

# 10

## DATA INTEGRATION AND REPORTING

---

Human impacts on the biological integrity of water resources are complex and cumulative (Karr 1998). Karr (1998) states that human actions jeopardize the biological integrity of water resources by altering one or more of five principal factors — physical habitat, seasonal flow of water, the food base of the system, interactions within the stream biota, and chemical quality of the water. These factors can be addressed in environmental management by shifting our focus from technology-based to water resource-based management strategies. This change in focus requires a commensurate shift from the measurement of pollutant loadings to a measurement of ecosystem health. Biological assessment addresses ecosystem health and cumulative impacts by concentrating on population and community level response rather than on discharger performance (Courtemanch 1995).

The translation of biological data into a report that adequately conveys the message of the assessment is a critical process. It is important to identify the intended audience(s) for the report and to bear in mind that users of the report will likely include groups (i. e. managers, elected officials, communities) who are not biologists. Reports must be coherent and easily understood in order for people to make informed decisions regarding the water resource. First, the data must be summarized and integrated, then clearly explained and presented. The use of a multimetric index provides a convenient, yet technically sound method for summarizing complex biological data for each assemblage (Karr et al. 1986, Plafkin et al. 1989). The procedures for developing the Multimetric Index for each assemblage is described in Chapter 9. The index itself is only an aggregation of contributory biological information and should not be used exclusive of its component metrics and data (Yoder 1991, Barbour et al. 1996a). However, the index and its component metrics serve as effective tools to communicate biological status of a water resource.

### 10.1 DATA INTEGRATION

Once indices and values are obtained for each assemblage, the question becomes how to interpret all of the results, particularly if the findings are varied and suggest a contradiction in assessment among the assemblages? Also, how are habitat data used to evaluate relationships with the biological data? These questions are among the most important that will be addressed in this chapter. The integration of chemical and toxicological data with biological data is not treated in depth here. It is briefly described in Chapter 3 and discussed in more detail elsewhere (Jackson 1992, USEPA 1997c).

#### 10.1.1 Data Integration of Assemblages

USEPA advises incorporating more than 1 assemblage into biocriteria programs whenever practical. Surveying multiple assemblages provides a more complete assessment of biological condition since the various assemblages respond differently to certain stressors and restoration activities. For instance, Ohio EPA found, in a study of the Scioto River, that fish responded (recovered) more quickly than did benthos to restoration activities aimed at reducing the effects of cumulative impacts (i.e., impoundments, combined sewer overflows, wastewater treatment plants, urbanization) (Yoder and Rankin 1995a). Although significant improvement was observed in the condition of both assemblages in the river from 1980 to 1991, the benthic assemblage was still impaired in several reaches of the

river; whereas, the fish assemblage met Ohio's warm water habitat criterion in 1991 for many of the same reaches. The use of both assemblages enhanced the agency's assessment of trend analysis for the Scioto River.


In addition, using more than 1 assemblage allows programs to more fully assess the occurrence of multiple stressors and seasonal variation in the intensity of the stressors (Gibson et al. 1996). Mount et al. (1984) found that benthic and fish assemblages responded differently to the same inputs in the Ottawa River in Ohio. Benthic diversity and abundance responded negatively to organic loading from a wastewater treatment plant and exhibited no observable response to chemical input from industrial effluent. Fish exhibited no response to the organic inputs and a negative response to metal concentrations in the water.

Integration of information from each assemblage should be done such that the results complement and supplement the assessment of the site. Trend analysis (monitoring changes over time) is useful to illustrate differences in response of the assemblages (Figure 10-1). In this example of the Scioto River (Figure 10-1), the improvement in the fish Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) and the benthic macroinvertebrate Index of Community Integrity (ICI) assemblages can be seen over time (1980 and 1991) and over a length of the river (River Mile [RM] 140 to 90) (Yoder 1995a).

Biological attributes and indices can also be illustrated side-by-side to highlight differences and similarities in the results. Oftentimes, differences in the results are useful for diagnosing cause-and-effect.


