream insects influences of gene flow, demographics, and habitat fragmentation. *Journal of North American Benthological Society*. **21**, 114-131.
- Monaghan M.T., Robinson, C.T., Saak, P., and Ward, J.V. (2005) Macroinvertebrate diversity in fragmented Alpine streams: implications for freshwater conservation. *Aquatic Sciences*. **67**,454-464.
- Nebeker, A. V. and Gaufin, A. R. (1967) Factors affecting wing length and emergence in the winter stonefly *Capnia nana*. *Entomological News* **4**, 85-92
- Nei, M. (1972) Genetic distance between populations. *The American Naturalist*. **106**, 283-292.
- Palumbi, S. R. (1997) Nucleic acids II: the polymerase chain reaction. pp.205-247 In: *Molecular Systematics*, 2nd Ed. (eds. Hillis, D. M., Moritz, C. and Mable, B. K.), Sinauer Assoc. Sunderland, MA.
- Petersen, I., Masters, Z., Hildrew, A.G., and Ormerod, S.J. (2004) Dispersal of adult aquatic insects in catchments of differing land use. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. **41**, 934-950.
- Reiss, R.A., Ashworth, A.C., and Schwert, D.S. (1999) Molecular genetic evidence of post-Pleistocene divergence of populations of the arctic-alpine ground beetle *Amara alpine* (Paukull) (Coleoptera: Carabidae). *Journal of Biogeography*. **26**, 785-794.
- Ross, H.H., and Ricker, W.E. (1971) *The Classification, Evolution, and Dispersal of the Winter Stonefly Genus Allocapnia* Illinois Biological Monographs. University of Illinois Press, Chicago, IL 167pp.
- Sanderson, R.A., Eyre, M.D., and Rushton, S.P. (2005) The influence of stream invertebrate composition at neighboring sites on local assemblage composition. *Freshwater Biology* **50**, 221-231.

- Schultheis A. S., Hedricks, A. C. and Weigt, L.A. (2002) Gene flow, dispersal, and nested clade analysis among populations of the stonefly *Peltoperla tarteri* in the southern Appalachians. *Molecular Ecology* **11**, 317-327.
- Slatkin, M. (1985) Gene flow in natural populations. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematic*. **16**, 393-430.
- Smith, P.J., McVeagh, S.M., and Collier, K.J. (2006) Genetic diversity and historical population structure in the New Zealand mayfly *Acanthophlebia cruentata*. *Freshwater Biology* **51**, 12-24.
- Stark, B. P, Szczytko, S.W. and Nelson, C. R. (1998) *American Stoneflies: A Photographic Guide to Plecopterans*. The Caddis Press, Columbus, Ohio 126 pp.
- Tilley, S.G. (1997) Patterns of genetic differentiation in Appalachian desmognathine salamanders. *Journal of Heredity* **88**, 305-315.
- White, G.W. (1982) *Glacial geology of Northeastern Ohio* State of Ohio, Department of Natural Resources Division of Geological Survey. Bulletin 68. 75pp.
- White, G.W. and Totten, S.M. (1979) *Glacial geology of Ashtabula County*, State of Ohio, Department of Natural Resources Division of Geological Survey. Report number 112. 48 pp.

CHAPTER III

DISPERSAL ANALYSIS WITHIN THE SPECIES *ALLOCAPNIA RECTA* (ORDER PLECOPTERA) BETWEEN FOUR WATERSHEDS IN NORTHEAST OHIO

3.1 Introduction

Flight is of prime importance in most insect species and affects their dispersal behavior. Adult stoneflies exhibit significant variability in wing morphology and musculature among species, and thus a high degree of flight variability (Malmqvist, 2000; Winterbourne, 2005). Dispersal in stoneflies may be passive (e.g. migrating as a result of wind directionality, hydraulic gradient of open channel stream systems, etc.), but dispersal, as it relates to flight capabilities, can generally be categorized in adult stoneflies through the delineation of a continuum of extremes ranging from full wing, full flight capabilities to apterous, flightless members. In the most rudimentary forms of adult flight starting with surface skimming most likely evolved into more complex forms of flight that required well developed wings with increasing flight velocity at each stage of evolution (Marden et al., 2000; Marden, 2008). Although their adult terrestrial stage is short-lived, it is important for mating and reproductive processes. Furthermore, as

dispersal behaviors are altered, intraspecies relationships are affected – including natal population demographics, the population of adjacent habitats, colonization of new or previously uninhabited regions, and the rates at which populations become genetically distinct from each other (Briers et al., 2003).

In a previous study on two stonefly species varying in dispersal potential, Yasick et al. (2007) compared genetic variability between *Allocaonia recta*, a short-winged, winter emerging stonefly, and *Leuctra tenuis*, a long-winged summer emerging stonefly. Populations of *A. recta* were significantly more diverse between the adjacent watersheds, the Chagrin and Grand Rivers, in Ohio. The results suggest that rudimentary wing structure and time of year of the adult terrestrial stage limit flight capability (Marden et al., 2000) and isolated even the nearby Chagrin and Grand Rivers populations. With limited population studies of stoneflies in the literature, this research expands on previous analysis by determining how extensive population isolation in Northeast Ohio watersheds may be, despite the close proximity of the watersheds to one another. Furthermore, this research also addresses several questions relevant to understanding how the distance of between populations contributes to levels of divergence in post-glacial systems.

Wing morphology cannot be an exclusive reason for population isolation. Maintaining the correlation asserting that rudimentary wing morphology leads to limited flight distance in stoneflies, the genetic variability of *A. recta* populations between and among the research collection sites will be directly proportional to the distance between sampling sites. Here we test whether genetic differences between *A. recta* populations is a function of distance – either linear distance along waterways or direct distance overland between watersheds. The collecting sites farthest from each other should be the most

different. Thus we assess genetic variation in four Lake Erie tributaries in Northeast Ohio,, the Rocky, Cuyahoga , Chagrin, and Grand Rivers. .

3.2 Materials and Methods

Adult specimens of *Allocapnia recta* (Family Capniidae) were collected between 2004 to 2007 at sites within four adjacent tributaries– the Cuyahoga, (N41.2314; W –81.5086 and N41.2335; W –81.5021) Chagrin (N41.5960: W81.2512 and N61.6071; W81.2875) , Rocky (N41.2115; W –81.6831), and Grand Rivers (N41.7217; W81.0830) (Figure III.1) –. Samples were obtained during the peak of annual winter adult emergence from November to February. Specimens were collected within the stream channel and within 15m of the stream embankments in the riparian zone. Collection within the channel was performed manually using forceps to procure samples from tree trunks, or on snow and ice between the embankments. A beating sheet was used to collect *A. recta* from low-lying tree limbs or upon remnants of ground vegetation along the stream. Preferred collecting days were when temperatures exceeded 0°C with few to no clouds (based on personal observations). Individual *A. recta* were placed in a 1.5 ml microcentrifuge tube containing 95% ethanol. If a male and female were captured in copula, the mating pair was placed in the same tube.

Collected *A. recta* specimens were identified to species based on the structure of the male genitalia (Ross & Rickter, 1971). Following identification, the lower abdomen was removed from male specimens and stored for species documentation. The only female samples used in this study were those captured in copula. To further verify species identification, a cladogram was constructed using available sequence data from species within the same family as *A. recta*, Capniidae [Used by permission MD Terry (Figure

III.2)]. Prior to DNA extraction, specimens were soaked in distilled water for fifteen minutes to remove the ethanol. Samples were then blot dried on Kimwipe tissue and placed into a microcentrifuge tube for DNA (mtDNA) extraction. DNA was amplified according to the methods and primers outlined in Yasick et al. (2007). The forward primer was (SF_arF) 5'- TCG AAC AGA CCT AAA CTT TG -3' (20 nucleotides in length) and the reverse primer was (SF_arR) 5'- AAT AAT TTA AAG TCT GAC CTG C -3' (22 nucleotides in length).

Early sequencing of *A. recta* was conducted at Cleveland State University's DNA sequencing facility on a Beckman CEQ-8000 capillary autosequencer. Those samples were run in both the forward and reverse directions. Later samples were sequenced at the Cleveland Clinic Lerner Research Institute's Genomic Core Facility using a Biosystems model 37 30xl DNA analyzer using the forward primer only. Using the forward primer only, sequences were reduced from 492 base pairs (results published in Yasick et al. 2007) to 467 base pairs (see Table III for a complete list of newly sequenced specimens and previously sequenced specimens used in this section). Mitochondrial DNA sequences were aligned and read using the Sequencher® software package (Sequencher v. 4.10.1, Gene Codes Corp.) and conservatively screened to eliminate any ambiguous scoring.

Analysis of variance among haplotypes was performed with *DnaSP* v. 5.10.01 (Rozas et al. March 2010) and the minimum spanning trees were produced with Network v. 4.6.0.0 (Fluxus Technology Limited 2005). Pairwise comparison was used to determine where the greatest genetic differences, or similarities, exist when comparing samples across the four watersheds. Hedrick (2005) and Merimans and Hedrick (2011), propose G'_{ST} as a standardized method of measuring genetic variation between populations and

results in a more meaningful score – resultant values range from 0 to 1 – and increased validity; particularly with smaller sample sizes when compared to F_{ST} . A G'_{ST} score of 1 indicates haplotypes are completely different, while a score of 0 is indicative of identical haplotypes.

Table III. Haplotypes scaled to shortened sequences used from those originally identified in Yasick et al. 2007, a publication that that only included the Grand and Chagrin River sites, and the more recently identified haplotypes collected from all four sampling locations. Letter codes indicate collection site: Rocky River (RR), Cuyahoga site A,(CU1); Cuyahoga site D (CU2); East Branch Chagrin (CH1); Stebbins Gulch (CH2); and Talcott Creek (GR)

Insect	Published Haplotypes (492 bp range)	Revised Haplotypes (467 bp range)	Insect	Published Haplotypes (492 bp range)	Revised Haplotypes (467 bp range)	Insect	Published Haplotypes (492 bp range)	Revised Haplotypes (467 bp range)
05CU22		1	05CH1_59	5	3	05CU288		6
05CU23		1	05CH1_81	5	3	44CH2_6		6
7CU4		1	05CH1_82	6.6	3	07RR136		7
9CU2		1	05CH1_96	6	3	07RR150		7
21CU8		1	05CH1_97	6	3	07RR152		8
20CU27		1	31CH2_7		4	07RR155		8
29CU9		1	33CH2_9		4	07RR149		9
05CU87		2	43CH2_5		4	07RR153		9
05CU95		2	07RR125		4	07RR157		10
8CU3		2	07RR126		4	07RR159		10
07RR134		2	07RR127		4	07RR160		10
15RR1		2	07RR135		4	07RR167		11
05CH2_25	1	2	07RR173		4	07RR128		12
05CH2_21	1	2	17RR3		4	07RR130		12
05CU215		3	38RR4		4	07RR158		13
05CU80		3	39RR5		4	07RR156		14
05CU85		3	40RR6		4	05CH1_98	6.5	15
05CU86		3	41RR7		4	4GR8		16
05CU89		3	42RR8		4	13GR7		16
05CU91		3	04CH2_4	3	4	14GR10		16
05CU292		3	04CH2_12	3	4	1GR1		17
05CU93		3	05CH2_26	3	4	2GR2		17
05CU94		3	05CH2_28	3	4	3GR3		17
05CU100		3	05CH2_30	3	4	5GR9		17
07CU141		3	05CH2_31	3	4	11GR5		17
07CU143		3	05GR44	3	4	12GR6		18
19CU26		3	05GR45	3	4	05GR37	7	19
26CH2_2		3	05GR47	3	4	05GR38	7	19
32CH2_8		3	05GR48	3	4	05 GR39	8	19
07RR124		3	05CH2_54	4	4	05GR42	7	19
07RR151		3	05GR109	9	4	05GR43	8	19
07RR165		3	05GR110	10	4	05GR46	7	19
04CH2_1	5	3	23CH1_1		5	05GR55	7	19
04CH2_2	5	3	23CH2_1		5	05GR60	7	19
05CH1_36	5	3	04CH2_5	3	5	05GR83	7	19
			05CU79		6	05GR84	7	19

Figure III.1: Collecting sites within the Rocky (RR), Cuyahoga (CU1 and CU2), Chagrin (CH1 and CH2), and Grand (GR) Rivers, Northeast Ohio USA. Large circles indicate sampling sites and smaller circles represent major metropolitan areas. Two sites were used within the Chagrin and Cuyahoga Rivers for more meaningful data collection.





Figure III.2 MEGA Phylogeny Tree. Using MEGA (Molecular Evolutionary Genetic Analysis) version 5.05 (Tamura et al. 2011) a phylogeny tree was constructed with haplotypes identified in Table III. The cladogram includes outgroups used by permission from MD. Terry, PhD (Associate Professor at University of Texas-Pan America). Outgroups are identified by genus and species, along with *A. recta* are members of the family Capnidae. The outgroups were used to validate the relatedness of the *A. recta* haplotypes



3.3 Results

Haplotypes were obtained from 107 specimens of *Allocapnia recta* from four watersheds in Northeast Ohio; the Grand (n=25), Cuyahoga (n=25; pooled from CU1 and CU2), Chagrin (n=27; pooled from Ch1 and Ch2), and the Rocky River (n=30). Nineteen unique haplotypes were identified and distinct polymorphisms were found using the 16sRNA region of the mitochondria DNA (KC881036-KC881054). The F_{st} score for *A. recta*

indicated that separation of samples between the four watersheds explained 37% ($P < 0.05$) of the variation in haplotype diversity, while 63% of the variation is represented within-group variation (Table IV).

Table IV Molecular Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) of 16s RNA variation among and within groups of *A. recta* samples collected in the four sample sites were analyzed in Arlequin.

Source of Variation	d.f.	Sum of Squares	Variance Components	% of Variation
Among	3	58.86	0.69	36.66
Within	103	122.85	1.19	63.34
Total	106	181.70	1.88	
Fixation Index	Fst=0.367			

From Table IV, not one haplotype was present across all four watersheds, not even the two most common haplotypes, H3 and H4, which were represented by 26 and 27 individuals, respectively, and collected at from three of the four sites. H3 was absent in *A. recta* samples collected in the Grand River and H4 was absent in *A. recta* samples collected in the Cuyahoga River. The third most common haplotype, H19 (n=10) was collected in the Grand River only. H1 and H2 haplotypes were the fourth most common haplotypes identified (both n=7). All seven specimen samples with H1 haplotypes were collected in the Cuyahoga River, while the H2 haplotype was unusual for its presences in multiple watersheds was collected in the Cuyahoga, Rocky, and Chagrin Rivers. Nine haplotypes (H5-H10, H12, H16, and H17) were present in two to five copies in only one watershed. Haplotypes H11, H13-15, and H18 were only observed once and were pooled together (see Table V).

Samples from Rocky River had the greatest haplotype diversity with eleven total haplotypes found; including eight unique haplotypes. Six haplotypes were collected from

samples in the Chagrin River with two unique haplotypes; five haplotypes were collected in the Grand River with three unique haplotypes; and, four haplotypes were collected in the Cuyahoga River with one unique haplotype. This pattern is graphically apparent when employing the minimum spanning tree where samples were derived from one large and divided clade (Figure III.2). Haplotype and nucleotide diversities are estimated in Table V and indicate that the overall haplotype and nucleotide diversity was 0.86 and 0.47, respectively. Table VII is representative of the calculated population pairwise estimate using both F_{ST} and G'_{ST} scores. Greatest pairwise difference exist between sample populations collected in the Cuyahoga and Grand Rivers ($G'_{ST} = 1.0$). Least pairwise difference is between the Chagrin and Rocky River ($G_{ST} = 0.31$). All other sample specimens and locations are statistically significantly different from each other using a p-value < 0.05 . By comparing sites based on distance from each other, Table VIII illustrates that overland distance is not the likely driving force between distance population genetic structures. Sites like the Rocky River and the Grand River should be completely different from each, while sites such as the Cuyahoga and the Chagrin, Rocky and the Cuyahoga, and the Chagrin and the Grand should not be significantly different from each other.

Table V Haplotype frequencies for *Allocapnia recta* as they relate to sampling location. Single haplotypes were pooled and haplotypes collected in more than one location are highlighted in grey.

Site	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	H10	H12	H16	H17	H19	Pooled*	Total
Cuyahoga	7	3	13	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Rocky	0	2	3	11	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	3	30
Chagrin	0	2	10	10	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	27
Grand	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	1	25
Total	7	7	26	27	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	5	10	5	107
Frequency	0.07	0.07	0.24	0.25	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.09	0.05	1

Table VI Gene diversity (h) was estimated in alignment with the work of Nei (1972); and nucleotide diversity (π) was calculated using Arlequin v. 3.5 (Excoffier et al. 2011). SE is standard error.

Sites	Totals	h	hSE	$\pi \times 100$	$\pi SE \times 100$
Cuyahoga	25	0.66	0.071	0.19	0.12
Rocky	30	0.85	0.055	0.37	0.18
Chagrin	27	0.73	0.054	0.25	0.14
Grand	25	0.76	0.051	0.32	0.17
Totals	107	0.86	0.020	0.47	0.18

Table VII Pairwise Population differences based on location using both Fst (the upper number) and G'st (the lower number) scores.

	Rocky	Cuyahoga	Chagrin	Grand
Rocky	-----			
Cuyahoga	0.47 0.86	-----		
Chagrin	0.07 0.31	0.35 0.45	-----	
Grand	0.34 0.68	0.62 1.0	0.29 0.72	-----

Figure III.3 Haplotypes of *Allocapnia recta* in the four watersheds. The diameter of each circle represents the sample size of each haplotype and levels of shading denote the location: Rocky River (white), the Cuyahoga River (light grey), Chagrin River (dark grey) or the Grand River (black). Numbers indicate the haplotype number and the dashes represent the number of base changes from each haplotype.




Table VIII Pairwise comparisons based on distance by flight. The first group is one step away from each other, while the second and third groups are two and three steps away from each other respectively. More steps refer to greater distance between the watersheds. Overall, the table illustrates that distance is not a major factor on genetic variability.

Flight Distance	Collecting Site		Fst	G'st	Significance
	Rocky/Cuyahoga		0.47	0.86	***
One Step	Cuyahoga/Chagrin		0.36	0.45	**
	Chagrin/Grand		0.29	0.72	***
		Average	0.37	0.68	
Two Steps	Rocky/Chagrin		0.01	0.31	*
	Cuyahoga/Grand		0.58	1.00	***
		Average	0.36	0.65	
Three Steps	Rocky/Grand		0.34	0.68	***

3.4 Discussion

The goal was to assess patterns of dispersal among *Allocapnia recta* and to further explain the dispersal processes observed in Yasick et al. (2007). The initial predication was that distance would be the driving factor towards explaining intraspecific dispersion and why collected specimens of *Allocapnia recta* varied genetically between all four watersheds. The four watersheds sampled illustrated different haplotypes from each other, suggesting that dispersal of *Allocapnia recta* between neighboring watersheds is minimal. This inference is drawn from the results that no single haplotype was found among all four watersheds, even among the five most common haplotypes. The samples collected from the Cuyahoga River and Grand River were completely different from each other ($G'_{ST} = 1$) while the samples collected from the Rocky River and Chagrin River, the two non-adjacent watersheds were the most similar ($G'_{ST} = 0.31$).

Thus linear overland distance between the four watersheds cannot explain the observed variation. If distance was a major contributor, then the Rocky River and the Grand River should have had the most differences among populations, while comparisons between the Rocky River and Cuyahoga Rivers; Cuyahoga and the Chagrin Rivers; or the Chagrin and the Grand Rivers should not be the most similar. Instead no discriminating pattern occurred and therefore, other factors, such as post-glacial migration, land use (both historic and modern), and resource competition dynamics are more likely explanations (Alp et al., 2012; Shulthesis et al., 2012).

