

Case Study: What can we detect and when?: Program Implications

M.J. Paul
D. Bressler





How will climate change affect

- Ability to detect impairment ?
- Ability to identify causes of impairment?
- Adaptive monitoring design?



Climate drivers on streams

- Temperature
- Precipitation: quantity and distribution affects stream hydrology:
 - Seasonal pattern of flow
 - Stream power
 - Erosion
 - Habitat
 - Pollutant loading
 - Nonpoint sources
- Interaction: evapotranspiration and CO₂ concentration



Predicted effects (many regions)

- Increased hydrologic variability
 - More severe annual summer dry period
 - More intense storms
 - Increased winter-spring precipitation: more severe spring flooding
 - More rain, less snow (W. snowpack)
- Increased mean temperature
 - Warmer winters



Evaluating Vulnerability

- Detection – Case Study 1
 - What changes are occurring?
 - Can our program detect them?
- Adaptation – Case Study 2
 - How can we adapt our program?


Detection

- Many dimensions of detection
- Focus here on two principal questions:
 - How long will it take to reliably detect a change in the mean native taxa richness of the reference site population?
 - How long will it take to reliably detect a change in mean native taxa richness for a particular site?



Data – Maryland Biological Stream Survey (MBSS)

- 1995-2005
- Fish (summer) and bugs (spring)
- Land cover, water chemistry
- 5-year rotating basin design
- Stream segments stratified by order; sites selected from list frame of segment-miles
- Used Piedmont and highlands regions: 0-100% urban, some agriculture







Highlands



Eastern Piedmont

Coastal Plain

 Assessment Region Borders

Stations

-  Coastal Plain
-  Eastern Piedmont
-  Highlands - Coldwater
-  Highlands - Warmwater

-  Rivers
-  Counties
-  Maryland



80

0

80

160 Miles


Methods

- Power analysis approach

$$\delta^2 = \frac{2 \times (Z_{\alpha} + Z_{\beta})^2 \times \sigma^2}{n}$$

- Detectable change for an assessment program

Methods



Methods

- Power analysis approach

$$\delta^2 = \frac{2 \times (Z_{\alpha} + Z_{\beta})^2 \times \sigma^2}{n}$$

- Detectable change for an assessment program
- Need two things:
 - Variance
 - What changes might be expected

Variance

- Standard program variability
- MBSS repeat visits to sentinel sites
 - 29 sites
 - Repeat visits over last 6 years
- Gives an estimate of standard interannual variability (σ^2)

Expected Changes

- Scientific Literature
- Climate (NAST 2001)

Average Annual Temperature (° C)		
Increases by 2100		
Region	Min	Max
Northeast/Mid-Atlantic	2.6	5
Southeast	2.3	5.5
Midwest	2	6
Great Plains	3	
West	4	6
Pacific Northwest	3 (by 2050)	


Expected Changes

- Scientific Literature
- Macroinvertebrates
 - 4.6 taxa per degree C (HIGH)
 - Daufresne et al. 2003
 - 1.0 taxa per degree C (LOW)
 - Lehigh University 1960
- Fish
 - 2.0 taxa per degree C (FISH)
 - Gammon 1971

Expected Changes


- Scientific Literature
- Combine loss rates and climate change
 - 4.6 taxa per degree C
 - 5 degree C increase by 2100
 - 23 taxa by 2100 = 0.2 taxa per year

Methods




Macroinvertebrate Richness

(high taxa loss rate, high temp. scenario)




Macroinvertebrate Richness

(low taxa loss rate, high temp. scenario)



Macroinvertebrate Richness

(high taxa loss rate, high temp. scenario)



Data Summary – Northeast/Mid-Atlantic

Northeast/Mid-
Atlantic

Maximum Predicted Temperature Increase by 2100

Macroinvertebrates - High Taxa Loss Rate (4.6 per degree C)

$\alpha=\beta=0.95$ **21**

$\alpha=\beta=0.8$ **11**

Macroinvertebrates - Low Taxa Loss Rate (1 per degree C)

$\alpha=\beta=0.95$ **98**

$\alpha=\beta=0.8$ **51**

Fish Taxa Loss Rate (3.6 per degree C)

$\alpha=\beta=0.95$ **28**

$\alpha=\beta=0.8$ **14**

Data Summary – Northeast/Mid-Atlantic

Minimum Predicted Temperature Increase by 2100

Macroinvertebrates - High Taxa Loss Rate (4.6 per degree C)

$\alpha=\beta=0.95$ **41**

$\alpha=\beta=0.8$ **21**

Macroinvertebrates - Low Taxa Loss Rate (1 per degree C)

$\alpha=\beta=0.95$ **>100**

$\alpha=\beta=0.8$ **97**

Fish Taxa Loss Rate (3.6 per degree C)

$\alpha=\beta=0.95$ **53**

$\alpha=\beta=0.8$ **27**

Results

- Decrease required error rate (α/β), quicker to detect a change
- Increase N , quicker to detect a change
- Low taxa loss rate, slower to detect a change
- Lower temperature scenario, slower to detect a change

Summary

- How long will it take to reliably detect a change in the mean native taxa richness of the reference site population?

Macroinvertebrates, N=40 reference sites,
 $\alpha = \beta = 0.8$

- High temp. scenario
 - ~11y at high taxa loss rate, ~51 years if slower
- Low temp. scenario
 - ~21y at high taxa loss rate, ~97 years if slower
- Sooner if N increases

Summary

- How long will it take to reliably detect a change in mean native taxa richness for a particular site (watershed)?

Macroinvertebrates, N=10 reference sites,
 $\alpha=\beta=0.8$

- High temp. scenario
 - ~22y at high taxa loss rate, ~100 years if slower
- Low temp. scenario
 - ~42y at high taxa loss rate, >>100 years if slower
- Sooner if increase N



Implications

- Probabilistic vs targeted designs
- Sample reference/sentinel sites regularly
- Protect reference/sentinel sites
- Keep N as high as practical
- Relax error rates
- Use regional estimates of variability and climate scenarios
- Run analysis to estimate detection power