### 10.1.2 Relationship Between Habitat and Biological Condition

Historically, non-chemical impacts to biotic systems have not been a major focus of the nation's water quality agencies. Yet there is clear evidence that habitat alteration is a primary cause of degraded aquatic resources (USEPA 1997c). Habitat degradation occurs as a result of hydrological flow modification, alteration of the system's energy base, or direct impact on the physical habitat structure. Preservation of an ecosystem's natural physical habitat is a fundamental requirement in maintaining diverse, functional aquatic communities in surface waters (Rankin 1995). Habitat quality is an



**Figure 10-1. Cumulative frequency diagrams (CFD) for the IBI (upper) and the ICI (lower) comparing the pre-1988 and post-1988 status on a statewide basis from Ohio. In each case, estimated attainable level of future performance is indicated. The Warm Water Habitat (WWH) and Exceptional Warm Water Habitat (EWH) biological thresholds are given for each index.**

essential measurement in any biological survey because aquatic fauna often have very specific habitat requirements independent of water-quality composition (Barbour et al. 1996a). Diagnostic evaluations are enhanced when assessment of the habitat, flow regime, and energy base are incorporated into the interpretation of the biological condition (USEPA 1990b).




**Figure 10-2. Relationship between the condition of the biological community and physical habitat.**

The relationship between habitat quality (as defined by site-specific factors, riparian quality, and upstream land use) and biological condition can be graphed, as illustrated in Figure 10-2 to enhance data interpretation. On the X-axis, habitat is shown to vary in quality from 30 points, which is poor (nonsupporting of an acceptable biological condition) to 85 points, which is good (comparable to the reference condition). Biological condition, represented by the fish IBI on the Y-axis, varies from 10 points (severely impaired) to 60 points (excellent). Interpretation of the relationship between habitat and biology as depicted by Figure 10-2 can be summarized by 4 points relating to specific areas of the graph.

1. The upper right-hand corner of the curve is the ideal situation where optimal habitat quality and biological condition occur.
2. The decrease in biological condition is proportional to a decrease in habitat quality.
3. Perhaps the most important area of the graph is the lower right-hand corner where degraded biological condition can be attributed to something other than habitat quality (Barbour et al. 1996a).
4. The upper left-hand corner is where optimal biological condition is not possible in a severely degraded habitat (Barbour et al. 1996a).

A relationship between biology and habitat should be substantiated with a large database sufficient to develop confidence intervals around a regression line. Rankin (1995) found that Ohio's visual-based habitat assessment approach, called the Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI), explained most of the variation in the IBI for the fish assemblage. However, Rankin also pointed out that covariate relationships between aggregate riparian quality and land use of certain subbasins could be used to partition natural variability. In one example, Rankin illustrated how high-quality patches of habitat structure in otherwise habitat-degraded stream reaches may harbor sensitive species, thus masking the effects of habitat alteration.




**Figure 10-3. Data from a study of streams in Florida's Panhandle.**

An informative approach to evaluating affects from specific or cumulative stressors is to

ascertain a gradient response of the aquatic community using a bivariate scatter plot. In one example provided by Florida DEP, a gradient response of the EPT taxa indicated a strong relationship to nitrogen in the stream (Figure 10-3).

When multiple data types (i.e., habitat, biological, chemical, etc.) are available, sun ray plots may be used to display the assessment results. As an example, the assessments of habitat, macroinvertebrates and fish are integrated for evaluating of the condition of individual stream sites in a Pennsylvania watershed (Snyder et al. 1998). The assessment scores for each of the triad data types are presented as a percentage of reference condition (Figure 10-4). The area enclosed by each sun ray plot can be measured to provide a comparison of the biological and habitat condition among the sites of interest (Snyder et al. 1998). This technique helps determine the extent of impairment and also which ecological components are most affected.