3.4.1 Post-Glacial Migration

The lack of dispersion, among *A. recta* is caused by a number of variables. Rudimentary wing structure (especially apterous males w), winter-time adult terrestrial

emergence period, and the behavior in females to return to the natal stream to oviposit are three of the most common and well understood. In addition, the current distribution of *Allocapnia recta* populations in northeast Ohio may have also been affected by post-glacial changes in topography that disconnected streams that were once interconnected to each other in the past (Hynes, 1988). Regional glacial periods and the consequential changes to the watershed landscape in northeast Ohio may be responsible for the limited interactions of stonefly species following glaciation (White and Totten, 1982 and Szabo et al., 1988).

Records of known glacial events coupled with the presence of *A. recta* in and around streams once covered by continental ice sheets establish a relationship between biogeography and the history of the landscape (Ross & Ricker 1971, Ford 1987, and Hynes 1988). Prior to glaciation, the headwaters of the Cuyahoga River, Chagrin River, and Grand River were in close proximity to each other; creating a natural passageway connecting the streams and the amphibious organisms (i.e. *A. recta*) between them (Austin et al., 2002). The Laurentide Ice Sheet had a profound effect on the region's geomorphology. The transgressing ice sheet originated in Labrador and advanced in a southeasterly direction, first into the Great Lakes basin and then into present day Northeast Ohio. The entire landscape in and around Lake Erie was isostatically compressed by the weight of the 3km thick ice sheet during the Wisconsin Glacial cycle, a glacial period that ended only 15,000 years ago (Lo and Soster, 1981; White and Totten, 1982; DP Cronin; personal communication May 2013). Once the ice retreated, the rigid crust experienced glacial isostatic adjustment – a slow uplifting due to the removal of the glacier's weight.

As a result of glaciation, the hydrological and geomorphic systems in the region dramatically changed (White and Totten, 1982). In riverine systems like the Grand River and Cuyahoga River, glacial dynamics and ice movement disrupted flow patterns and changed the direction of flow. The Grand River turned westward and the Cuyahoga flowed north (White and Totten 1982). Thus the Grand, Cuyahoga, and Chagrin Rivers lost their interconnectivity and separated populations of aquatic insects. As the glacial ice melted, re-colonization of *A. recta* may have occurred first in the Rocky River, and expanded eastward. Thus the post-glacial population dynamic helps explain why specimens of *A. recta* collected from the Rocky River are the most diverse, although they share some haplotypes with *A. recta* from the other three watersheds but also have many unique haplotypes when the same comparison is made (as supported by findings in Yasick et al., 2007). The region continues to experience glacial isostatic adjustment over long periods of time, and may be continually placing organisms like *A. recta* into closer proximity to each other and possibly allow organisms to migrate to streams that are currently out of reach for poor dispersers (Coffey, 1958 and Habel et al. 2005).

3.4.2 Land Use

Aquatic insects employ aerial dispersion for a variety of reasons. While predator avoidance and mate competition are the primary interactions that drive aerial dispersion among aquatic insects, it can also be used for site selection if the aquatic conditions of the habitat become suboptimal (Lehrian et al., 2010; Bogan and Boersma, 2012; Krosch et al., 2012). Aquatic species are integrated with the movement of a stream and dispersal can be passive or active. As a result of unilateral water flow, dispersion among many aquatic macroinvertebrates tends typically to follow a downstream bias (Alp et al., 2012).

Given the wide array of geological, climatological, and natural phenomenon that affect the Earth's surface, land fragmentation is not an unusual phenomenon when assessing the paleoecology of specific sites over geologic time. However, on shorter time scales – ranging years to centuries of human habitation – land fragmentation often results in anthropogenic effects on land use, reducing stream habitat quality. Although drift dispersal is considered the primary mechanism for colonization of a new or disturbed habitat (Williams and Hynes 1976, Gore 1982, and Bogan and Boersma 2012), limits to aerial dispersal need to be considered, even for minimal dispersal distance over fragmented terrestrial habitats.

Allocapnia recta dispersal is further limited by a complicated mix of historical and anthropogenic factors leading to land fragmentation that can be used to explain the low dispersal and distribution of *A. recta* in Northeast Ohio as with other aquatic insects with similar flight restraints (Alp et al., 2012). As such, dispersal and re-population into a new aquatic habitat or one that is recovering from land fragmentation due to natural or anthropogenic disturbances is not likely among *A. recta* population in this region. Lyle et al. (2007) states not all disturbances are bad. Species can adapt to a wide range of natural disturbance regimes, suggesting that species populations may be able to evolve in response to disturbance if given enough time. Unfortunately, anthropogenic disturbances tend to be more traumatic and unpredictability in regards to dispersal.

Each of four watersheds historically have been dominated by agricultural land use and anthropogenic disturbances. The Cuyahoga River (Burkes and McClaugherty, 2008), and Grand River (Grand River Partners 2003; Natural Conservatory 2009) watersheds have a history of intensive row crop farming, while the Rocky River, (Lo and Soster, 1981) and

Chagrin River watershed was primarily pastoral (Chagrin River Watershed Partners 2013; Case Western 1997). Although row crop farming and other forms of intensive cultivation strongly impact stream conditions, the influence of pastoral agriculture is less pronounced (Meador and Goldstein, 2003; Allan, 2004).

Streams draining in agricultural lands support fewer pollution sensitive aquatic insect species than streams draining in forested landscapes (Meador and Goldstein 2003; Allan 2004). Currently, three of the four sampling sites – Rocky River, Cuyahoga River, and Chagrin River – are under the auspices of conservation land management systems – the Cleveland Metroparks, Cuyahoga Valley National Park, and Holden Arboretum, respectively (the Grand River sampling site location is within privately owned land). However, the Rocky River watershed remains primarily enveloped by pastoral farming and cultivated crops with isolated areas of mixed forest along some reaches. With the Cuyahoga River collection site located within the boundaries of the Cuyahoga Valley National Park, the primary land use is currently mixed forest. Regardless, several areas adjacent to the park system and the Cuyahoga River watershed as a whole are dominated by cultivation and pastoral farming; with land use and cash crops similar to those in the Rocky River watershed. Located east of the Cuyahoga River, the Chagrin River collection site is within the boundaries of the Holden Arboretum, which is a protected mixed forest habitat of both deciduous and evergreen trees. The low-density, developed region surrounding the Holden Arboretum remains, or is marked by the remnants of, agricultural use. The Grand River is circumscribed primarily by mixed forests followed by low-to medium density developed property and mixed forest habitat [land use

conclusions based on Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC), 2013 and personal observation of the terrestrial habitat].

Both current and long-term land disturbances on macroinvertebrate populations continue to occur (Harding et al., 1998; Allan, 2004). While many changes in the past century have looked to protect the habitat, legacy land use continues to play a role in macroinvertebrate distribution and population structure. Conservation by regional, state, and federal agencies may protect the immediate regions adjacent to the stream embankments (i.e. Cuyahoga Valley National Park, Hinckley Reservation, and Holden Arboretum), but little can be done to avert the consequences of surrounding agricultural land use and the drainage that makes its way into the streams.

3.4.3 Resource Competition

Analyses relevant to fragmentation, land use, and post-glacial migration each present reasonable explanations for the current haplotype distribution within poor dispersing species. Another hypothesis presented by McCauley et al., 2009 likewise provides an explanation for the *A. recta* haplotype distribution, by using resource competition as a way of explaining differences in haplotype diversity even between neighboring streams. According to McCauley et al., aquatic insects, including poor dispersers, when they emerge as terrestrial adults, are likely to avoid adjacent riverine habitats even if they are of good quality. Using species abundance and habitat quality as methodological variables, McCauley et al., (2009) concluded that aquatic insects will disperse greater distances to avoid genetically similar members of the species for mate, food, and other resource competition. Despite *A. recta* being a poor disperser, they can still disperse longitudinally and respond to poor habitat quality and limited food resources by moving

out of a particular stream reach through downstream drift. Thus avoidance for resource competition can be a potential explanation that leads to genetic differentiation and haplotype differences between the subpopulations of the four watersheds.

3.5 Conclusion

Although this study has limited ability to infer the specific processes that have contributed to current genetic structure of *Allocapnia recta*, distance between watersheds was not the primary factor. Other factors such as a combination of post-glacial migration, land fragmentation and land use, and resource competition are all possibilities for population separation. In a dispersal study conducted by Finn et al., 2006, using a species of blackfly, a much stronger flier than stoneflies, they determined that distance was a factor of dispersal. However, their population pairwise comparison illustrated that landscape features were more influential than overland distance. Landscape features such as high ridgelines, and areas lacking stream and riparian zone corridors lead to greater intra-population genetic diversity. Both the Chagrin and Grand River collecting sites were greatly incised and would be difficult for such weak fliers as *A. recta* from moving from one stream site to the next with ease. Furthermore, since all streams within this study were surrounded by current and historic agricultural land use would also influence the size of the riparian zone, and hinder the ability for passive fliers to migrate from one stream site to another. Peterson et al. (2006) suggested that female stoneflies are more likely to remain near their natal streams for ovipositing her eggs than fly another stream, especially if the migration were made difficult by hindering landscape uses.

REFERENCES

- Allan, JD. 2004. Landscapes and Riverscapes: The influence of land use on stream ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 35, 257-284.
- Alp, M., Keller, I., Westram, A. M., & Robinson, C. 2012. How river structure and biological traits influence gene flow: a population genetic study of two stream invertebrates with differing dispersal abilities. *Freshwater Biology*, 57, 969-981.
- Austin, JD., Lougheed, SC., Neidrauer, L., Chek, AA., and Boag, PT. 2002. Cryptic lineages in a small frog: the post-glacial history of the spring peeper, *Pseudacris crucifer* (Anura: Hylidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 25: 316-329.
- Briers, RA., Cariss, HM., and Gee, JHR. 2003. Flight activity of adult stoneflies in relation to weather. *Ecological Entomology*. 28. 21-40.
- Bogan, MT., and Boersma, K S. 2012. Aerial dispersal of aquatic invertebrates along and away from arid-land streams. *Freshwater Science*, 31, 1131-1144.
- Burkes, K. and McClaugherty, C. 2008. Landscape position influences the distribution of garlic mustard, an invasive species. *Northeastern Naturalist*. 15: 541-556.
- Case Western Reserve University. 1997 *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland: The Chagrin River*. <http://ech.case.edu/ech-cgi/article.pl?id=CR1> Accessed 30 June 2009.
- Chagrin River Watershed Partners Incorporated, 2005. *The Chagrin River*. Retrieved from www.crowp.org Retrieved 2013.
- Coffey, GN. (1958). Major glacial drainage changes in Ohio. *The Ohio Journal of Science*, 58, 43-49.
- Excoffier, L., Laval, G., and Schneider, S. 2005. Arlequin ver. 3.0: An integrated software package for population genetics data analysis. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics Online* 1, 47-50.
- Finn, D.S., Theobald, DM., Black IV, W C., and Poff, N L. 2006. Spatial population genetic structure and limited dispersal in a Rocky Mountain alpine stream insect. *Molecular Ecology*, 15, 3553-3566.
- Ford, D. 1987. Effects of glaciations and permafrost upon the development of Karst in Canada. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*. 12, 507-521.
- Grand River Partners Inc. Jun 2003. *The Grand River*. <http://www.grandriverpartners.org> Accessed 15 June 2009

- Gore, A.J., 1982. Benthic invertebrate colonization: source distance effects on community composition. *Hydrobiologia*, 94, 183-193
- Habel, J C., Schmitt, T., and Muller, P. 2005. The fourth paradigm pattern of post-glacial range expansion of European terrestrial species: the phylogeography of the Marbled White butterfly (Satyrinae, Lepidoptera). *Journal of Biogeography*, 32, 1489-1497.
- Harding, J.S., Benfield, E.F., Bolstad, P.V., Helfman, G.S., and Jones III, E.B.D. 1998. Stream biodiversity: the ghost of land use past. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science USA*, 95, 14843-14847.
- Hedrick, P.W. 2005. A standardized genetic differentiation measure. *Evolution*, 59, 1633-1638.
- Hynes, H.B.N. 1988. Biogeography and origins of the North American stoneflies (Plecoptera). *Memoirs of the Entomological Society of Canada*, 144, 31-37.
- Krosh, M.N., Baker, A.M., Mather, P.B., and Cranston, P.S. 2012. Comparison of intraspecific genetic structure among related chironomids (Diptera) from New Zealand and Patagonia: disparity between potential and realized dispersal. *Freshwater Science*, 31, 1105-1120.
- Lehrian, S., Balint, M., Haase, P., and Pauls, S.U. 2010. Genetic population structure of an autumn-emerging caddisfly with inherently low dispersal capacity and insights into its phylogeography. *Journal of North American Benthological Society*, 29, 1100-1118.
- Lo, H.H. and Soster, F.M., 1981. Chemical composition of the Rocky River, near Cleveland, OH. *Ohio Journal of Science*. 81: 78-82.
- Lytle, D.A., Bogan, M.T., and Finn, D.S. 2008. Evolution of aquatic insect behaviors across a gradient of disturbance predictability. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Biological Sciences*, 275, 453-462.
- Malmqvist B. 2000. How does wing length relate to distribution patterns of stoneflies (Plecoptera) and mayflies (Ephemeroptera)? *Biological Conservation*, 93, 271-276.
- Marden, J.H. 2008. Quantitative and evolutionary biology of alternative splicing: how changing the mix of alternative transcripts affects phenotypic plasticity and reaction norms. *Heredity*, 100, 111-120.
- Marden, J.H., O'Donnell, B.C., Thomas, M.A., and Bye, J.Y. 2000. Surface-skimming stoneflies and mayflies: the taxonomic and mechanical diversity of two-

- dimensional aerodynamic locomotion. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*, 73, 751-764.
- McCauley, S.J., Davis, C.J., Nystrom, J., and Werner, E.E. 2009. A humped-shaped relationship between isolation and abundance of *Notonecta irrorata* colonists in aquatic mesocosms. *Ecology*, 90, 2635-2641.
- Meador, M.R. and Goldstein, R.M. 2003 Assessing water quality at large geographic scales: relations among land use, water physicochemistry, riparian condition, and fish community structure. *Environmental Management*, 31, 504-517.
- Merimans, P.G. & Hedrick, P.W. 2011. Assessing population structure: F_{st} and related measures. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 11, 5-18
- Nei, M. 1972. Genetic distance between populations. *American Naturalist*, 106, 283-292.
- Ross H.H. & Ricker, W.E. 1971. *The Classification, Evolution, and Dispersal of the Winter Stonefly Allocapnia*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, Illinois Biological Monographs.
- Schultheis, A.S., Booth, J.Y., Perlmutter, L.R., Bond, J.E., and Sheldon, A.L. 2012. Phylogeography and species biogeography of montane Great Basin stoneflies. *Molecular Ecology*. 21, 3325-3340.
- Szabo, J.P., Carter, C.H., Bruno, P.W., Jones, E.J. 1988. Glacial and post-glacial deposits of Northeast Ohio. *The Ohio Journal of Science*. 88: 66-74.
- Tamura, K., Peterson, D., Peterson, N., Stecher, G., Nei, M., and Kumar, S. 2011. MEGA 5: Molecular evolutionary genetics analysis using maximum likelihood, evolutionary distance, and maximum parsimony methods. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 28, 2731-2739.
- Watanabe, K., Monaghan, M.T., Takemon, Y., and Omura, T. 2010 Dispersal ability determines the genetic effects of habitat fragmentation in three species of aquatic insect. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*. 20, 574-579.
- White, G. W. & Totten, S. M. 1982. Glacial geology of Northeastern Ohio. *Ohio Geological Survey Bulletin* 68, 1-75.
- Williams, D.D., and Hynes, H.B. 1976. The re-colonization mechanisms of stream benthos. *Oikos*, 27, 265-272 .
- Winterbourne, M.J. 2005. Dispersal, feeding, and parasitism of adult stoneflies (Plecoptera) at a New Zealand forest stream. *Aquatic Insects*, 27, 155-166.

Yasick, AL., Krebs, RA., and Wolin, JA. 2007. The effects of dispersal ability in winter and summer stoneflies on their genetic differentiation. *Ecological Entomology*, 32, 399-404.

CHAPTER IV
SEASONAL AND LEGACY LAND USE EVALUATION OF
MACROINVERTEBRATE COMMUNITIES IN FOUR WATERSHEDS IN
NORTHEAST OHIO

4.1 Introduction

The role of spatial heterogeneity and temporal variation in determining biological communities has long been a central topic of stream ecology (Hynes, 1970; Winemiller et al., 2010). For nearly 60 years aquatic organisms have been used to evaluate lotic ecosystems, with benthic macroinvertebrates among the most commonly studied. Benthic macroinvertebrates are often favored over fish, algae, and macrophytes for several reasons, among the most important are the cost efficiencies in collection, identification, and analysis. Macroinvertebrates are long-lived, exhibit fidelity to a stream ecosystem, and are found in abundances that enable the use of meaningful statistical analyses. Benthic macroinvertebrates are also particularly sensitive to sedimentation, habitat loss, and chemical pollution and therefore capable of indicating

long-term local habitat quality and legacy land use impacts (Usseglio-Polatera et al., 2000). Legacy land is used to describe anthropogenic disturbance that continues to influence ecological systems long after the initial disturbance is over (Harding et al., 1998). Due to the long life cycle and long-lived aquatic stages of stoneflies and other macroinvertebrates, comparison of their relative abundance and taxonomic diversity across regional stream habitats may provide insight as to how historic changes in land use may influence present day communities.

The conversion of forested land to agriculture and/or urban land use has long been considered a major stressor to aquatic ecosystems. Agricultural lands increase the input of herbicides/pesticides and fine sediments, catalyze the loss of riparian complexity and in-stream habitat, and change the stream hydrology (Allan, 2004; Harding et al., 1998; Zhang et al., 2012). Urban land uses also bring about changes that greatly affect stream systems. Runoff from increased impervious surfaces modify channel morphology, increase sediment loads, and change the overall hydrology of a stream system (Zhang et al., 2012). In addition, each transition in land use affects organic matter exchanges with the floodplain and surrounding lands, and can negatively impact the dispersal ability of stoneflies and other macroinvertebrates requiring macroinvertebrates to travel farther to reach more suitable stream habitats (Vibrickas et al., 2011). Increased awareness of the effects of land use on streams has spearheaded conservation and protection efforts of stream ecosystems from a watershed perspective including embankments and riparian zones by regional, state, and federal agencies. To further complicate anthropogenic effects, changes in land use and impact on stream ecosystems, which include species richness and community diversity, may last for decades even after the land has been

altered to another land use type (Harding et al., 1998). Legacy land use effects are particularly important factors to consider when studying stream ecosystem recovery. Streams that are impacted by impairments such as urbanization or agriculture lead to changes in macroinvertebrate community structure. These impairment induced changes typically lead to communities where most taxa exhibit non-seasonal life cycles and are present throughout the year (Soulsby et al., 2001; Johnson et al. 2012). Thus, it can be inferred that macroinvertebrate communities in impaired environmental conditions will exhibit less seasonal variation than more taxonomically diverse streams not compromised by anthropogenic effects, and will contain taxa exhibit seasonal growth and diversification patterns.

Seasonal dynamics play an important role in macroinvertebrate assemblage composition within a stream. Taxonomic abundance and richness in aquatic macroinvertebrates change seasonally, as do hydrology and thermal regimes (Spoka et al., 2006). Flooding occurs more frequently during the spring and fall, freezing during the winter, and drought in the summer, and result in within-year changes; especially in low-order streams; the majority of streams investigated for this research (Beche et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2012). These changes in thermal regime and hydrology greatly influence emergence time, reproduction, growth and development of stoneflies and other macroinvertebrates.

While seasonal patterns in macroinvertebrate communities and life history strategies are known, there have been few studies that examine seasonality of functional feeding groups at the community level. In general, seasonality and temporal variability in benthic

macroinvertebrate communities have only been examined in terms of macroinvertebrate taxonomic identification.

In order to better understand the seasonality of macroinvertebrate functional feeding groups at the community level, a two year study of stoneflies and macroinvertebrate communities was conducted seasonally, in four watersheds of Northeast Ohio.

Macroinvertebrate communities were compared spatially (based on land use surrounding each sample site) and temporally (by season). This work hypothesizes:

1. The greatest species diversity and richness among stoneflies and other macroinvertebrates will occur during the summer months, when weather conditions in Northeast Ohio are more conducive, while the lowest diversity will occur during the winter months, when weather conditions in Northeast Ohio are the most inhospitable.
2. The greatest species diversity and richness among stoneflies and other macroinvertebrates will occur in regions where the landscape has been historically less disturbed, and the lowest diversity will occur at sites that have been historically impacted by humans even if the stream is currently surrounded by protected and managed lands.
3. Current land use, in addition to flight ability and emergence success, has the potential to affect the overall community structure of macroinvertebrates at the collection sites.

Although the primary objective of the this study was to determine the relationship that spatial and temporal changes have on the macroinvertebrate community located within

the stream, it was also important to consider the results of chapter 3, and the influence of spatial and temporal factors on *Allocapnia recta* population structure.

4.2 Materials and Methods

This two year study ran from January 2004 to December 2004 (YEAR 1), and January 2005 to December 2005 (YEAR 2). The four seasons were defined as mid-March to early June (spring), late June to mid-September (summer), late September to early December (fall), and late December to early March (winter). In addition to macroinvertebrate data, physical/chemical data were collected from the four watersheds and six collecting sites designated in Chapter 3: one collecting site within the Rocky River (N41.2115; W -81.6831), two sites within the Cuyahoga River (N41.2314; W -81.5086 and N41.2335; W -81.5021), , two collecting sites within the Chagrin River (N41.5961; W -81.2521 and N41.6071; W -81.2875), , and one collecting site in the Grand River (N41.7258; W -81.0774), for all seasons between 2004 and 2005.

The Rocky River watershed consists of west, east, and main branches, with the collecting site in the East Branch. The land surrounding the collecting site is dominated by agriculture and paralleled by bridle paths. The East Branch of the Rocky River flows south into Hinckley Lake where it is impounded by the Hinckley Dam. The collection site was located in the channel downstream from the Hinckley Dam within the Hinckley Reservation of the Cleveland Metroparks. Using a nearby access road, the collection site is 2.410km along an earthen trail that follows the bridle path; both eventually crossing the river. The river is very dynamic in this area due, in part, to the dam and its sinuous path experiences a wide range of water depths from very shallow in some areas to more than 1.0m deep in others.

The two Cuyahoga River collecting sites were located within the Cuyahoga Valley National Park (CVNP), within the headwaters of the Boston Run tributary. Boston Run flows parallel to state Route 303, approximately 420m west of Happy Days Nature Center. The headwaters of Boston Run originate in a forested area within the CVNP. The upstream collection site was designated site CU1. The second site, approximately 200 meters downstream of the first site, was designated CU2.

Two collecting sites were located in the East Branch of the Chagrin River. The first was in the East Branch of the Chagrin River itself; the collection site was located within the Holden Arboretum on Wisner Road. The riparian zone on the left bank was approximately 60 meters deep while the riparian zone on the right bank was a steep embankment. The second collection site was located within Stebbins Gulch, a first order tributary to the East Branch of the Chagrin River, also located within Holden Arboretum, along an extension of Wilder Road south of Mitchells Mill Road; near row crop and livestock farming to the north. Most of the land outside of Holden Arboretum, as well as downstream, is privately owned and characterized as rural residential. The land upstream from Holden Arboretum is dominated by a large horse ranch

The Grand River collection site was located within the tributary Talcott Creek, a second order stream. The Grand River has been protected within the Lake County Metroparks since 1974, but remains adjacent to various land uses around the stream without protective designations. As a remnant of the Wisconsin glaciation and other glacial events, the river is deeply entrenched with steep embankments and sloping hills; hindering urbanization in comparison to other areas in Northeast Ohio. As a result, the land around the stream and, in particular, the sampling site, is a low-intensity residential

area. Despite the presence of some residents, the predominant land use is crop and pastoral agriculture.

To determine stream conditions at each collection site, water samples were collected and analyzed using HACH chemical testing. Benthic macroinvertebrates were collected, identified to genus in most cases, and community structure was analyzed for each collecting site. Additional data, including stream habitat assessment and physical characterization, were collected in the field using Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's *Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index*.

4.2.1 Water Chemistry

Dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH were measured *in situ* at each site using YSI Environmental 550A Dissolved Oxygen (DO) instrument (YSI Environmental Incorporated Yellow Springs, OH). The YSI Environmental 550A was calibrated prior to each use and DO readings were set to mg/L. Recordings for dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH were acquired in the thalweg, upstream from the researcher.

Water chemistry samples for ammonia, nitrate, and orthophosphate were collected in a 1L polyurethane bottle by submerging the bottle beneath the stream's surface. Once collected, the sample was placed in a cooler, on ice, and transported to the lab for analysis. Samples were analyzed for ammonia, nitrate, and orthophosphate concentrations using an AQUAMATE ThermoSpectronic Spectrophotometer (St. Louis, Missouri) using HACH methods, reagents, and standards. To test for orthophosphate, the HACH PhosVer3 (Ascorbic Acid) Method was used. A 10mL subsample was placed into a clean, acid washed Erlenmeyer flask using a plastic pipette. The reagent PhosVer3 phosphate powder pillow was added to the flask and the solution mixed. After a two

minute reaction time period a 2mL cuvette was filled with the solution and placed in the spectrophotometer along with distilled water blank. The spectrophotometer was set at wavelength 890nm (per procedural instructions) and output values were recorded in mg/L.

The HACH Cadmium Reduction Method was used to test for nitrate. A 10mL subsample was placed into a clean, acid washed Erlenmeyer flask using a plastic pipette. NitraVer 5 Nitrate Reagent Powder Pillow was added to the flask and shaken vigorously for one minute followed by a five minute reaction time. After the reaction period, a 2mL cuvette was filled with the solution and placed in the spectrophotometer along with distilled water blank. The spectrophotometer was set at the wavelength 400nm (per procedural instructions) and results were measured in mg/L.

The HACH Nessler Method was used to test for ammonia. A 50mL graduated cylinder was filled with the stream water sample to the 25mL mark. A second 50mL graduated cylinder was filled with deionized water and used as the blank. Three drops of Mineral Stabilizer were added to each cylinder, stoppered, and inverted three times to mix. Three drops of Polyvinyl Alcohol Dispersing Agent were added next to each cylinder, stoppered, and inverted three times. Finally, 1.0mL of Nessler Reagent was added to each cylinder, stoppered, and inverted three times. Following a one-minute reaction time, a subsample was placed in 2mL cuvette. The spectrophotometer was set at the wavelength 425nm (per procedural instructions) and output values were measured in mg/L. All reagents; PhoVer 3 phosphate pillow, NitraVer 5 nitrate reagent powder pillow, Mineral Stabilizer, Polyvinyl Alcohol Dispersing Agent, and Nessler Reagent were supplied by the HACH company.

4.2.2 Habitat/Physical Characterization Assessment

Habitat evaluation was done using the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (2006), modified to best fit the habitat and needs for aquatic macroinvertebrates. Four metrics were evaluated: substrate, in-stream cover, riparian zone and bank erosion, and riffle-run habitat quality. Substrate is a two-fold metric that measures type and quality of substrate. Larger substrates, like boulders, cobble, and gravel are preferred for most aquatic macroinvertebrates, while substrate such as artificial substrates, silts, or muck are scored lower as they can interfere with insect respiration, especially those with external gills such as Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Tricoptera (EPT). In-stream cover represents areas of shelter that provide macroinvertebrates protection from predators, competitors, or provide a resting place to conserve energy away from current forces. The in-stream cover metric is measured under four conditions: extensive (> 75%), moderate (25-75%), sparse (5-25%), and minimal (< 5%). Riparian zone and bank erosion (RZ/BE) is the third metric. Riparian zone measures the quantity of the vegetative area around the stream and the quality of floodplain vegetation. This metric includes the zone width, floodplain quality, and extent of erosion. The maximum score of 100% includes: little to no erosion, riparian width of 750m or more, and forested or swamp floodplain vegetation. The lowest score includes conditions that show signs of severe erosion, absences of riparian zone, and urban, construction, or pastoral/row crop activity within the floodplains. The final metric is the riffle-run habitat quality. A mixture of flow and depth in a stream provide a variety of habitats to support diverse communities of macroinvertebrates. Riffles are shallow regions of the stream where water runs fast and is agitated by rocks. Dissolved oxygen

concentrations in these areas are extremely high and may be near 100% saturation. Habitat specialists and macroinvertebrates that require high levels of oxygen due to external gills are the most diverse in these regions. Runs are deeper regions of a stream, but not as deep as pools. Although oxygen concentrations are lower in runs in comparison to riffles, runs provide additional habitat proximal to riffles where macroinvertebrates may be outcompeted in riffle or pool habitats. Riffle depth, run depth, riffle/run substrate, and riffle run embeddedness were also measured. The highest quality riffle depth is greater than 10cm deep, run depth greater than 50cm deep, and substrate is either boulder or cobble, with no embeddedness. Poor quality areas are riffles less than 5cm deep, run depths less than 50cm deep, and substrate of more than 75% fine gravel or sand.

4.2.3 Benthic Macroinvertebrates

Benthic macroinvertebrate samples were collected using a 500 μ m mesh kick-net with a collection surface area of 84.60cm². Two kick-net collections were performed at each site, one from the riffle and one from the pool, for a period of two minutes. Kick-nets were then placed on a tarp and macroinvertebrates were collected from the kick-net using forceps. The kick-nets and the tarp were then rinsed into a tub to ensure all captured samples were collected.

Macroinvertebrates were collected during all four seasons, identified to genus (oligocheates and chironomids were identified to family) and recorded in the field. Samples that required further identification, and all samples collected during the winter due to less than favorable weather conditions were collectively placed in a 1L sample jar containing 75% ethanol and returned to the laboratory. Upon arrival at the laboratory, the

collected sample was emptied into a small basin and individual specimens removed and placed into a new 20mL plastic specimen jar with 75% ethanol alcohol. The specimen bottle was labeled with the date, location, and weather conditions from the sampling. Specimens were identified under magnification, using reference materials (McCafferty (1998), Peckarsky (1990), Merrit and Cummings (1996), Thorp and Covich (2001), and Voshell (2002), and additional resources.

All samples collected on-site from the kick-net and tarp were rinsed into a collecting tub and immediately transferred to 1L sample jars containing 75% ethanol alcohol before being transported to the lab.

4.2.4 Statistical Analyses and Metrics

Several metrics and statistical programs were utilized to evaluate the relationship of macroinvertebrate communities including stream characteristics and water quality, habitat characteristics and quality, riparian zone quality, and seasonal distribution among and between the Rocky, Cuyahoga, Chagrin, and Grand Rivers.

4.2.4.1 Shannon Diversity and Evenness Indices

Shannon Diversity Index measures macroinvertebrate taxonomic richness and diversity at the sample sites, while the Evenness Index determines how similar in number each macroinvertebrate taxa is at the collecting sites, together the indices were used to quantify taxa distribution. The underlying measure of this particular statistical method is that the more diverse the macroinvertebrate sample populations are, and the more similar their proportional abundance in a stream ecosystem, the more difficult it becomes to predict which species will be the next one collected from the sampling site. If diversity is very low – predominantly represented by a single, common species with all other

specimens being rare – and a large number of members of the species are collected, the Shannon Diversity index will approach zero, therefore no uncertainty in predicting the taxonomic species of the next randomly collected specimen. Thus in the case of Shannon Diversity and Evenness Indices, macroinvertebrate community diversity was compared between and among sites, per season, per years.

4.2.4.2 *Cluster Analysis*

Cluster analysis was used to explore and analyze the data. The objective of cluster analysis is to sort samples into groups (clusters) so that the degree of association is strong between members of the same cluster and weak between members of different clusters. Since cluster analysis is a descriptive tool, it was used to reveal associations and structure in data, which though not immediately evident become clear once associations were determined. An agglomerative cluster analysis, using Euclidean Distance was performed using SPSS 19.0 for Windows (© 2010) to comparing sites, seasons, and percent abundance of macroinvertebrate taxa.

4.2.4.3 *Canonical Correspondence Analysis*

To analyze data relevant to the distribution of macroinvertebrate taxa and specific physical factors measured within the four watersheds in this study, Canonical Correspondence Analysis (CCA) was conducted using the software program CANOCO (ter Braak and Smilauer 2002). Canonical Correspondence Analysis is a direct gradient analysis that compares response variables (species) against environmental variables in order to determine which factors are most important in determining the presence and abundance of species in each sample.

Canonical correspondence analysis was used to compare seasonal macroinvertebrate distribution between collecting sites and years with seasonal environmental variables. The relative abundance of each macroinvertebrate taxa (genus) and eleven physical characteristics, including orthophosphate, ammonia, nitrate, dissolved oxygen, pH, water temperature, percent canopy cover, substrate quality, in-stream cover, riparian zone/bank erosion, and riffle/run habitats, were used in the analyses. Data for each season and from each of the four sampling locations were imported into CANOCO to complete the data set. Manual forward selection in the CANOCO software was used to determine significant environmental variables.

4.2.4.4. *Analysis of Variance and Functional Feeding Groups*

A statistical model, analysis of variance (ANOVA), using SPSS 19.0 for Windows (© 2010) was used in two ways. ANOVA was used to first analyze the physical variations between and among seasons and sites, and second to relate the physical variables in relation to the functional feeding groups (FFG) collected for each of the eight seasons.

Functional feeding groups were determined using Merritt and Cummings (1996) and McCafferty (1998). This is a classification method based on morpho-behavioral mechanisms for food acquisition and enables study of a much smaller group of macroinvertebrates based on how they obtain food and how they function in processing energy in the stream ecosystem. Additionally, FFG establish a link between aquatic food resource categories and the adaptations required for their exploitation. Food resource categories include coarse particulate organic matter (CPOM) – food particles greater than 1.0mm, fine particulate organic matter, (FPOM) – food particles with a size ranging from 0.45µm to 1.0mm, periphyton – sessile organisms such as heterotrophic microbes and algae, and prey – a general category including other macroinvertebrates, small

amphibians, fish and fish eggs. The five defined categories of macroinvertebrates based on aquatic food resources in FFG analysis include: a.) *scrapers* – consuming mainly algae; b.) *shredders* – consuming mainly leaf litter but also decomposing wood debris; c.) *collector-gather* – consuming collected FPOM from the stream substrate; d.) *collector-filters* – consuming collected FPOM suspended in the water column; and, e.) *predators* – consuming other consumers.

4.3 Results and Discussion

Diversity indices, multivariate analysis, and functional feeding group evaluations were utilized in evaluating macroinvertebrate communities. Although some of these metrics may seem redundant, they measure different aspects of macroinvertebrate assemblage structure, function, and processes; lending a greater depth of understanding. A total of 62 species, representing 49 families and 13 orders (Table IX) were identified among the 6,243 macroinvertebrate specimens collected seasonally during 2004 and 2005. The number of individuals identified collectively at each site collectively over the two year period was lowest at Cuyahoga Site A in spring with 87 specimens collected and highest in the summer at Rocky River with 498 specimens (Table X). Six taxa were commonly collected throughout the study period at all six sites; *Hydropsyche* (order Tricoptera), *Stenelmis* and *Psephenus* (order Coleoptera), *Baetis* (order Ephemeroptera), *Simulium* (order Diptera), and the family Chironomidae (order Diptera). Although, the presence of the same taxa may indicate similarity among sites, it may also indicate that these taxa are generalists and have certain biological traits such as desiccation resistance, respiration mechanisms, body armor, and food preferences that allow them to survive in many different ecological habitats.

4.3.1 Analysis of Variance and Physical Data

4.3.1.1 Seasonal Variation within Sites.

To test for change in environmental conditions that affect macroinvertebrate communities, eleven variables; dissolved oxygen, temperature, pH, ammonia, nitrate, orthophosphate, substrate, in-stream cover, riparian zone, bank erosion, and riffle/run quality (Table XI) were tested and compared seasonally using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using SPSS. Several seasonally based environmental factors were statistically significant different from each other; water temperature (C°) (p=0.000), dissolved oxygen (mg/L) (p=0.011), canopy cover (percent coverage) (p=0.011) orthophosphate (mg/L) (p=0.026) and nitrate (mg/L) (p=0.031) (Table XII). Not surprisingly, water temperature was highest in the summer (average = 15.5°C), lowest in the spring (average = 6.3°C), and intermediate during both the fall (average = 14.0 °C) and winter seasons (average = 7.0°C). Dissolved oxygen (DO), like water temperature, also changed seasonally. DO was significantly different among the all seasons (p-value = 0.011) and, in general, DO was highest in the winter (average = 11.66mg/L) and lowest in the spring (average = 7.25mg/L) in Northeast Ohio. Percent canopy cover measured using a densitometer and is the measure leaf density stretching over or adjacent to the stream channel, also changed seasonally at each collection site. Summer had the highest percent canopy cover (average = 78.67%) and the winter season had the lowest (average = 15.83%) (see Table XII).

Orthophosphate and nitrate were also statistically significant with p-values of 0.026 and 0.031, respectively. The highest mean concentrations of orthophosphate was recorded during the spring (average = 0.14mg/L) and a no orthophosphate was detected

in the fall (0.00mg/L). Similar to orthophosphate, nitrate was recorded at highest concentrations during spring (average = 0.51mg/L). However, high concentrations were also recorded during the winter season (average = 0.21mg/L), while no nitrate was detected in samples tested during the summer and fall collecting periods (Table XII).

Table IX Macroinvertebrate abundance collected seasonally within the six sample sites for years one and two. The data has been combined yearly for this table

	RRSp	RRSu	RRFa	RRWt	CuyASp	CuyASu	CuyAFa	CuyAWt	CuyDsp	CuyDSu	CuyDFa	CuyDWt	EBCuSp	EBCuSu	EBCuFa	EBCuWt	STGSp	STGSu	STGFa	STGWT	GrSp	GrSu	GrFa	GrWt
Ephemeroptera	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Acentrella</i> sp.	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Arthrobaeta</i> sp.	4	16	6	8	2	15	19	23	23	0	23	30	0	0	15	16	19	29	3	5	9	20	18	15
<i>Brachyercus</i> sp.	8	4	6	0	0	12	13	10	5	6	8	10	0	0	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
<i>Ephemerella</i> sp.	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	7	0	6	0	0	7	5	0	2	11	0	0	12	4	0
<i>Heptagenia</i> sp.	7	0	8	3	0	0	0	8	0	5	0	1	8	1	2	1	4	0	0	9	17	0	14	0
<i>Maccaffertium</i> sp.	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Paraleptophlebia</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Procladius</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	9	0	1	3	33	0	0	2	25	0	0	0
<i>Siphonurus</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	34	0	0	0	0	19	0	1
Plecoptera	4	0	1	2	2	3	4	3	8	3	2	2	7	7	3	10	116	0	3	28	55	0	0	2
<i>Allocapnia</i> sp.	13	7	5	1	0	14	23	16	15	25	17	14	0	7	11	7	10	0	10	15	6	4	12	
<i>Acroneta</i> sp.	1	1	6	0	0	9	8	7	5	6	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
<i>Capnia</i> sp.	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Haploperla</i> sp.	4	0	1	20	6	0	0	1	3	2	0	2	3	0	0	0	13	0	0	16	3	0	0	1
<i>Isoperla</i> sp.	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Leuctra</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Nemacaphia</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Nemoura</i> sp.	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	7	0	0	0	26	4	3	0	0
<i>Paraleuctra</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tricoptera	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Doloplistes</i> sp.	59	231	37	11	3	29	49	53	28	25	40	40	22	32	42	4	69	15	26	42	110	85	11	40
<i>Hydropsyche</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	1	1	3	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Leptostoma</i> sp.	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Limnephilus</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4	6	6	0	0	2	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Neuracapsis</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Phryganea</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Polycentropus</i> sp.	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Pseudostenophylax</i> sp.	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1
<i>Rhaconephila</i> sp.	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	18	31	8	1	2
Coleoptera	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Dineutus</i> sp.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Gerris</i> sp.	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	5	2	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Gyrinus</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	2	3	1	0	0	2	6	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1
<i>Helicorus</i> sp.	28	0	0	2	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	6	2	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Hydroporus</i> sp.	4	2	16	15	0	31	25	26	25	26	21	25	1	12	25	5	38	17	9	10	13	39	5	19
<i>Stenelmis</i> sp.	52	151	10	16	0	35	36	40	21	24	25	40	11	8	32	11	17	18	0	1	13	0	0	20
Odonata	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Aeschna</i> sp.	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Gomphus</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
<i>Metanema</i> sp.	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Progomphus</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Megaloptera	1	4	2	0	0	2	2	6	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Chauliodes</i> sp.	0	3	1	0	0	3	6	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Corydalus</i> sp.	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	2
<i>Stialis</i> sp.	2	2	4	0	0	2	4	1	3	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diptera	0	0	4	0	0	5	8	7	4	5	2	7	1	8	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
<i>Atherix</i> sp.	0	0	5	1	0	5	4	1	1	3	0	4	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Antocha</i> sp.	19	20	37	15	41	44	64	135	27	26	35	30	24	21	24	41	24	21	8	27	49	47	32	
Chironomidae	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Chrysops</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Culex</i> sp.	1	1	1	0	0	3	2	20	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
<i>Dasyhelea</i> sp.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Dolichopus</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
<i>Hexatoma</i> sp.	5	0	2	12	1	3	6	3	6	5	7	6	0	11	9	1	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
<i>Leptocnops</i> sp.	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Pedicia</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Simulium</i> sp.	3	14	24	4	1	16	25	19	21	35	27	30	0	0	0	0	10	0	48	231	10	0	0	1
<i>Stratiomys</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Tipula</i> sp.	7	23	3	1	4	9	10	12	7	9	6	14	0	7	5	4	5	1	1	10	0	0	0	4
Hemiptera	1	4	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Ricagovella</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	12	4	6	9	8	0	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	4	1	0
Others	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Gammarus</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Hapluraxida</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Hyalella</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Lumbricula</i> sp.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unionidae, Family	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table X Total number of individuals collected at each site. Each subsequent column represents the number of individuals collected during each season combined from January 2004-December 2005

Site	Total	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter
Rocky	1046	235	498	197	116
CuyahCU1	1197	87	287	369	454
CuyahCU2	1115	255	275	265	320
EBCH	748	104	192	253	199
StGulch	1181	471	145	127	438
Grand	946	393	249	101	213

Table XI Seasonal Chemistry and Physical Assessment The mean and range of water chemistry and physical features of the stream collected seasonally within each site from January 2004 until December 2005.

Rocky River								East Branch Chagrin							
SampleID	PO4(mg/L)	NH4mg/L	NO3(mg/L)	DO(mg/L)	pH	Temp°C	%CC	SampleID	PO4(mg/L)	NH4mg/L	NO3(mg/L)	DO(mg/L)	pH	Temp°C	%CC
RR_SP04	0.03	0.44	0.59	9.00	8.00	7.50	75	EBCHSp04	0.27	0.62	0.95	9.70	7.50	5.00	40.00
RR_SP05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.05	6.75	74	EBCHSp05	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.20	7.15	8.00	41.00
RR_SU04	0.00	0.13	0.00	8.90	7.50	16.00	75	EBCHSu04	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.72	7.50	16.05	40.00
RR_SU05	0.00	0.11	0.00	8.05	7.50	15.80	80	EBCHSu05	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.01	7.60	15.80	45.00
RR_FAL04	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.21	7.30	13.80	40	EBCHF04	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.36	7.55	14.90	25.00
RR_FAL05	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.89	7.30	11.50	60	EBCHF05	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.80	8.14	12.80	20.00
RR_WT04	0.17	0.00	0.00	10.50	8.15	6.20	15	EBCHWT04	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.70	7.45	6.10	0.00
RR_WT05	0.08	0.00	0.00	10.50	7.90	6.90	15	EBCHWT05	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.50	7.60	8.00	4.00
Mean	0.04	0.08	0.07	9.13	7.71	10.56	54.25	Mean	0.03	0.08	0.12	11.12	7.56	10.83	26.88
Range	0-0.17	0-0.44	0-0.59	0-15.9	7.3-8.2	6.2-15.8	15-80	Range	0-0.273	0-0.6211	0-0.955	9.7-13.5	7.15-8.14	5.00-16.05	0-45.0
Cuyahoga Site A								Stebbin's Gulch							
SampleID	PO4(mg/L)	NH4mg/L	NO3(mg/L)	DO(mg/L)	pH	Temp°C	%CC	SampleID	PO4(mg/L)	NH4mg/L	NO3(mg/L)	DO(mg/L)	pH	Temp°C	%CC
CuyASp04	0.39	0.56	1.33	5.10	7.95	4.85	85.0	StGSp04	0.25	0.53	0.73	10.20	7.20	4.80	91.00
CuyASp05	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.45	8.30	6.00	84.0	StGSp05	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.50	7.00	7.90	93.00
CuyASu04	0.00	0.12	0.00	3.85	8.30	15.20	90.0	StGSu04	0.02	0.00	0.00	10.91	7.30	12.00	96.00
CuyASu05	0.03	0.08	0.00	4.87	8.30	16.01	97.0	StGSu05	0.04	0.00	0.00	11.09	7.40	15.70	96.00
CuyAFa04	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.31	8.25	13.00	60.0	StGFA04	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.45	7.20	14.50	45.00
CuyAFa05	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.89	7.84	15.23	50.0	StGFA05	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.45	8.20	12.90	70.00
CuyAWt04	0.01	0.00	0.00	11.75	8.35	6.35	10.0	StGWT04	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.15	7.00	5.90	30.00
CuyAWt05	0.00	0.60	1.26	10.40	7.75	8.50	10.0	StGWT05	0.00	1.59	0.01	13.80	7.50	8.10	28.00
Mean	0.05	0.17	0.32	6.45	8.13	10.64	60.8	Mean	0.04	0.27	0.09	10.94	7.35	10.23	68.63
Range	0-0.390	0-0.603	0-1.33	3.84-11.75	7.75-8.35	4.85-16.01	10.0-97.0	Range	0-0.25	0-1.59	0-0.73	10.2-13.80	7.00-8.20	4.80-15.7	28.00-96.0
Cuyahoga Site D								Grand River							
SampleID	PO4(mg/L)	NH4mg/L	NO3(mg/L)	DO(mg/L)	pH	Temp°C	%CC	SampleID	PO4(mg/L)	NH4mg/L	NO3(mg/L)	DO(mg/L)	pH	Temp°C	%CC
BRD_SP04	0.74	1.00	2.51	6.45	8.20	5.00	90.00	TC_SP04	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.30	7.55	5.20	63.00
BRD_SP05	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.05	8.00	7.00	87.00	TC_SP05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.25	7.00	65.00
BRD_SU04	0.00	0.05	0.00	7.67	8.25	16.00	93.00	TC_SU04	0.09	0.00	0.00	12.90	7.60	13.40	65.00
BRD_SU05	0.02	0.11	0.00	8.01	8.40	17.19	99.00	TC_SU05	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.50	8.10	16.80	68.00
BRD_FAL04	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.40	7.70	14.00	70.00	TC_FAL04	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.25	8.15	14.15	35.00
BRD_FAL05	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.59	8.50	16.05	65.00	TC_FAL05	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.56	7.50	14.80	50.00
BRD_WT04	0.01	0.00	0.00	12.40	7.60	6.05	15.00	TC_WT04	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.65	8.20	7.20	25.00
BRD_WT05	0.00	0.61	1.30	10.40	8.00	8.00	10.00	TC_WT05	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.20	8.30	6.10	28.00
Average	0.10	0.22	0.48	8.50	8.08	11.16	66.13	Mean	0.01	0.00	0.00	10.05	7.83	10.58	49.88
Range	0-0.734	0-1.00	0-2.51	6.45-10.40	7.50-8.50	5.00-17.19	10.00-99.00	Range	0-0.09	0.00	0.00	0-15.3	7.3-8.2	5.2-16.8	25-68

Table XII Summary results of a one-way analysis of variance of the physical characteristics between seasons. Orthophosphate (PO₄), nitrate, dissolved oxygen (DO), temperature, and canopy cover were significantly different between seasons. DF=47.

Physical by Season	F score	P<0.05
PO ₄ (mg/L)	3.39	0.03
Ammonia(mg/L)	2.27	0.94
Nitrate(mg/L)	3.24	0.03
DO(mg/L)	4.17	0.01
pH	0.28	0.84
Temp(°C)	176.66	0.00
Canopy Cover (%)	34.92	0.00
Substrate Type	1.60	0.20
In-stream Cover (%)	2.37	0.08
RipZon/BE(%)	0.57	0.64
Riffle/Run(%)	0.30	0.82

4.3.1.2 Seasonal variations Between Sites

ANOVA was also used to analyze seasonal variables between sites (Table XIII).

ANOVA results revealed pH (p=0.0), dissolved oxygen (mg/L) (p=0.046), riparian zone/bank erosion (a metric with a possible score from 0 (no riparian zone and the presence of bank erosion) to 10 (well developed riparian zone and an absences of bank erosion) (RZ/BE) (p=0.0), riffle/run habitat quality (a metric with a possible score of 0 (absences of riffle/run) and 10 (a stream with an extensive level of the combination of riffles and runs)) (p=0.0), and substrate quality (%) (p=0.000) were statistically significant (Table XIII).

ANOVA indicated that pH was statistically significant between Cuyahoga site CU1, compared to East Branch of the Chagrin (p-value = 0.017) and Stebbins Gulch (p-value = 0.0). Significant differences was also observed for the pH variable when between Cuyahoga site CU2, pH value was compared between East Branch of the Chagrin (p-value = 0.035) and Stebbins Gulch (p-value = 0.001). Dissolved oxygen statistically significant between East Branch of the Chagrin and Cuyahoga site CU1 (p-value =

0.050). Riparian zone/bank erosion (RZ/BE) when compared among sites, were determined to be significantly different between Rocky River and Stebbins Gulch (p-value = 0.001), between Rocky and Grand River (p-value = 0.00); between Cuyahoga site CU2 and the East branch of the Chagrin (p-value= 0.00), Cuyahoga site CU1 and between the Grand River, EB Chagrin, and Stebbins Gulch (all comparisons had a p-value equal to 0.00)

Riffle/run habitat quality was statistically significant between most of the sites, including between Rocky River and Cuyahoga CU1, East Branch of the Chagrin (both with a p-value = 0.00) and Stebbins Gulch (p-value = 0.002)). Cuyahoga site CU2 was significantly different from the East Branch of the Chagrin and Stebbins Gulch (both p-values = 0.00), and Cuyahoga site CU1 (p-value = 0.002).

Comparison of riffle/run habitat quality between the East Branch of the Chagrin and the other sites, determined it was significantly different from all sites except Stebbins Gulch (p-value = 0.993). Additionally, the Grand River was significantly different from the Cuyahoga site CU1, (p-value = 0.0), East Branch of the Chagrin (p-value = 0.008), and Stebbins Gulch (p-value = 0.035).

Percent substrate quality was significantly different between Cuyahoga site CU1, when compared between East Branch of the Chagrin (p-value = 0.020), Stebbins Gulch (p-value= 0.00), and Grand Rivers (p-value = 0.002) sites. Additional comparisons showed that there was also significant results observed when comparing percent substrate between the Rocky River and Stebbins Gulch (p-value = 0.032) and between Cuyahoga site CU2 and Stebbins Gulch (p-value = 0.005).

Table XIII Summary results of a one-way analysis of variance of the physical characteristics between collecting sites. Significantly different variables were dissolved oxygen (DO), pH, substrate type, percent riparian zone/bank erosion (RipZon/BE), and percent riffle run. Df=47.

Physical by Site	F score	P<0.05
PO4(mg/L)	0.36	0.88
Ammonia(mg/L)	0.80	0.56
Nitrate(mg/L)	1.07	0.39
DO(mg/L)	2.49	0.05
pH	6.04	0.00
Temp(°C)	0.24	1.00
Canopy Cover (%)	1.74	0.15
Substrate Type	7.36	0.00
In-stream Cover (%)	0.93	0.47
RipZon/BE(%)	15.18	0.00
Riffle/Run(%)	25.68	0.00

4.3.2 Macroinvertebrate Evaluation

Overall, the most dominant taxa at each collecting site, season, and year were *Baetis*, *Hydropsyche*, *Simulium*, *Stenelmis*, and members of the family Chironomidae. These taxa are generalist, and tolerate a variety of anthropogenic impacts. The genus *Baetis* (order Ephemeroptera) is more tolerant of organic wastes and nutrient increases than most members of the order. *Baetis* larvae can develop successfully in water as warm as 32°C and as cold as 4°C (Voshell, 2002) and eggs when laid can hatch immediately or may remain dormant for months under extreme conditions (Merritt and Cummings, 1995). *Hydropsyche* (order Trichoptera), are collector-gathers using nets to collect anything from fine organic matter to coarse particulate matter, while some members are filter feeders. They can survive in moderate levels of pollution but are the densest in streams high in organic matter and nutrients (McCafferty, 1983).

Members of the genus *Stenelmis* (order Coleoptera) can live in a variety of habitats and commonly feed on periphyton. They exchange oxygen by means of a highly

developed plastron and are not dependent on dissolved oxygen levels within the stream. Most *Stenelmis* do not reach sexual maturity until their second year in the aquatic larval stage, and have the ability to forgo adulthood and mating during times of extreme stress brought about by anthropogenic or natural events (Merritt and Cummings, 1995).

Like *Hydropsyche*, *Simulium* (order Diptera) are generalist and filter –feeders, feeding on fine organic particulate matter (FPOM), algae, bacteria, and microfilms. Though most dipterans are tolerant of high levels of stream pollution, *Simulium* are sensitive to inorganic pollution, but more tolerant of organic pollution (Voshell, 2002).

Members of the family Chironomidae (order Diptera) were among the most abundant taxa collected in this research. The Chironomidae are a large and diverse family found in almost every aquatic or semiaquatic ecosystem (Merritt and Cummings, 1995). Most are generalist and some members of the family have hemoglobin that allows them to exist in near anoxic environments (Voshell, 2002).

4.3.2.1 Shannon Diversity Index and Evenness Analysis

While most collecting sites showed seasonal or year to year variation in Shannon Diversity and Evenness Index values (Figure IV.1), there was no consistent pattern of change within or across sites. Overall, the second Cuyahoga site, CU2, had the highest diversity for all seasons and years, and was the most consistently diverse ($H' =$ lowest 2.77 to highest 2.97). All other sites varied across seasons and years. In addition, diversity declined significantly at two sites during the two year sampling period; however, both sites were able to recover. The decline occurred in Cuyahoga Site CU1 and Grand River, and reflects effects of a 100-year storm event in August 2003 at Cuyahoga site CU1 and a 50-year storm event in August 2005 in the Grand River.

Preliminary macroinvertebrate sampling occurred at Cuyahoga River site CU1 in winter 2002 and summer 2003 to assess adult stonefly populations. This was followed by a 100-year storm event in late summer 2003. The lowest macroinvertebrate diversity at Cuyahoga site CU1 occurred in spring 2004. Previous to the 100-year storm event, this headwater stream had cobble and gravel substrate, dense canopy cover, fast moving cold water, and high dissolved oxygen concentrations. After the storm event in August of 2003, a dense clay layer several centimeters thick collapsed into the river, altering substrate and water chemistry. Despite these changes, macroinvertebrates were still present during spring 2004, though in much lower numbers. By summer 2004, the macroinvertebrate community assembled in Cuyahoga site CU1 showed signs of recovery with the highest site diversity values occurring in summer and fall 2004. The low diversity seen in spring 2005 may be due to the persistence of road runoff related to nearby State Route 303 following spring snowmelt and rainfall. The most diverse period in the Grand River was during winter 2004 sampling ($H = 2.895 / E_H = 0.814$), followed by spring 2004 samples. During the summer, the highest number of individuals were collected ($n=158$) represented by 35 taxa. Similar to Cuyahoga site CU1, a reduction in diversity occurred at the Grand River site during the summer 2005 season/year following a 50-year storm event. One hundred and sixteen specimens were collected post-storm and only ten taxa were represented. As with Cuyahoga CU1, the decrease in the number of specimens and taxa within the Grand River post flood event was most likely the result of the storm and altered substrate.

In the Rocky River, the most diverse sampling period was fall 2004 ($H=2.953/E_H = 0.868$), while the lowest diversity was summer 2005 ($H = 1.073 / E_H = 0.418$). While 388

individuals were collected, they were only comprised of 13 taxa. The following seasons the number of individuals remained high, but the total number of taxa was low. Within the East Branch of the Chagrin, the most diverse sample period was during summer 2004 ($H = 2.906 / E_H = 0.854$) and the sampling period with the least diverse macroinvertebrate distribution was collected in winter 2005 ($H = 2.895 / E_H = 0.814$). During summer 2004, 165 individual macroinvertebrates were collected representing 30 unique taxa. Dominant taxa at the collection site were consistent with the aforementioned taxa above (i.e. *Baetis*, *Hydropsyche*, *Simulium*, *Stenelmis*, and the family Chironomidae). Furthermore, taxa that were rare in many of the other collection sites (e.g. *Heptagenia* and *Ephemerella* (ephemeropterans), *Allocapnia* and *Acroneuria* (plecopterans), and *Hexatoma* and *Tipula* (dipterans) were present in larger numbers in East Branch of the Chagrin, and may be due to the fact that the East Branch collecting site was a much higher order stream than other sample sites, and included taxa that favor larger order streams. Winter 2005 was the season with the lowest Shannon Diversity and evenness, with 8 taxa representing 59 specimens. Chironomids and *Simulium* accounted for 75% of the taxa collected. Even though other taxa were collected at this time, no more than 10 individuals of any one taxon were collected from the site. The low diversity found in samples from the East Branch is difficult to explain within the scope of this research. At other sampling locations where diversity was low, such as the Cuyahoga River and Grand River, catastrophic storm events and subsequent flooding provided a plausible explanation for the lack of diversity. These low levels of diversity at East Branch of the Chagrin may actually be the result, in part, of a mild summer and fall. Aquatic insects that normally


remain in their aquatic stage during poor stream conditions will emerge as terrestrial adults during favorable terrestrial conditions, leaving fewer juveniles in the stream.

In Stebbins Gulch, the most diverse sampling period was during spring 2004 ($H = 2.336 / E_H = 0.808$) and the least diverse community structure was found during fall 2004 ($H = 1.528 / E_H = 0.735$). In spring 2004, 154 specimens representing 18 genera were collected. Although *Hydropsyche* was among the dominant genera with 31 specimens, it only accounted for 20% of the total organisms collected. Abundances of a taxon relatively unique from the other sites, *Chelifera* (n=40) a dipteran, exceeded those of *Hydropsyche*, (n=31) during this sampling period.

Sample collection at Stebbins Gulch during the fall of 2004 had the lowest diversity for all sampling periods during the two years of collecting. Only 58 macroinvertebrate specimens were collected, and the specimens were represented by only 8 taxa. Together, *Simulium* and *Hydropsyche* accounted for 70% of the macroinvertebrate community sampled at the site. Although both genera were dominant during all eight seasons of sampling, it was noteworthy that the community structure lacked representatives from other taxa when compared to the other sampling locations, years, and seasons.

Chironomids, *Baetis*, and *Stenelmis* were typically collected at Stebbins Gulch but there were periods, i.e. fall 2004, when the number of specimens in each taxon was marginal to absent. The level of diversity observed at the location improved throughout the course of this work, but the lack of sampling data prior to 2004 prevents development of a meaningful explanation for the lack of community structure in 2004.

Figure IV.1 Shannon diversity (H) and Evenness (E_H) for all six collecting locations by season and year.



4.3.2.2 Cluster Analysis

In previous research, cluster analyses have been used to classify data into discrete groups. While cluster analysis classification is a useful tool, it does not take into account

the degree of variability along natural or anthropogenic environmental gradients (Gerth et al., 2013). In this particular study, seasonal variation in temperature, rainfall, and stream flow velocity are among the major factors influencing macroinvertebrate community structure at a stream site. However, the more refined the data, the more likely cluster analysis reflects this gradient (Leslie et al., 2012). In this research, it was important to identify macroinvertebrates to the lowest taxonomic level possible. Macroinvertebrates were identified to genus (except chironomids, which were identified to family), by collecting site, season, and year. The more refined the data, the more useful cluster analysis becomes. An agglomeration cluster analysis using Euclidian distance was conducted in SPSS using the percent abundance macroinvertebrate data for each of the six collecting sites, and eight sample seasons for the 2004 and 2005 sampling period. Data were analyzed based on the resulting dendrogram (Figure IV.2). Clusters were defined based on hierarchical designation. Five major groups were identified and labeled Roman numerals I through V. Delineating the groups further Arabic numbering 1-11 were used to designate the next tier of clusters, letters were used to identify specific relationships within clusters. While similar communities grouped together, outlier sites were also identified. From the results, many similarities existed among the communities. Most clusters occurred based on collecting site and season; year had the least influence on the results. With few exceptions, most sites/season/year within Cluster I which include the more distinct Clusters 1 through 4; Figure IV.2), had high percent abundance of the following taxa: *Hydropsyche*, *Stenelmis*, *Simulium*, *Beatis*, and chironomids. Other clusters either shared similar, but unique macroinvertebrate taxa composition or had lower percentages of the aforementioned abundant taxa.

Overall, cluster analysis of the macroinvertebrate community data revealed that fall and winter samples for both years (2004 and 2005), regardless of site, were similar in composition at some level, especially in Cluster I; 1-4. In some cases, spring and summer samples also had similar composition either among or between sites, while most other spring and summer samples were unique, and not clustered together.

Cluster analysis indicated that macroinvertebrate communities in Cuyahoga CU2 had similar composition for all years and seasons (Cluster I; 1a and 2), which was supported by the Shannon Diversity and Evenness indices results. Hypothetically, although several unique taxa were found in all clustered sites and samples, rare taxa (i.e. *Tipula* and *Antocha*, *Nigronia*, and *Acroneuria*) and common species (i.e. *Stenelmis*, *Simulium*, *Beatis*, and *Psephenus*) were present in nearly the same abundance across all samples at Cuyahoga site CU2 and could explain the pattern of clustering.

The macroinvertebrate community for Cuyahoga site CU1 samples was similar in composition to Cuyahoga CU2 in fall 2004 and summer and winter 2005, with slightly different community composition in summer 2004 and fall 2005. Samples from winter 2004, and spring 2004 and 2005 clustered together to form Cluster IV, cluster 10. During these three particular seasons and years, macroinvertebrate community diversity was low, a result from the potential influence of roadway runoff due to its close proximity to State Route 303.

Within the larger Cluster V; cluster 11a-b not only did the two Chagrin River samples cluster together, East branch and Stebbins Gulch, but they also cluster by fall and winter seasons, similar to those observed in Cluster I. Fall and winter macroinvertebrate communities collected within Stebbins Gulch (SG) clustered together with fall (2004 and

2005) and winter 2005 samples clustering first, before joining winter 2004 and the Chagrin winter 2005 samples (clusters 11a and b). In Cluster II; cluster 7a-b, three out of the five samples clustering are from the Grand River. Grand River spring 2005, clustered with the East Branch of the Chagrin spring 2005 for the formation of 7a cluster, while Grand River summer 2004 and winter 2005 clustered with the Rocky River fall 2005.

Finally spring and summer samples paired with the East Branch of the Chagrin and the Rocky River collecting sites in the larger Cluster III, specifically cluster 9. The most probably reason for this is that both the East Branch of the Chagrin and the Rocky River collecting sites are much more open systems and support different members of a the macroinvertebrate communities (i.e. less shredders and more grazers and filter-feeders). Except for clustering with the East Branch of the Chagrin and the Grand Rivers, Rocky River (RR) macroinvertebrate communities showed no distinct affinity by site or season.

The two identified outliers identified were the East Branch of the Chagrin, spring 2004 and Grand River summer 2005. In August of 2005 Grand River a fifty-year storm event occurred that altered the stream habitat similar to that in Cuyahoga Site CU1 in summer 2003. Northeast Ohio counties of Lake, Geauga and Ashtabula had flood events and several tributaries to the Grand River were either flooded or altered (personal observations). This storm event caused extensive flood damage; especially at the Grand River sample site. Unfortunately, the summer collection occurred after the flood event. The site had been washed out and a stream-side residence abandoned by the owners was collapsing due to water damage. A closer examination of the site and surrounding area revealed that gravel entrained upstream of the collection site, had moved downstream with smaller clastic particles and altered the aquatic habitat, noticeably changing the in-


stream dynamics. The effects of increase sedimentation, stream embeddedness, and change in stream pattern from the fifty year storm event on macroinvertebrate community composition, is the most likely explanation for the Grand River summer 2005 sample as an outlier . A total of 115 macroinvertebrate specimens were collected during this sample. Of the 115 specimens collected, thirty-four and thirty-five individuals were represented by *Hydropshye* and *Psephenus* (order Coleoptera), respectively. Collectively, these two genera accounted for 63% of the macroinvertebrates at that time. Both genera are relatively hardy macroinvertebrates and are able to survive extreme conditions caused by storm events, whereas other macroinvertebrates could not survive, or at least stay within that region of the stream. Macroinvertebrates may simply move downstream along with the stronger current during the storm, while others may have moved down into the hyporehic zone for shelter.

In the second outlier, spring 2004 at the East Branch of the Chagrin River, only twenty macroinvertebrate specimens were collected, one of the lowest numbers of macroinvertebrates collected per season at any site. Spring 2004 was the first collection period from this site, and reasons for the low numbers of both individuals and taxa are unknown; subsequent macroinvertebrate collection numbers were much higher. The most common taxa were collected here, as were a few rare taxa including the plecopterans *Allocapnia* and *Leuctra*.

In summary, Cluster I contained taxa that were in low numbers and were common among all members of the cluster (i.e. plecopterans *Acrenuria*, *Allocapnia*, and *Capnia*, the dipteran *Atherix*, and the ephemeropteran *Ephemeralla*). Other taxa which are normally rare were also high in number within Clusters I and II, *Nigronia* (order

Megaloptera), and dipterans *Tipula* and *Hexatoma* were in relatively high abundance for all sites in the second cluster. Dominant genera such as *Hydropshye*, *Stenelmis*, *Simulium*, *Beatis*, and chironomids are less influential because they make up close to 99% of all macroinvertebrates among collecting sites, seasons, and years combined. Percent abundance of rare and moderate taxa such as *Allocapnia*, *Isoperla*, *Tipula*, and *Heptagenia* are more likely to link sites and seasons together. Despite the fact that rare species are smaller in quantity, they are more influential on overall macroinvertebrate community structure than previously realized, and exert more influence on cluster analysis results than the dominant species (Chao et al., 2012).

Figure IV.2 Cluster Analysis: The clusters were defined based on hierarchy of the data. The major clusters were designated I through V. The second tier of grouping macroinvertebrate data into smaller clusters designated 1-11. Some clusters were further specified into a-c. Rocky River (RR), Cuyahoga site A (CU1) Cuyahoga site D (CU2), East branch of the Chagrin (CH), Stebbins Gulch (SG), and Grand River (GR).



2 In the cluster analysis, five major clusters were based on temporal factors and that appear
3 to have the most influence on which sites grouped together. Overall, year had little
4 influence on clustering whereas season followed closely by location were the most
5 influential factors in the analysis. Winter samples clustered more often with other winter
6 data , than with spring, summer, or fall. However, winter and fall samples clustered
7 together more often than spring and summer. Location was also a factor that contributed
8 to site clustering. Sampling locations within the same watershed were more often
9 clustered together than with any other sample sites (i.e. the East Branch of the Chagrin
10 and Stebbins Gulch, and the two Cuyahoga River sites). Sample sites located farther east
11 were clustered together and those sites that were farther west were clustered together, i.e.,
12 sample sites from the East Branch of the Chagrin River and the Grand Rivers paired
13 together more often as did sites from the Rocky and Cuyahoga Rivers.

14 Research conducted by Kim et al., 2013 used cluster analysis to determine temporal
15 and seasonal variation in the Nakdong and Suyong Rivers in South Korea. They defined
16 seasonal variation as “winter” (low temperatures and drought) and “summer” (high
17 temperatures and rainfall). Temporal conditions were based on pollution level in the
18 streams. The Nakdong River was less polluted than Suyong River. The results of their
19 cluster analysis indicated that in the less polluted river, the Nakdong, macroinvertebrate
20 community structure clustered according to season, while in the polluted rivers of the
21 Suyong River macroinvertebrate communities did not cluster according to season, but
22 were influenced with metropolitan factors such as increase in sedimentation, bank
23 erosion, road waste, and sewage, along with other point source pollution (Kim et al.,
24 2013). Although most sites in my research were not directly affected by urbanization,

25 they were affected by agriculture, and/or low-residential areas and Allan (2004) showed
26 that agricultural areas may have similar effects on macroinvertebrate community
27 assemblages.

28 4.3.2.3 Canonical Correspondence Analysis

29 Results from CCA using the manual forward selection identified riffle/run habitat
30 quality as a statistically significant variable for spring ($p = 0.036$; F-ratio = 1.65) and
31 accounted for 14.2% of the variance in the species data. Orthophosphate ($p = 0.008$; F-
32 ratio = 3.41) and pH ($p = 0.044$; F-ratio = 2.20) were statistically significant for winter
33 and together accounted for 40% of the variance in the data. Temperature was the
34 dominant environmental factor in summer but was not significant ($p = 0.09$; F-ratio =
35 1.58), as was dissolved oxygen in the fall ($p = 0.128$; F-ratio = 1.60). Riffle/run habitat
36 quality influenced the macroinvertebrate community during the spring of 2004 and 2005.
37 This metric quantifies stream habitat diversity and is directly proportional to the
38 biodiversity of macroinvertebrate community (Voshell, 2002). Taxa and samples (sites
39 and years) located near the center of the CCA triplot are neutral and variance in these
40 data are not explained by the particularly significant environmental variables used, while
41 the data points located near the vectors or opposite them are either positively or
42 negatively influenced by that particular variable (see Figures IV.3 and IV.4 *Spring*).
43 Both sampling sites of the East Branch of the Chagrin River and Cuyahoga site CU1
44 were strongly affected by percent riffle/run quality during the spring season, Cuyahoga
45 CU1 was negatively correlated with the variable, while East Branch of the Chagrin was
46 positively correlated with it. Same was true for both orthophosphate and pH during the
47 winter analysis.

48 Macroinvertebrate data from Cuyahoga site CU1 was negatively correlated with
49 riffle/run habitat quality in particularly in the spring of 2004. In August 2003, the 100-
50 year storm event resulted in a replacement of cobble/gravel stream bed material with
51 clay, and riffle/run habitat quality QHEI score was 0.0% in spring 2004. Three major
52 genera, *Dasyhelea*, *Stratiomys*, and *Leptoconops*, were dominant at this site, and
53 normally negatively correlated with riffle/run habitat quality. All three genera are midge
54 taxa common to slower bodies of water with low dissolved oxygen, conditions associated
55 with poorer riffle/run habitat. The East Branch of the Chagrin site was positively
56 correlated to riffle/run habitat quality measured as 87.5%. The stream substrate had a
57 good mix of riffle/run and pool habitats and macroinvertebrates associated with high
58 oxygen levels were collected at this site (i.e. *Allocapnia* and *Nemocapnia* (Plecoptera),
59 *Mccaffertium* (Ephemeroptera), and *Dineutus* (Coleoptera).


60 Although no sample was negatively correlated with orthophosphate, Rocky River
61 was positively correlated for 2004 and 2005, and had the highest concentrations of PO₄
62 (0.175mg/L) and (0.08mg/L) respectively during the winter when compared to any other
63 site or year. All sites within the study area were either currently or historically affected
64 by agriculture (row-crops or pastoral) and low-residential land use. Water contaminants
65 such as fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, and/or sewage could increase the amount of
66 orthophosphate, especially in the winter. Higher concentrations of orthophosphate are
67 released during snow melt then during other times of the year. The Rocky River 2004
68 sample had the highest concentration of orthophosphate, 0.175mg/L. Additionally; a
69 bridle path ran perpendicular to the Rocky River site and crossed the river approximately
70 4m from the collecting site. Horse feces were observed where the bridle path crossed the

71 stream during most seasons when samples were collected. Two plecopteran genera
72 *Isoperla* and *Haploperla*, and three dipteran genera of Diptera: *Helichus*, *Dasyhelea*, and
73 *Hexatoma* were positively correlated with these higher levels of orthophosphate. The
74 dipteran species are more tolerant of pollutants, but the two plecopteran taxa are not.
75 Both stonefly taxa are known to be predaceous in their aquatic stages, and may be present
76 due to food availability (Voshell 2002; McLeod 2006).

77 The other significant environmental variable, pH ranged from 7 to 8.5. Sites
78 positively correlated with pH were the Grand River in 2004 and 2005, and Cuyahoga site
79 A in 2004. Winter values were measured at 8.2, 8.3, and 8.3 respectively. Most
80 macroinvertebrate genera respond better to pH levels that are slightly basic as opposed to
81 acidic or neutral conditions. The East Branch of the Chagrin winter 2005, however, was
82 negatively correlated with pH levels, with a value of 7. (Figure IV.3 and IV.4 *Winter*).
83 Typically macroinvertebrates prefer basic pH (Voshell 2002). No statistically significant
84 environmental variables were identified for summer and fall.

85


86 Figure IV.3 CANOCO Analysis: Canonical Correspondence Analysis of seasonal
 87 variation according to 1% or greater macroinvertebrate percent abundance according to
 88 season. This figure reflects macroinvertebrates community assemblage. The seasons are
 89 identified at the top of the figure and the legend represents the species, environmental
 90 variable, and sample. Sites were represented by the following abbreviations: Rocky
 91 River (RR), Cuyahoga River site A (CuyA), Cuyahoga site D (CuyD), East Branch of the
 92 Chagrin River (CH), Stebbins Gulch (SG), and Grand River (GR).




93

94

Summer





Fall



96
97


Winter



98
99

100 Figure IV.4 CANOCO Analysis: Canonical Correspondence Analysis of seasonal
101 variation according to 1% or greater macroinvertebrate percent abundance according to
102 season Figure IV.4 is similar to figure IV.3, however, macroinvertebrate taxa have been
103 removed and replaced by triangles, so that better observation of how physical factors
104 affect macroinvertebrate community distribution.


105



106

107


Summer




108

109

Fall





113

Table XIV Environmental data used for CCA analysis per season.

Spring													Summer												
Sample	PO4	NH4	NO3	DO	pH	Temp	% Canopy	Substrate	Instream	RipZone	Riffle	Run	Sample	PO4	NH4	NO3	DO	pH	Temp	% Canopy	Substrate	Instream	RipZone	Riffle	Run
RRsp04	0.0238	0.436	0.5864	9	8	7.5	75	65	30	80	80	62.5	RRsu04	0	0.1271	0	8.9	7.5	16	75	70	45	80	37.5	
RRsp05	0	0	0	0	8.05	6.75	74	90	60	80	80	37.5	RRsu05	0.00175	0.11025	0	8.05	7.5	15.8	80	90	40	80	25	
CuyAsp04	0.390184	0.555267	1.3256	5.1	7.95	4.85	85.0	55.0	20.0	75.0	75.0	0.0	CuyAsu04	0.0024	0.122383	0	3.845	8.3	15.2	90.0	36.0	45.0	75.0	0.0	
CuyAsp05	0	0	0	7.45	8.3	6	84.0	85.0	30.0	75.0	75.0	25.0	CuyAsu05	0.02608	0.08205	0	4.87	8.3	16.01	97.0	40.0	40.0	70.0	0.0	
CuyDsp04	0.73855	1.002633	2.512567	6.45	8.2	5	90.0	80.0	30.0	85.0	85.0	50.0	CuyDsu04	0	0.052167	0	7.665	8.25	16	93.0	50.0	65.0	85.0	37.5	
CuyDsp05	0.001235	0	0	8.05	8	7	87.0	50.0	55.0	95.0	95.0	37.5	CuyDsu05	0.0174	0.10635	0	8.01	8.4	17.19	99.0	60.0	55.0	95.0	28.0	
CHsp04	0.273017	0.621133	0.954867	9.7	7.5	5	40.0	95.0	55.0	80.0	80.0	87.5	CHsu04	0	0	0	10.72	7.5	16.05	40.0	90.0	80.0	75.0	94.0	
CHsp05	0	0	0	10.2	7.15	8	41.0	80.0	35.0	65.0	65.0	87.5	CHsu05	0	0	0	11.014	7.6	15.8	45.0	50.0	40.0	60.0	62.5	
SGsp04	0.250383	0.533133	0.726	10.2	7.2	4.8	91.0	100.0	60.0	100.0	100.0	87.5	SGsu04	0.017717	0	0	10.905	7.3	12	96.0	100.0	70.0	100.0	75.0	
SGsp05	0	0	0	11.5	7	7.9	93.0	95.0	35.0	100.0	100.0	62.5	SGsu05	0.0425	0	0	11.09	7.4	15.7	96.0	93.0	70.0	90.0	75.0	
Grsp04	0	0	0	9.3	7.55	5.2	63	85	60	60	60	62.5	Grsu04	0.092684	0	0	12.9	7.6	13.4	65	60	60	60	75	
Grsp05	0	0	0	7.25	7	7	65	100	45	60	60	50	Grsu05	0	0	0	10.5	8.1	16.8	68	95	55	65	37.5	
Fall													Winter												
Sample	PO4	NH4	NO3	DO	pH	Temp	% Canopy	Substrate	Instream	RipZone	Riffle	Run	Sample	PO4	NH4	NO3	DO	pH	Temp	% Canopy	Substrate	Instream	RipZone	Riffle	Run
RRfa04	0	0	0	10.21	7.3	13.8	40	45	40	80	80	62.5	RRwt04	0.174635	0	0	10.5	8.15	6.2	15	95	40	80	50	
RRfa05	0	0	0	15.89	7.3	11.5	60	40	60	80	80	62.5	RRwt05	0.083	0	0	10.5	7.9	6.9	15	80	60	80	25	
CuyAfa04	0	0	0	4.305	8.25	13	60.0	35.0	55.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	CuyAwt04	0.009085	0	0	11.75	8.35	6.35	10.0	55.0	50.0	75.0	0.0	
CuyAfa05	0	0	0	3.89	7.84	15.23	50.0	34.0	35.0	46.0	46.0	35.0	CuyAwt05	0	0.603334	1.2587	10.4	7.75	8.5	10.0	80.0	55.0	75.0	25.0	
CuyDfa04	0	0	0	8.395	7.7	14	70.0	65.0	35.0	95.0	95.0	37.5	CuyDwt04	0.0077	0	0	12.4	7.6	6.05	15.0	85.0	30.0	95.0	37.5	
CuyDfa05	0	0	0	6.59	8.5	16.05	65.0	80.0	60.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	CuyDwt05	0	0.6098	1.301	10.4	8	8	10.0	60.0	45.0	95.0	37.5	
CHfa04	0	0	0	11.355	7.55	14.9	25.0	85.0	55.0	65.0	65.0	50.0	CHwt04	0	0	0	12.7	7.45	6.1	0.0	55.0	65.0	65.0	75.0	
CHfa05	0	0	0	9.8	8.14	12.8	20.0	90.0	35.0	60.0	60.0	100.0	CHwt05	0	0	0	12.15	7	5.9	30.0	100.0	35.0	100.0	62.5	
SGfa04	0	0	0	6.45	7.2	14.5	45.0	100.0	65.0	100.0	100.0	75.0	SGwt04	0	0	0	13.5	7.6	8	4.0	95.0	40.0	65.0	75.0	
SGfa05	0	0	0	11.45	8.2	12.9	70.0	95.0	65.0	100.0	100.0	87.5	SGwt05	0	1.5874	0.01287	13.8	7.5	8.1	28.0	100.0	35.0	100.0	75.0	
Grfa04	0	0	0	15.25	8.15	14.15	35	95	65	60	60	62.5	Grwt04	0	0	0	11.65	8.2	7.2	25	95	50	60	50	
Grfa05	0	0	0	10.56	7.5	14.8	50	65	45	20	20	25	Grwt05	0	0	0	10.2	8.3	6.1	28	100	30	60	62.5	

115 4.3.2.4 ANOVA and Functional Feeding Groups

116 One-way ANOVA was used to compare functional feeding groups (FFG) in the
117 macroinvertebrate community between sites. Two FFG, collector-gatherers ($p=0.032$)
118 and scrapers ($p=0.050$), (Table XV; figures IV.5 and IV.6) were significantly different
119 between the sites following a one-way ANOVA, Tukey's honestly significant difference
120 (HSD), and Bonferroni post hoc tests (See Table XVI). The analysis revealed that there
121 was a statistically significant difference between collector-gatherers in the Rocky River
122 and Cuyahoga CU2, as well as Cuyahoga CU2 and the Grand River. Scrapers were
123 significantly different between Rocky River and Stebbins Gulch.

124 Collector-gatherers feed on fine particulate organic matter (FPOM) that passes by in
125 flowing water or is found within bottom sediments. FPOM is organic material of $0.5\mu\text{m}$
126 – 1mm in size. It is mostly composed of feces, algae, plant and animal fragments, and
127 contains different types of bacteria. While collector-gatherers are dominantly omnivores,
128 scrapers are mainly herbivores. They remove algae, bacteria and fungus growing on the
129 surface of rocks, twigs and leaf debris, with specialized mouthparts that scrape the
130 surface of rocks and other sediment. Many of these organisms are flattened to better
131 attach to rocks while they feed in strong currents typical to headwater and low order
132 streams.

133 Stream order has a major influence on the distribution of aquatic macroinvertebrates.
134 According to the River Continuum Concept (Vannote, 1980), stream order will influence
135 FFG densities collected at each site. In theory, low and very high order streams have
136 more consumers than primary producers, while middle order streams have a larger

137 percentage of producers. These characteristics will in turn affect the type of FFGs
138 present. All streams within this study are categorized as low to middle order streams.

139 Summer samples from the Rocky River and spring samples from the Grand River,
140 stand out for the large number of collector-gatherers identified at each site. In the Rocky
141 River, a total of 479 collector-gathers were collected, 338 in the genus *Hydropsyche*.
142 Within the Rocky River, summer had the highest total number of collector gathers, with
143 255 specimens. In the Grand River, a total of 488 collector-gatherers were identified.
144 The highest number of specimens (n = 199) were collected in spring, most of which were
145 collected in spring 2005 (n = 172). Similar to the Rocky River, the Grand River had a
146 large number of *Hydropsyche* (n= 246) collected in both years. Cuyahoga site CU2 had
147 the lowest numbers of collector-gatherers throughout the two year collection period.
148 While total numbers were lower, Cuyahoga site CU2 had a higher diversity of collector-
149 gatherers. In addition to *Hydropsyche*, *Procloeon*, and Chironomidae, other collector-
150 gatherers identified included *Capnidae* (order Plecoptera), and *Culex* (order Diptera).
151 This fits the River Continuum Concept (RCC) which states that lower order streams may
152 have lower numbers of individual taxa, but higher taxa diversity. As a headwater stream,
153 the Cuyahoga River site CU2 is smaller and aquatic insects need to adapt to the harsh
154 conditions of colder temperatures, narrower channel widths, and swift currents.
155 Headwaters may freeze over during the winter and even dry up in the summer. These
156 conditions result in fewer individuals per taxa. Furthermore, in headwaters like
157 Cuyahoga CU2, FPOM is limited and provides fewer resources for large populations of
158 collector-gatherers, while mid-order streams like the Grand and Rocky Rivers have large
159 quantities of FPOM available and can support larger populations like *Hydropsyche*.

160 Surrounding land use is another factor determining available food resources and thus
161 the type of functional feeding groups found in these macroinvertebrate communities. As
162 previously discussed in chapter 3, all collecting locations are currently within protected
163 lands (i.e. Holden Arboretum, Cuyahoga Valley National Park, and Cleveland
164 Metroparks). However, as noted by Allan (2004) and the discussion in Chapter 3, not all
165 agricultural landscapes are identical. Historically, the Rocky River, Cuyahoga River and
166 the Grand River were predominately adjacent to row crop agriculture, while the Chagrin
167 River was historically surrounded by pastoral agriculture. Row crops tend to have more
168 negative effects on stream ecosystems than pastoral agriculture, but the type, amount, and
169 frequency of sediment load, nutrient input, riparian structure and size, and land use
170 modifications will influence the stream and be reflected by the macroinvertebrate
171 community. In streams impacted by agriculture, there would be a shift in functional
172 feeding groups. Filter –feeders and grazers increase in numbers in agricultural land cover
173 due to increase in nutrient input and loss of canopy cover. However, the loss of canopy
174 cover and other riparian vegetation leads to a decrease in shredders and collector-gathers
175 within the macroinvertebrate community.

176 The second functional feeding group of significance was scrapers. Scrapers, like
177 collector-gatherers also respond to change in stream orders and the environmental shifts
178 associated with it. Since scrapers feed on algae, bacteria, and fungi that grow on bottom
179 substrates, their presence is related to available stream depth, current velocity, and they
180 prosper best in mid-order streams. In low order streams, the narrow channel width, fast
181 current velocity, and low light penetration, provides few resources, while in higher order
182 streams, stream velocity and canopy cover decreases, but less light makes it to the

183 stream bed. Mid-order streams have optimal conditions for scrapers, with ideal stream
184 velocity, depth, and canopy cover and abundant food resources. Stebbins Gulch, a first
185 order stream with dense canopy cover, narrow channel width, and low light penetration,
186 provides few resources to scrapers. However Rocky River a third order stream was
187 more open and lower percent canopy cover that allowed more light, and thus more food
188 resources available for scrapers.

189 Most scrapers were collected in the Rocky River during the summer while the greatest
190 numbers in Stebbins Gulch were found in spring when canopy cover is low. The
191 dominant scraper collected in the Rocky River was *Stenelmis* (order Coleoptera) (n=
192 151), followed by three genera in the order Ephemeroptera: *Baetis* (n= 16), *Ephemerella*
193 (n =4) and *Paraleptophlebia* (n=2). The total number of specimens collected for the
194 remaining three seasons during the two year sample collection period were much lower –
195 79 scrapers in spring, 48 in fall, and 32 scrapers in winter. There were 90 scrapers
196 collected in Stebbins Gulch during the spring season with the dominant scrapers being
197 *Psephenus* (order Coleoptera; n = 38), *Baetis* (n=29), and *Stenelmis* (n=17).

Table XV Total Number taxa analyzed for Functional Feeding Groups analyzed in the ANOVA analysis.

Rocky								Cuyanoga CU1							
Collector-Gathers								Collector-gathers							
RR_SP04	RR_SP05	RR_SU04	RR_SU05	RR_FAL04	RR_FAL05	RR_WT04	RR_WT05	CU1_SP04	CU1_SP05	CU1_SU04	CU1_SU05	CU1_FAL04	CU1_FAL05	CU1_WT04	CU1_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	7	4	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	3	0	1	0
0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	59	21	210	20	17	2	9	1	4	9	20	25	24	23	30
12	7	20	0	16	21	10	5	10	31	20	24	20	44	113	22
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	14	6
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4	6	6	5	7
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	95	44	211	43	38	20	15	14	36	50	55	61	84	165	71

Collector-filters								Collector-Filters							
RR_SP04	RR_SP05	RR_SU04	RR_SU05	RR_FAL04	RR_FAL05	RR_WT04	RR_WT05	CU1_SP04	CU1_SP05	CU1_SU04	CU1_SU05	CU1_FAL04	CU1_FAL05	CU1_WT04	CU1_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	3	14	0	10	14	0	4	0	1	3	13	14	11	4	15
0	3	16	0	12	14	1	4	1	4	4	14	15	11	7	16

Scrapers								Scrapers							
RR_SP04	RR_SP05	RR_SU04	RR_SU05	RR_FAL04	RR_FAL05	RR_WT04	RR_WT05	CU1_SP04	CU1_SP05	CU1_SU04	CU1_SU05	CU1_FAL04	CU1_FAL05	CU1_WT04	CU1_WT05
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	2	12	4	4	2	1	7	2	0	9	6	8	11	11	12
0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	3	0	0
8	0	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	2	5	5
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	6
0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
7	0	0	0	8	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1
3	1	0	2	12	4	0	5	0	0	14	17	10	15	10	16
16	36	6	145	10	0	16	0	0	0	15	20	16	20	15	25
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
39	40	24	151	42	6	20	13	2	0	47	54	46	53	50	65

Shredders								Shredders							
RR_SP04	RR_SP05	RR_SU04	RR_SU05	RR_FAL04	RR_FAL05	RR_WT04	RR_WT05	CU1_SP04	CU1_SP05	CU1_SU04	CU1_SU05	CU1_FAL04	CU1_FAL05	CU1_WT04	CU1_WT05
4	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	3	2	2	2	1
1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	1
2	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	3	9	14	3	0	0	1	0	4	5	4	5	5	6	6
11	3	11	14	12	3	0	4	0	7	6	14	19	11	16	15

Predators								Predators							
RR_SP04	RR_SP05	RR_SU04	RR_SU05	RR_FAL04	RR_FAL05	RR_WT04	RR_WT05	CU1_SP04	CU1_SP05	CU1_SU04	CU1_SU05	CU1_FAL04	CU1_FAL05	CU1_WT04	CU1_WT05
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	0
0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
12	1	6	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	6	8	9	14	6	10
4	0	0	0	1	0	19	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	5
0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	1	1	0
0	0	1	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	0
0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	1
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
0	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3	4
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	0
5	0	0	0	2	0	12	0	0	1	0	3	5	1	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	7	15	12	25	2	36	3	6	17	20	23	40	29	24	25

Cuyahoga CU2							
Collector-gathers							
CU2_SP04	CU2_SP05	CU2_SU04	CU2_SU05	CU2_FAL04	CU2_FAL05	CU2_WT04	CU2_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	1	5	2	2	2	2
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
17	11	14	11	18	22	21	19
14	13	15	11	15	20	19	11
0	2	0	2	2	1	2	1
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	4	2	8	1	4	4
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
39	31	34	33	47	48	49	38

EB Chagrin							
Collector-gather							
CH_SP04	CH_SPO5	CH_SU04	CH_SU05	CH_FAL04	CH_FAL05	CH_WT04	CH_WT05
0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
0	9	0	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0
0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	22	20	12	18	24	4	0
5	19	21	0	10	14	26	15
0	3	2	0	1	1	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
0	0	5	1	3	0	6	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	54	51	15	33	46	43	17

Collector-Filters							
CU2_SP04	CU2_SP05	CU2_SU04	CU2_SU05	CU2_FAL04	CU2_FAL05	CU2_WT04	CU2_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	11	17	18	15	12	15	15
10	12	17	20	15	12	18	15

Collector-Filter							
CH_SP04	CH_SPO5	CH_SU04	CH_SU05	CH_FAL04	CH_FAL05	CH_WT04	CH_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	20	0	11	10	19	29
0	0	20	0	11	11	21	29

Scrapers							
CU2_SP04	CU2_SP05	CU2_SU04	CU2_SU05	CU2_FAL04	CU2_FAL05	CU2_WT04	CU2_WT05
0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1
11	12	11	11	10	13	16	14
0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0
3	2	1	5	3	5	9	1
7	0	1	1	0	0	1	5
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	5	0	1	0	1	0
11	14	11	15	11	10	11	14
9	12	4	20	10	15	20	20
0	0	1	1	2	0	0	6
41	43	34	57	38	45	58	61

Scraper							
CH_SP04	CH_SPO5	CH_SU04	CH_SU05	CH_FAL04	CH_FAL05	CH_WT04	CH_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	15	0	14	2	18	1
0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0
0	0	4	0	0	3	8	0
0	0	7	0	0	5	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	7	1	0	1	1	1	0
0	1	12	0	10	15	5	0
0	11	5	3	11	21	11	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	19	44	3	40	49	43	1

Shredders							
CU2_SP04	CU2_SP05	CU2_SU04	CU2_SU05	CU2_FAL04	CU2_FAL05	CU2_WT04	CU2_WT05
1	7	1	2	1	1	1	1
0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
3	1	0	0	4	2	5	1
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0
2	5	3	6	2	4	7	7
6	18	12	11	7	10	16	17

Shredder							
CH_SP04	CH_SPO5	CH_SU04	CH_SU05	CH_FAL04	CH_FAL05	CH_WT04	CH_WT05
3	4	7	0	1	2	3	7
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	1	0	7	0
0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	5	2	4	1	4	0
9	5	16	2	12	5	17	7

Predators							
CU2_SP04	CU2_SP05	CU2_SU04	CU2_SU05	CU2_FAL04	CU2_FAL05	CU2_WT04	CU2_WT05
2	1	2	1	0	1	0	0
1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1
0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
1	14	10	15	7	10	6	8
3	0	0	2	0	0	1	1
0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0
0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2
0	3	1	0	1	2	0	1
2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
4	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
0	2	0	3	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
0	1	1	0	2	1	1	1
2	2	1	4	1	1	2	5
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	3	1	4	3	4	3	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
21	34	23	34	18	25	21	27

Predator							
CH_SP04	CH_SPO5	CH_SU04	CH_SU05	CH_FAL04	CH_FAL05	CH_WT04	CH_WT05
0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0
0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0
0	0	2	0	4	1	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	6	1	7	4	4	3
2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	2	0	2	4	2	0
0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
0	0	2	0	2	4	2	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	1	3	5	0	1	2	1
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	11	0	0	4	5	1
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	5	34	7	24	22	16	5

Stebbins Gulch							
Collector-gather							
SG_SP04	SG_SP05	SG_SU04	SG_SU05	SG_FAL04	SG_FAL05	SG_WT04	SG_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	33	0	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	31	3	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	23	1	5	2	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
31	38	2	13	15	11	22	20
0	24	20	1	0	8	21	6
1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	118	54	23	22	19	46	27

Grand River							
Collector-gather							
GR_SP04	GR_SP05	GR_SU04	GR_SU05	GR_FAL04	GR_FAL05	GR_WT04	GR_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	19	0	0	1	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	3	0	0	0	1
20	90	50	35	5	6	26	14
2	47	44	3	15	17	14	18
2	9	0	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	0	1	0	0	6	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	173	94	61	20	23	53	34

Collector-Filter							
SG_SP04	SG_SP05	SG_SU04	SG_SU05	SG_FAL04	SG_FAL05	SG_WT04	SG_WT05
0	4	0	0	0	0	5	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	8	0	0	26	23	196	35
2	12	0	0	26	23	202	35

Collector-filter							
GR_SP04	GR_SP05	GR_SU04	GR_SU05	GR_FAL04	GR_FAL05	GR_WT04	GR_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
4	6	0	0	0	5	13	1
4	7	0	0	0	5	15	1

Scraper							
SG_SP04	SG_SP05	SG_SU04	SG_SU05	SG_FAL04	SG_FAL05	SG_WT04	SG_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	10	3	0	0	5	0	5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	4	0	0	0	7	2	0
6	32	9	8	2	7	1	9
6	11	6	12	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33	57	29	20	2	12	9	16

Scraper							
GR_SP04	GR_SP05	GR_SU04	GR_SU05	GR_FAL04	GR_FAL05	GR_WT04	GR_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	3	15	5	8	10	12	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	12	0	0	10	4	0	0
8	5	1	38	3	2	14	5
11	2	0	0	0	0	20	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35	22	20	43	21	16	52	8

Shredder							
SG_SP04	SG_SP05	SG_SU04	SG_SU05	SG_FAL04	SG_FAL05	SG_WT04	SG_WT05
11	105	0	0	0	3	18	10
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	26	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
4	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	1	0	1	0	2	8
29	106	2	1	7	4	46	18

Shredder							
GR_SP04	GR_SP05	GR_SU04	GR_SU05	GR_FAL04	GR_FAL05	GR_WT04	GR_WT05
1	54	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	11	0	0	0	1	0
4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	2	2	5	2
5	54	14	0	3	3	11	3

Predator							
SG_SP04	SG_SP05	SG_SU04	SG_SU05	SG_FAL04	SG_FAL05	SG_WT04	SG_WT05
0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
9	1	0	0	1	9	0	1
0	13	0	0	0	0	14	2
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	4	1	0	1	18	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
40	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
54	24	9	7	1	11	36	3

Predator							
GR_SP04	GR_SP05	GR_SU04	GR_SU05	GR_FAL04	GR_FAL05	GR_WT04	GR_WT05
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
15	0	3	3	1	3	7	5
0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	1	1	5	2
0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	31	0	8	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
25	38	5	12	4	6	27	9

201


Table XVI ANOVA descriptive data between seasonal variation and collecting sites for functional feeding groups. **Collector-gathers and Scrapers were significantly different among the six collecting sites.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
collector-gather	Between Groups	192.880	5	38.576	2.737	.031
	Within Groups	591.958	42	14.094		
	Total	784.838	47			
collector-filter	Between Groups	13.656	5	2.731	1.211	.321
	Within Groups	94.687	42	2.254		
	Total	108.343	47			
scraper	Between Groups	58.153	5	11.631	2.424	.051
	Within Groups	201.539	42	4.799		
	Total	259.692	47			
shredder	Between Groups	6.396	5	1.279	1.042	.406
	Within Groups	51.540	42	1.227		
	Total	57.936	47			
predator	Between Groups	5.442	5	1.088	1.358	.259
	Within Groups	33.659	42	.801		
	Total	39.100	47			

202


203

204 Figure IV.5 ANOVA Analysis Collector-gathers. Based on results from the ANOVA
 205 analysis collector-gathers (c-g) had a statistically significant difference both between
 206 Rocky River and Cuyahoga site CU2) as well as Cuyahoga siteCU2 and Grand River.



207

208 Figure IV.6 ANOVA Analysis of Scrapers. Based on results from the ANOVA analysis
 209 scrapers (scr) were found to be statistically significantly different between Rocky River
 210 and Stebbins Gulch (StG)



211

212 **4.4 Synthesis**

213 **4.4.1 *Seasonal Perspective***

214 Seasonal variation in macroinvertebrate communities result from varied life history
 215 differences in growth, development, and reproduction. Many macroinvertebrate
 216 communities exhibit seasonal life cycles that are timed to take advantage of optimal
 217 environmental conditions or to avoid sub-optimal conditions (Wise, 1980; Beche et al.,
 218 2006; and Johnson et al., 2012). Biotic variables are often affected by abiotic factors
 219 including water temperature, water velocity, food availability, dissolved oxygen

220 concentrations and competition which in turn affect population structure and size,
221 (Hilsenhoff, 1988; Stark and Phillip 2009). The interaction of macroinvertebrate
222 communities is dynamic and displays differently from season to season, resulting in a
223 wide range of life history strategies. Therefore, year round macroinvertebrate sampling
224 occurring in the same stream and in the same reach often reveals substantial variation in
225 the type and abundance of taxa.

226 As shown through the year-round sampling, seasonal variation in biological and
227 physical variables can be a major confounding factor affecting macroinvertebrate
228 assessment data. Throughout the course of this study, samples collected from one season
229 to another appeared to contradict each other due to dramatic changes in community
230 composition which was not always due to observable changes in the environment.

231 Most comparative seasonal studies have been conducted during dry periods and/or
232 periods of increased hydrologic inputs, such as increased precipitation or urban-based
233 runoff. Few studies have addressed temporal variations between all seasons (spring,
234 summer, winter, and fall) in a humid continental climate (Koppen Climate Classification
235 Dfa., 2013). Two studies that have looked at seasonal differences are Reece et al., 2001
236 and Zhang et al. 2012, both of which used all four seasons and found a statistically
237 significant relationship between taxa diversity and community structure at different times
238 of year. In addition, both studies concluded that the fall season is the time of the year
239 with the richest diversity of taxa.

240 As with Reece et al. 2001 and Zhang et al. 2012, the results of this research revealed
241 seasonal variation; with some seasons being more diverse than others. However, the
242 diversity was not consistent from site to site. An examination of seasonal diversity on a

243 site-by-site basis revealed that for two of the six collection sites, spring was the most
244 diverse season, two other collection sites revealed that fall was the most diverse season
245 and finally, in the remaining two sites, winter was the most diverse season. As a result,
246 summer – the season in which most macroinvertebrate studies are conducted in northeast
247 Ohio – was the only season that did not have the greatest seasonal diversity among
248 collection sites.

249 One possible explanation for inconsistencies in seasonal results is the lack of a
250 predictive flow regime from season to season. This is common in lower order streams
251 (most streams sites within this study are located in headwaters or low order streams),
252 especially in the spring and summer, when stream velocity can be very fast and forceful
253 as a result of increased runoff from precipitation and snow melt, along with sudden, high
254 precipitation, spring storm events. High rates of stream flow often cause an increase in
255 the downstream migration of macroinvertebrates; making it very difficult to estimate true
256 population size. This makes accurate population estimation even more problematic as
257 certain taxa remove themselves from the water column and move into the hyporehic zone
258 – the region beneath and adjacent to the streambed where ground water and surface water
259 mix. A final phenomenon that affects community estimates is the fact that some
260 macroinvertebrate taxa avoid irregular stream flow altogether by either going through
261 diapause or emergence as terrestrial adults.

262 ***4.4.2 Land Use Perspective***

263 Landscape perspective is also important in understanding the distribution of
264 macroinvertebrates. Biogeographers have formalized reasons for macroinvertebrate
265 distribution by using two approaches, ecological distribution and/or historical distribution

266 (Bonada et al., 2009). Ecological distribution focuses on contemporary environmental
267 factors and small spatial scales while historical distribution is centered upon historical
268 environmental factors and their impact on a larger scale (Wiens and Donoghue, 2004;
269 Bonada et al., 2009). Although few studies have addressed both perspectives together,
270 there is considerable evidence for the contribution of each to current spatial patterns of
271 organisms and the evolutionary processes that have occurred over distinct time-scales
272 (Vargas et al., 1998; Qian, 2008).

273 Current biodiversity and organism distribution is the result of both contemporary and
274 historic environmental conditions. Muto et al. (2011) suggested that in order to maintain
275 diversity among macroinvertebrate communities, diversity must also be maintained
276 among riparian vegetation. Thus, the greater riparian zone vegetation variation, the
277 greater variation of environmental factors. This simplified but significant factor is an
278 important consideration for riparian management, particularly in areas of reforestation
279 and forested wetland restoration. Several federal, state, and regional organizations that
280 have executed riparian management and restoration plans have found themselves
281 hindered by budget restrictions and political issues, leading to single (or very limited)
282 species plantings. While the effort to return these regions to pre-disturbance conditions is
283 a positive step, the lack of variation limits the diversity of macroinvertebrates capable of
284 thriving in the stream system.

285 The comparison of land use data, particularly historical versus contemporary data,
286 excludes larger spatial factors in exchange for static temporal data – only providing a
287 snapshot of points in time. The evaluation of these data carries an assumption that
288 locations which differ in land use are similar in all other respects and change is

289 commonly viewed as progressive over time. This methodology ignores the immediate
290 impact that a transition in land use can have, such as conversion from natural to
291 developed land (Herlihy et al., 1998; Allan, 2004). Investigators are increasingly
292 recognizing that human actions at the landscape scale are a principle threat to the
293 ecological integrity of river ecosystems, impacting habitat, water quality, and biota via
294 numerous, and complex, pathways. In addition to direct influences, land use interacts
295 with other anthropogenic stressors that affect the health of stream ecosystems; such as
296 climate change and invasive species. The increase in studies on relationships between
297 land use and stream condition have been driven by several developments. First is the
298 widespread recognition of the extent and significance of change in land use and land
299 cover over a greater area and in a number of different regions worldwide. Secondly,
300 conceptual and methodological advances in landscape ecology, combined with readily
301 available land use/land cover data, has changed the way aquatic ecosystems are studied.
302 Finally, the use of stream health indicators to assess status and trends in rivers (Allan,
303 2004) has become more prevalent.

304 Whereas these advances are important, interpreting a particular land use variable as
305 the primary driver of stream condition must be used with caution (Herlihy et al., 1998).
306 It is well known that streams draining agricultural lands support less diverse insect
307 populations, fewer fish taxa, and fewer pollution intolerant species. Researchers have
308 found that row crops and other forms of intensive cultivation strongly impact stream
309 conditions, but the influence of pasture agriculture may be less intense than previously
310 thought (Meador and Goldstein, 2003; Allan 2004). Overland flow commonly occurs in
311 agricultural lands during extreme storm events due to enhanced drainage ditches, limited

312 subsurface drainage, decrease bank stability, loss of riparian zone, and wetland areas.
313 High flows can eliminate stream taxa if it occurs during vulnerable times in the life cycle
314 or with a frequency that selects for resistant and rapidly dispersing species.

315 *4.4.2.1 Past Land use Evaluation*

316 The National Land Cover Database (NLCD) provides spatial reference and descriptive
317 data for characteristics of the land surface. Using the most recent data available for this
318 study, 2001 data, and the dominant land cover for all six collecting sites was
319 characterized by deciduous forest. In the Rocky River, the dominant land cover was
320 deciduous forest along with forested wetlands, however, low to medium intensity human
321 development and cultivated crops were also present around the stream collection site.
322 Land cover for the two collection sites in the Cuyahoga River, site CU1 and site CU2,
323 changed little from 1992 to 2001 but, there was an increase in low intensity development
324 and developed open space, i.e. parking lots and playgrounds. The Chagrin River East
325 Branch site remained partially deciduous forest but 2001 data revealed small patches of
326 evergreen trees, medium density levels of development, and much larger areas of pasture
327 and hay fields than those present in the early 1990s. Land use surrounding Stebbins
328 Gulch is similar to that of the Chagrin River East Branch. However, human populations
329 are lower, there are more pasture and hayfields, and more open land not used for
330 anthropogenic purposes. The final collection site, the Grand River, revealed a distinct
331 transition from predominantly deciduous forest to pasture and hayfields, along with
332 cultivated crops.

333 Studies of stream assemblage recovery after short-term catastrophic disturbances (e.g.
334 logging, construction, flooding, and point-source pollution) have often shown relatively

335 rapid recovery of biotic communities. However, high impact or sustained anthropogenic
336 disturbance, such as agriculture, may profoundly alter biotic communities; the effects of
337 which may be persistent over time. These effects, termed legacy land use effects, are the
338 consequence of disturbance that continues to influence ecological systems long after the
339 initial disturbance (Harding et al. 1998, Allan 2004). Legacy land use is one explanation
340 for why currently forested streams have macroinvertebrate assemblages that are more
341 similar to agricultural regions than those of forested areas (Harding et al. 1998).

342 Harding et al. (1998) found that large-scale and long-term agriculture disturbances in a
343 watershed limit the recovery of macroinvertebrate diversity many decades later. The
344 authors compared two streams that were both forested streams at the time of the
345 research,. However, one of the two streams had only been forested since 1950, (i.e.
346 previously agriculture) while the other, according to historical documentation, had never
347 been used for any other purpose. Their research found that the reforested stream had a
348 macroinvertebrate assemblage similar to those in current agricultural streams and were
349 dominated by pollution tolerant taxa even though the stream had been free of agriculture
350 for over forty years. Additionally, the recovery time for any associated geomorphic
351 alterations is especially long, particularly when compared to changes in land use. As a
352 result, stream habitat and channel shape may never reach equilibrium with ongoing
353 development (Brierley et al. 1999). Although all collecting sites within this study were
354 under some form of federal, state, or regional protection, no site can be considered
355 pristine. Major storm events were observed at several sites during the collecting years
356 (i.e. Cuyahoga River site A and Grand River) which caused changes in hydrology and
357 substrate that devastated the macroinvertebrate communities at those sites. Had the

358 streams remained in pristine conditions and not gone through transitions of agriculture in
359 their past, the overall affects may not have brought about such dramatic changes to the
360 biota.

361 Maloney et al. (2008), using small heterotrophic streams, suggested that
362 anthropogenic effects may influence in-stream conditions for centuries to millennia,
363 much long in the smaller, lower order streams than in higher order streams, because
364 heterotrophic streams, are more dependent on allochthonous material. Thus for lower
365 order streams, not only is complete recovery dependent on direct in-stream interactions
366 and riparian zone vegetation, but also age and decomposition rate of the vegetation.
367 Maloney et al. (2008) illustrated the significance of in-stream coarse woody debris and
368 how it helps to stabilizes stream channels (especially important in low order streams) and
369 provide a habitat for macroinvertebrate communities. However, coarse woody debris
370 results from inputs by surrounding vegetation decades to centuries old. Thus the
371 researchers suggest that before complete stream recovery success should be
372 acknowledge, not only should the vegetation present be accounted for, but also the rate at
373 which the vegetation decomposes and becomes an available food resource (Maloney et
374 al. 2008; Entekin et al., 2009).

375 Anthropogenic activities in and around watersheds in northeast Ohio consistently are
376 changing the landscape and the habitat of the streams within them. Sedimentation,
377 hydrologic alteration, nutrient enrichment, contamination, and forest clear-cutting, among
378 other activities, alter stream ecosystems and their biotic dynamics. Often the relationship
379 between anthropogenic land use and the ecological integrity of streams are complicated
380 by co-variation between anthropogenic and natural gradients and uncertainties

381 concerning the importance of legacies and thresholds. Furthermore, land use, in addition
382 to flight ability and emergence success, has the potential to affect the overall community
383 structure of macroinvertebrates (i.e. *Allocapnia recta*) at the collection sites. If
384 macroinvertebrate communities become isolated due to the aforementioned effects, gene
385 flow could be slowed or halted completely due to isolation, leading to biotic homogeneity
386 (Olden, 2004).

387 With so much variation between stream sites, and the complicated relationship of
388 innumerable variables within sites, developing a complete data set necessarily requires
389 consistent sampling over an extended period of time. Traditionally, the summer season is
390 thought to be the best time for optimizing time, space, and money to monitor stream
391 health and macroinvertebrates. While this spatially and temporally constrained
392 methodology has been thought adequate for many decades, the prevailing wisdom is
393 beginning to change. Several recent studies have shown that the autumn or fall season is
394 the best time of year for accurately estimating population size (Zhang et al., 2012). Other
395 studies that may best answer the scientific question(s) being studied by winter collection
396 are not conducted due to less than hospitable weather, semester intercession, lack of
397 student assistance, fear of personal safety around iced-over streams, etc. A new way of
398 thinking in methodological development must occur, as this study has revealed, and
399 implement year-round sampling over an extended period of time to effectively track
400 macroinvertebrate community trends.

401 Furthermore, incorporating a legacy land use perspective into ecological studies may
402 help to elucidate potential mechanisms explaining outlier data. Such a perspective might
403 provide insight into subtle biological interactions and their associations with regional

404 environmental conditions, as well as aid in identification of reference conditions for
405 studies of biotic integrity and restoration. Without quantitatively rigorous approaches
406 designed to assess the potential influence of historical disturbance on contemporary
407 measures, one can only offer hypothetical explanations for high levels of habitat
408 alteration in certain streams, and underestimate the legacy effects on contemporary
409 biological data (Maloney et al., 2008). Fortunately, even though most studies today
410 investigate biotic integrity and restoration success, disturbance levels typically are based
411 on contemporary land use and watershed conditions, however, in some cases it may not
412 be too difficult to go back in time with historic records to reconsider current stream
413 conditions based on prior land use which could manifest as a measurable legacy effect.
414

415 **REFERENCES**

- 416 Allan, JD. 2004. Landscapes and Riverscapes: The influence of land use on stream
417 ecosystems. *Annual Review Ecological, Evolution, and Systematics*. 35: 257-284.
418
- 419 Beche, L., McElravy, E., and Resh, V. 2006. Long-term seasonal variation in the
420 biological traits of benthic macroinvertebrates in two Mediterranean-climate
421 streams in California, USA. *Freshwater Biology*. 51, 56-75.
422
- 423 Bonada, N., Murria, C., Zamora-Munoz, C. El Alami, M., Poguet, JM., Punti, T.,
424 Moreno, JL., Bennas, N., Alba-Tercedor, J., Ribera, C., and Prat, N. 2009. Using
425 community and population approaches to understand how contemporary and
426 historical factors have shaped species distribution in river ecosystems. *Global
427 Ecology and Biogeography*. 18: 202-213
428
- 429 Brierley GJ., Cohen, T., Fryirs K., Brook, A. 1999. Post-European changes to the fluvial
430 geomorphology of Bega catchment, Australia: implications for river ecology.
431 *Freshwater Biology*. 41: 839-848.
432
- 433 Chao, M., Shi, Y., Quan, W., Shen, X., An, C. Yuan, Q., and Haung, H. 2012.
434 Distribution of macroinvertebrates in relation to environmental variables across
435 the Yantze River Estuary, China. *Journal of Coastal Research*. 1008-1019.
436
- 437 Enterkin, SA., Tank, JL., Rosi, Marshall, EJ., Hoellein, TJ., and Lamberti, GA. 2009.
438 Response of secondary production by macroinvertebrates to large wood addition
439 in three Michigan streams. *Freshwater Biology*. 54: 1741-1758.
440
- 441 Gerth, WJ., Herlihy, AT., and Sifneos, JC. 2013. Large-scale macroinvertebrate
442 assemblage patterns from least disturbed Wadeable stream sites across the 48
443 contiguous US states. *Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems*. 408.
444 1-20.
445
- 446 Harding, JS., Benfield, EF., Bolstad, PV., Helfman, GS., Jones, EBD. 1998. Stream
447 Diversity: The ghost of land use past. *Proceedings of the National Academy of
448 Science*. 95: 14843-14847.
449
- 450 Herlihy, A., Stoddard, JL., and Johnson, CB. 1998. The relationship between stream
451 chemistry and watershed land cover data in the Mid-Atlantic region, USA. *Water
452 Air Soil Pollution* 105: 377-386.
453
- 454 Hilsenhoff, WL. 1988. Rapid field assessment of organic pollution with a family-level
455 biotic index. *Journal of North American Benthological Society*. 7: 65-78
456
- 457 Hynes, HBN. (1970) The ecology of running water. University of Toronto Press,
458 Toronto, Canada.
459

- 460 Johnson, RC., Smith, DP., and McMichael, C. 2012. Scale dependence in relating land
461 use/cover to stream macroinvertebrate communities in the Central Appalachian
462 Mountains, USA. *Gisience and Remote Sensing*. 49. 53-70.
463
- 464 Kim, DW., Cho, W., Chon, T. 2013. Self-organizing map and species abundance
465 distribution of stream benthic macroinvertebrates in revealing community patterns
466 in different seasons. *Ecological Informatics*. 17. 14-29.
467
- 468 Maloney, KO., Feminella, JW., Mitchell, RM., Miller, SA., Mulholland, PJ., and Houser,
469 JN. 2008. Landuse legacies and small streams: identifying relationships between
470 historical land use and contemporary stream conditions. *Journal of North
471 American Benthological Society*. 27: 280-294.
472
- 473 McCafferty, WP. 1983. *Aquatic Entomology: The Fisherman's and Ecologist's
474 Illustrated Guide to Insects And Their Relatives* 1st Edition. Blacksburg, VA.
475 Jones and Bartlett Learning.
476
- 477 McLeod, R. 17 February 2006. Bug Guide *Bugguide.net* Iowa State University
478 Entomology. Retrieved 1 April 2014, [http//bugguide.net](http://bugguide.net).
479
- 480 Meador, MR. and Goldstein, RM. 2003. Assessing water quality at large geographic
481 scales: regulations among land use, water physicochemistry, riparian conditions,
482 and fish community structure. *Environmental Management* 31: 504-517.
483
- 484 Merrit, RW. and Cummings, KW. 1995. *Aquatic Insects of North American*. 3rd Ed.
485 Dubuque, IA, Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.
486
- 487 Muto, EA., Kreutzweiser, DP., and Sibley, PK. 2011. Over-winter decomposition and
488 associated macroinvertebrate communities of three deciduous leaf species in
489 forest streams on Canadian Boreal Shield. *Hydrobiologia*. 658: 111-126.
490
- 491 Olden, JD. 2006. Biotic heterogeneity: a new research agenda for conservational
492 biology. *Journal of Biogeography*. 33: 2027-2039.
493
- 494 Peckarsky, BL., Fraissinet, PR., Penton, MA., and Conklin, Jr., DJ. 1990. *Freshwater
495 Macroinvertebrates of Northeastern North America*. Ithaca, NY. Cornell
496 University Press.
497
- 498 Reece, PF., Reynoldson, TB., Richardson, JS., and Rosenberg, DM. 2001. Implications
499 of seasonal variation for biomonitoring with predictive models in the Fraser River
500 Catchment, British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic
501 Sciences*. 58: 1411-1418.
502
- 503 Soulsby, C., Malcom, R., Gibbins, C., Dilks, C. 2001. Seasonal water quality trends and
504 biological responses in four streams in Cairngorm Mountains, Scotland.
505 *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*. 5: 433-450.

506
507 Spoka, F, Velek, H., Bulankova, E., and Krno, I. (2006) Influences of seasonal variation
508 on bioassessment of streams using macroinvertebrates. *Hydrobiologia*.566, 543-
509 555.
510
511 Stark, JD., and Phillips, N. 2009. Seasonal variability in the macroinvertebrate
512 community index: are seasonal correction factors required? *New Zealand Journal*
513 *of Marine and Freshwater Research*. 43: 867-882.
514
515 Ter Braak, CJF. and Smilauer, P. 2002. *CANOCO Reference Manual and CanoDraw for*
516 *Windows User's Guide: Software for Canonical Community Ordination (version*
517 *4.5)*. Ithaca, NY. Microcomputer Power.
518
519 Thorp, JH. and Covich, AP. 2001. *Ecology and Classification of North American*
520 *Freshwater Invertebrates*. 2nd Ed. Waltham, MA. Academic Press.
521
522 Usseglio-Polatera, P., Bournaud, M., Richoux, P., and Tachet, H. (2000) Biological and
523 ecological traits of benthic freshwater macroinvertebrates: relationships and
524 definitions of groups with similar traits. *Freshwater Biology*. 43, 175-205.
525
526 Vannote, RL. Minshall GW., Cummins, KW., Sedell JR., and Cushing CE. 1980. River
527 continuum concept. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 37:
528 130-137.
529
530 Vargas, JM., Real, R., and Guerrero, JC. 1998. Biogeographical regions of the Iberian
531 peninsula on freshwater fish and amphibian distribution. *Ecography*. 21: 371-382.
532
533 Voshell, Jr. JR. 2002. *A Guide to Common Freshwater Invertebrates of North America*.
534 1st Ed. Grainville, OH., McDonald and Woodward Publishing Company.
535
536 Wiens, JJ. and Donoghue, MJ. 2004. Historical biogeography, ecology, and species
537 richness. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*. 19: 639-644.
538
539 Winemiller, K., Flecker, A., and Hoeinghaus, D. 2010. Patch dynamics and
540 environmental heterogeneity in lotic ecosystems. 1, 84-99.
541 *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*. 15: 321-328.
542
543 Wise, EJ. 1980. Seasonal disturbance and life histories of Ephemeroptera in north-
544 Umbian River. *Freshwater Biology*. 10:101-111.
545
546 Zhang, Y. Wang, B., Han, M., and Wang, L. 2012. Relationships between the seasonal
547 variations of macroinvertebrates, and land uses for biomonitoring in the Xitiaoxi
548 River Watershed, China. *International Review of Hydrobiology*. 97: 184-199.
549 Chapter V Extended Comprehensive Summaries

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

CHAPTER V

559

CONCLUSION AND SYNTHESIS

560

5.1 Generalization

561

The worldwide loss of biodiversity, coupled with both a scientific and sociocultural

562

need to prevent continuing losses, has made biodiversity a “hot topic” for researchers. A

563

combined methodological integration of entomology, genetics, hydrology, and the

564

collective results of my work have led to a better, holistic understanding of four stream

565

systems in Northeastern Ohio; successfully demonstrating the importance of approaching

566

ecology from a multidisciplinary perspective.

567

Rivers are an integral part of ecosystems, providing food, energy, habitat, organismal

568

transportation, and drinking water. In addition, they serve a valuable role in human

569

economic growth, commerce, transportation, irrigation, and waste disposal. It comes as

570

no surprise that the interrelationship of humans and riverine systems has resulted in long

571

and intense impacts. Under the influence of humans, rivers have been channelized,

572

poisoned, fed with sewage and non-native fish, dammed, and drawn from to the point of

573 extinction. However, because of their rapid turnover and resilience, rivers have, in some
574 cases, the capacity for recovery and renewal.

575 **5.2 Summary of Plecoptera Dispersal and Species Comparison**

576 Earlier chapters of my research revealed how adult terrestrial emergence period and
577 flight capabilities have significant effects over the current population size and genetic
578 differentiation of *Allocapnia recta* versus *Leuctra tenuis* between the Chagrin and the
579 Grand Rivers. The two species of plecopteran were chose for this research because of
580 their differences in wing structure and opposing seasonal emergence as terrestrial adults.
581 Differences in wing structure and terrestrial emergence periods were designations made
582 for analyzing the potential genetic dispersal of macroinvertebrates. The culmination of
583 the research revealed that specimens of *A. recta* were not likely to fly from one watershed
584 to another due to their poorly developed wing structure and winter emergence as
585 terrestrial adults. In contrast, *L. tenuis* is a strong flying stonefly with well-developed
586 wings, and a summertime emergence. For their comparison the results revealed
587 statistically significant genetic differences between *A. recta* populations in the Chagrin
588 River compared to the Grand River, while there was no statistically significant difference
589 between the *L. tenuis* populations in the same rivers.

590 Four unique *A. recta* haplotypes were identified in the Chagrin River and three unique
591 haplotypes were collected in the Grand River. The two most common haplotypes,
592 haplotypes 1 and 2, were collected in both the Chagrin River and Grand River. The
593 presence of the haplotypes was significant and indicated that although these streams were
594 once connected, there has been sufficient time and land cover change– both natural and

595 anthropogenic, for the two populations to become isolated, succumbing to different
596 environmental factors, and mutate into distinctly different haplotypes.

597 *Leuctra tenuis* showed insignificant genetic differences among the populations in the
598 Chagrin River and the Grand River. Two haplotypes were collected in the Chagrin River
599 and three haplotypes were collected in the Grand River. The two most common
600 haplotypes, haplotypes 1 and 2, were collected in both watersheds. The results indicate
601 that *L. tenuis* samples are not genetically isolated between the two watersheds and, as
602 such, are able to migrate back and forth between the two watersheds.

603 Expanding my study on flight capability and genetic differentiation, *A. recta* samples
604 were further employed to investigate dispersal patterns. By adding two additional
605 watersheds, the Rocky River and the Cuyahoga River, to the previously studied Chagrin
606 and Grand Rivers, and utilizing a larger sample size, enabled me to further investigate
607 larger and farther populations of *A. recta* from each other in Northeast Ohio. Distance
608 was hypothesized to be the driving force in haplotype differences between sites. Sites
609 that were geographically closer to each other would have similar haplotypes, and sites
610 with greater distance between them would share little to no haplotypes between them.
611 However, this hypothesis was proven to be false; overland distance between the
612 watersheds was not a significant contributor to genetic differences in *A. recta*
613 populations. Data analysis revealed 19 different haplotypes among the sites, with
614 haplotypes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 19 being the most common among all sites; with haplotypes 3,
615 4, and 19 being the most abundant. Most of the remaining fourteen haplotypes were
616 either unique to a particular watershed or limited to one or two examples of each. Even
617 between the most common haplotypes, no haplotype was identified in all four

618 watersheds. These findings led to recognizing alternative reasons for the current genetic
619 distribution of *A. recta* populations. Some of the alternative factors affecting genetic
620 diversity and isolation, as discussed in chapter three are a combination of post-glacial
621 migration, land fragmentation, and immediate anthropogenic effects.

622 **5.3 Macroinvertebrate Community Structure**

623 Chapter 4 summarized the seasonal collection of macroinvertebrates at six sites in
624 Northeast Ohio, within the aforementioned four watersheds. Each site was analyzed by
625 using both physical and biological factors for a complete analysis of both the lotic system
626 and the macroinvertebrate community structure from January 2004 until December 2005.
627 Seasonal variation in aquatic macroinvertebrate communities result from a myriad of life
628 cycle differences among the community's constituent taxa, including growth,
629 development, and voltinism. Macroinvertebrate populations exhibit seasonal life cycles
630 that are timed to take advantage of optimal environmental conditions or avoid
631 unfavorable environmental variables like temperature, hydrological cycle, and food
632 availability (Johnson et al. 2012).A complete analysis of seasonality was performed when
633 evaluating the current macroinvertebrate distribution in streams. No single season could
634 be defined as the most diverse season for all sites and both collection years. However, in
635 reviewing the totality of the results, certain conclusions can be drawn. To begin,
636 although the most diverse season differed from site to site, year 2004 collections
637 experienced greater fluctuations than year 2005. Five out of eight times, 2004 collections
638 were the most diverse and, was the least diverse year three out of eight times, illustrating
639 the dramatic dynamics that occur within a year of a macroinvertebrate. One of the most
640 remarkable seasonal dynamics is the 100-year storm event in the Cuyahoga site CU1

641 during the summer of 2003, which still had an overall effect of macroinvertebrate
642 community structure three to six months later. . While dynamic in its own right, 2005
643 maintained moderate diversity throughout the collection period; however, the Grand
644 River was the one exception. During the summer of 2005, the Grand River experienced a
645 50-year storm event during the summer, that like Cuyahoga site CU1, changed the stream
646 substrate, and species diversity was lowered compared to the previous collecting periods.
647 Looking at season specific summary data, the fall and winter seasons were the most
648 diverse two of eight seasonal sampling periods, collectively, while spring and summer
649 seasons were the most diverse only once each between the seasonal sampling periods.

650 Legacy land use was also reviewed within chapter 4 to better understand not only the
651 anthropogenic effects of land use, but how long those effects endure. All six collecting
652 sites included in this research are currently under some form of land use protection and
653 management; governed by agencies such as the Cleveland Metroparks, the Cuyahoga
654 National Forest, and Holden Arboretum. However, land management practices have not
655 always been employed at the sites. Information gathered from United States Geological
656 Survey (USGS) maps and landholder survey records revealed that, historically, most sites
657 were agricultural. The agricultural activities ranged from pastoral to row crops, both of
658 which are known to negatively impact nearby streams, and the macroinvertebrate
659 community structure reveals continued negative impacts by these lingering legacy land
660 use effects.

661 **5.4 Education**

662 Throughout the course of any research project, many lessons will be learned that cause
663 the researcher(s) to think differently about scientific phenomenon. Some of these lessons

664 become reasonable suggestions that should be shared toward creating dialogue and more
665 efficient research in the future. This research is no exception. Perhaps the most seminal
666 lesson learned during the course of this research is that not every detriment to a stream is
667 human related, rather, a combination of anthropogenic and natural phenomenon (i.e.,
668 storm events and climate change).

669 While it is understood that not every case of polluted land and water is anthropogenic
670 in nature, we tend to assume that if there is corruption in nature it must be due to humans.
671 This research was started with that very assumption in mind and it was quickly
672 withdrawn after a 100-year storm event in 2003. This work set out to collect plecopteran
673 samples in four watersheds and analyze their genetic distribution within and between
674 adjacent watersheds. To get a general idea of their numbers and distribution,
675 plecopterans were collected at Cuyahoga River CU1, as well as the other sites in this
676 work, during the winter and summer of 2003 to determine if adequate sample sizes were
677 present. Based on the data collected at the sites, *Leuctra tenuis* and *Allocapnia recta*
678 numbers were both sufficient to proceed with this work. However, as previously
679 mentioned the 100-year storm event that occurred in August of 2003 had a major impact
680 on Cuyahoga River CU1. An upstream foot bridge was pushed downstream destroying
681 large sections of the stream bank vegetation and deposited large volumes of clay over the
682 gravel and cobble substrate. Based on continued collections at Cuyahoga River Site CU1
683 following the storm event, the *A. recta* and especially, *L. tenuis* population sizes
684 decreased significantly and had not yet recovered by the end of the collecting period for
685 this research (i.e. December 2005). Without sufficient sample sizes for the remainder of
686 the research, the scope and direction of the work changed significantly. The storm served

687 as a valuable reminder of the strength and fortitude of natural impacts on stream systems,
688 and that humans are not always the primary source of land and water disturbance.

689 A second important lesson is how invaluable year round sampling of
690 macroinvertebrates is for assessing stream health. Traditionally, summer is the most
691 common time of year for collecting macroinvertebrate samples. While convenient and
692 hospitable during the summer months, this research demonstrates that summer is not the
693 best season for assessing the population structure of macroinvertebrates in a lotic system.
694 In fact, scientists that only collect once a year are clearly underestimating the population
695 size. As indicated by the results of chapter 4 (and partially chapter 2, and Chapter 3),
696 summer sampling data alone restricts measures of diversity and community structure;
697 particularly with fall and winter samplings yielding greater sample numbers and
698 indicating much greater diversity. Not only should stream ecologists design long-term
699 projects that cover a span of several years, but they should also sample
700 macroinvertebrates seasonally in temperate forests.

701 A final lesson, building on year-round collecting, is the particular importance of
702 winter sampling. It is often difficult for researchers in a temperate continental climate to
703 find the self-motivation, and student assistants, to collect during the less than hospitable
704 winter season. In addition, the safety of researchers and assistants during the icy winter
705 season is a valid and important concern. However, if stream ecologists and government
706 agencies like the USEPA are to collect an accurate and robust data set, they need to be
707 trained on technique and safety in sampling macroinvertebrates during the winter months.
708 In extreme conditions that may freeze over part of the stream, macroinvertebrates are not
709 inactive. Many macroinvertebrates are in a dormant stage (or overwintering stage) to

710 avoid the harshness of winter within an aquatic environment, often residing in the
711 hyporheic zone, or may become terrestrial adults to avoid the stream altogether. Thus,
712 even in extreme cold conditions, macroinvertebrates are still major contributors to the
713 energy and nutrient cycling in the stream.

714 **5.5 Averting Methodological Error**

715 Too often in the recovery of aquatic ecosystems, there is a misplaced assumption that
716 post-disturbed ecosystems should return to pre-disturbance conditions. Recovery from
717 past events in a variety of environmental conditions is not easy to characterize and, as a
718 result, it may require human intervention and decades of time to restore habitats and
719 reintroduce lost species (Power 1999; Rupprecht 2009). There are numerous examples of
720 stream restoration projects, world-wide, in which immeasurable amounts of time and
721 money have been expended for research and promotion of site recovery. Unfortunately,
722 very few researchers continue to study and/or follow-up on the biological and physical
723 dynamics of these projects over the long-term, with most monitoring lasting only five
724 years. The absence of continued oversight on the part of the researcher has led to
725 projects deemed unsuccessful immediately due to the disturbance of biological and
726 physical variables. These projects over time go on to reach equilibrium, positive growth,
727 and a full recovery. Likewise, other projects have immediately been deemed a success,
728 only to experience a dramatic decline in overall health with the first major storm event or
729 upstream development. Some researchers, as cited in Palmer (1997), call this false,
730 positive declaration a *Field of Dreams Hypothesis* - if you build it they will come. The
731 foundation of this “field of dreams” is the continuous misconception among

732 environmental managers that once areas have gone through reconstruction and “restored”
733 to previous conditions the organisms that were lost or displaced will return.

734 A second issue in attempts to restore streams to their previously pristine condition is
735 the erroneous use of laboratory results as a predictor for real life restoration. Rupprecht
736 (2009) attempted to reintroduce five species of plecopteran into several third order
737 streams in Hessen, Germany. All streams in the study had been previously affected by
738 poor wastewater management and had lost most of their macroinvertebrate communities;
739 particularly pollution intolerant species. Following the installation of several purification
740 plants over a thirty year period that was put in place in what was believed would
741 dramatically improve the water quality, many orders of pollution sensitive
742 macroinvertebrates had returned to the sites on their own. However, not all taxon did,
743 and one of those were stoneflies. Stoneflies did not successfully reintroduced
744 themselves, thus Rupprecht and his team began to physically add stonefly eggs and larvae
745 to the streams. Over a two year period, 2,000 eggs and over 500 larvae were introduced
746 into the four brooks in and around Hessen. Following ten years of oversight, the team of
747 researchers only found a single larva in the brook. Based on findings from laboratory
748 results, the ten year time period should have yielded a much larger population size of
749 plecopterans. Given the extensiveness of the project, coupled with the laboratory results
750 guiding the study, the researchers concluded that there is too much unpredictability in the
751 biological and environmental aspects of a natural environment. The level of
752 unpredictability, regardless of the streams former conditions, prevented any foreseeable
753 results. Although the study attempted to restore populations it illustrated instead that
754 real life results are not identical to laboratory results and a lot of energy is placed into

755 remediation efforts that may not actually work. In fact, based on a meta-analysis of
756 similar studies, it is more likely that restoration projects will fail to attain their previous
757 conditions than they are to succeed.

758 Finally, it is also important to set standardized criteria to acknowledge when recovery
759 has occurred. The longer the evaluation process occurs the better the data reflects the
760 successes and failures of recovery, and the more likely confounding events can affect the
761 recovery trajectory. Macroinvertebrate community diversity at any site is influenced by a
762 variety of factors such as the degree that restoration overcomes altered water quality,
763 flow regime, food sources, habitat, and dispersal pathways. Drought events, weather
764 patterns, water chemistry, and flooding can all have profound effects on stream systems
765 (Power 1999; Galic et al. 2013). In addition, many of these aforementioned factors are
766 not acting alone but as co-variables to each other (Palmer et al. 2010 and Parkyn and
767 Smith 2011). Stream ecologists should view aquatic ecosystems as complex, nonlinear
768 dynamic systems in which specific endpoints (i.e. macroinvertebrate biodiversity, abiotic
769 factors) are not guaranteed to return to pre-disturbance values in the post-disturbance
770 period (Power 1999; Ward and Tockner 2001).

771 **5.6 Connectivity and Dispersal**

772 Macroinvertebrates are mobile organisms and due to this fact, macroinvertebrates use
773 streams as their main corridors or highway for dispersal as both aquatic and/or aerial
774 adults. Streams act as corridors by increasing connectivity, population size, movement
775 between island habitats, and enabling gene flow among the aquatic species (Parkyn and
776 Smith 2011). Despite the fact that it is almost impossible to ever restore land back to its
777 original pristine condition, there are positive efforts that can be made towards effective

778 restoration. For example, restoration of smaller but continuous habitats of land, as
779 opposed to restoring a large area of land in patches, has been shown to have a greater
780 level of restorative success. The ability of any organism to move from region to region is
781 essential not only as the movement of the organism, but also the genes of that organism
782 as well. . Limiting connectivity of a species limits its genetic variability and increases the
783 chances of a monoculture, or biological homogeneity (Olden and Rooney2006).
784 Biological homogenous communities are unstable groups of genetically similar
785 organisms that have been cut off from other similar species either through a loss of
786 reproduction or the loss of mobility from patches of land. Loss of genetic variability
787 could cause a single catastrophic event to wipe out the entire population. Species
788 isolation or loss may be accelerated by the fact that some species of macroinvertebrates
789 are already poor dispersers. If those macroinvertebrates are cut off from direct
790 connections between viable habitats, one will be creating even more devastating effects
791 on macroinvertebrate communities.

792 **5.7 Conclusion**

793 As a final point for discussion, evidence of climate change effects on biodiversity at a
794 global scale is now unequivocal in many habitats, and aquatic ecosystems are exception
795 (Li et al. 2012). Available long-term environmental data has already illustrated
796 significant warming trends in many rivers over large geographical areas (Floury et al.
797 2013). On a consistent basis, predictive models on the effects of global climate change
798 on aquatic ecosystems indicate increasing seasonality effects on hydrological patterns,
799 including increased discharge, flooding and drought events occurring with greater
800 frequency and severity. The result is both thermal and hydrological changes in rivers that

801 have major ecological consequences. Water temperatures play fundamental roles on
802 organismal survival, metabolism, growth, reproduction, and behavior in biotic
803 interaction. Temperature also impacts primary production and leaf litter decomposition,
804 modifying river energy and chemical fluxes along the entire river continuum (Vannote et
805 al. 1980). In turn, river flooding and drought variations have, and will continue to have, a
806 fundamental ecological effect on macroinvertebrate community structure.

807

808 **REFERENCES**

- 809 Flourey, M., Usseglio-Polatera, P., Ferreol, M., DeLattre, C., and Souchon, Y. 2013.
810 Global climate change in large European rivers: long-term effects on
811 macroinvertebrate communities and potential local confounding factors. *Global*
812 *Change Biology* 19: 1085-1099.
813
- 814 Galic, N., Hengeveld, GM., Van Der Brink, PJ., Schmolke, A., Thorbek, P., Bruns, E.,
815 and Baveco, HM. 2013. Persistence of aquatic insects across managed land:
816 Effects of landscape permeability on recolonization and population recover. *PLOS*
817 *One* 8 1-11.
818
- 819 Johnson, RC., Carreiro, MM., Jin, H., and Jack, JD. 2012. Within-in year temporal
820 variation and life-cycle seasonality affect stream macroinvertebrate community
821 structure and biotic metrics. *Ecological Indicators* 13. 206-214.
822
- 823 Li, F. Cai, Q., Jiang, W., and Qu, X. 2012. The response of benthic macroinvertebrate
824 communities to climate change: Evidence of subtropical mountain streams in
825 Central China. *International Review of Hydrobiology*. 97 200-214.
826
- 827 Olden, JD. and Rooney, TP. 2006. On defining and quantifying biotic homogenization.
828 *Global Ecology and Biogeography*. 15: 113-120.
829
- 830 Palmer, MA., Ambrose, RF., and Poff, NL. 1997. Ecological theory and community
831 restoration ecology. *Restoration Ecology* 5: 291-300.
832
- 833 Palmer MA., Menninger, HL., and Bernhardt, E. 2010. River restoration, habitat
834 heterogeneity, and biodiversity: a failure of theory or practice? *Freshwater*
835 *Biology* 55:205-222.
836
- 837 Parkyn, SM., and Smith, BJ. 2011. Dispersal constraints for stream invertebrates: setting
838 realistic timescales for biodiversity restoration. *Environmental Management*. 48:
839 602-614.
840
- 841 Power, M. 1999. Recovery in aquatic ecosystems: an overview of knowledge and needs.
842 *Journal of Aquatic Ecosystem Stress and Recovery* 6 253-257.
843
- 844 Rupprecht, R. 2009. Attempts to recolonize water insects in German Brooks. *Aquatic*
845 *Insects*. 3: Supplement 1 429-441.
846
- 847 Vannote, RL. Minshall, GW., Cummins, KW. , Sedell, JR., and Cushing, CE. 1980. The
848 river continuum concept. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*.
849 37: 130-137.
850
- 851 Ward, JV. and Tockner, K. 2001. Biodiversity: towards a unifying theme for river
852 ecology. *Freshwater Biology* 46: 807-819.