**Figure 10-4. Comparison of integrated assessment (habitat, fish, and benthos) among stream sites in Pennsylvania. Station 16 is a reference site. (Taken from Snyder et al. 1998).**

## 10.2 REPORTING


Historically, reports containing assessment results and recommendations for further action have been designed to address objectives and data uses relevant to the specific monitoring program. Increasingly, however, assessment reports are designed to reach a broader, non-scientific audience including water resource managers and the environmentally conscious public. Communicating the condition of biological systems, and the impact of human activities on those systems, is the ultimate purpose of biological monitoring (Karr and Chu 1999). Reporting style and format has become an important component in effectively communicating the findings of ecological assessments to diverse audiences. As pointed out by Karr and Chu (1999), effective communication can transform biological monitoring from a scientific exercise into a powerful tool for environmental decision making.

### 10.2.1 Graphical Display

Graphical displays are a fundamental tool for illustrating scientific information. Graphs reveal—more effectively than do strictly statistical tools—patterns of biological response. Patterns include “outliers,” which may convey unique information that can help diagnose particular problems or reveal specific traits of a site (Karr and Chu 1999). Examples of some of the most useful graphical techniques are presented for specific biological program objectives:


1. Stream classification — a graph should illustrate the distinction between and among site classes or groups. Two common graphical displays are bivariate scatter plots (used in non-metric multidimensional scaling) and cluster dendrograms.

*Bivariate scatter plots*—used for comparing the scatter or clustering of points given 2 dimensions. Can be used to develop regression lines or to incorporate 3 factors (3-dimensional) (Figure 10-5).




**Figure 10-5.** Use of multidimensional scaling on benthic data to ascertain stream classification. The first and second axes refer to the dimensions of combinations of data used to measure similarity (Taken from Barbour et al. 1996b).

*Cluster dendrogram*—used to illustrate the similarities and dissimilarities of sites in support of classes (Figure 10-6).




**Figure 10-6.** Example of a cluster dendrogram, illustrating similarities and clustering of sites (x-axis) using biological data.

2. **Problem Identification and Status of Water Resource** — The status of the condition of water resources requires consolidating information from many samples and can be illustrated in several ways.



**Figure 10-7.** Results of the benthic assessment of streams in the Mattaponi Creek watershed of southern Prince George’s County, Maryland. Percent of streams in each ecological condition category. (Taken from Stribling et al. 1996b).

*Pie charts*—used to illustrate proportional representation of the whole by its component parts. Can be sized according to magnitude or density (Figure 10-7)



**Figure 10-8.** The population of values of the IBI in reference sites within each of the ecoregions of Ohio. (Contributed by Ohio EPA).

*Box-and-whisker plots*— used to illustrate population attributes (via percentile distribution) and provides some sense of variability (Figure 10-8).



- Trend monitoring and assessment — Monitoring over a temporal or spatial scale requires a graphical display depicting trends, which may show improvement, degradation, or no change.

*Line graphs*—used to illustrate temporal or spatial trends that are contiguous. Assumes that linkage between points is linear (Figure 10-9).




Figure 10-9. Spatial and temporal trend of Ohio’s Invertebrate Community Index. The Scioto River - Columbus to Circleville. (Contributed by Ohio EPA).

*Cumulative frequency diagram*—illustrates an ordered accumulation of observations from lowest to highest value that allows one to determine status of resource at any given level (Figure 10-10).





Figure 10-10. Cumulative distribution of macroinvertebrate index scores. 21% of sites scored at or below 60. The median index score is 75, where the cumulative frequency is 50%.




4. A determination of cause-and-effect — illustrating the source of impairment may not be a straightforward process. However, certain graphs lend themselves to showing comparative results in diagnosing problems.

*Bar charts* — used to display magnitude of values for discrete entities. Can be used to illustrate deviation from a value of central tendency (Figure 10-11).




**Figure 10-11. Biological assessment of sites in the Middle Rockies, showing mean and standard deviation of repeated measures and the assessment threshold (dashed line).**

*Sun Ray plots* — used to compare more than 2 endpoints or data types. Most effective when reference condition is incorporated into axes or comparison (Figure 10-12).



**Figure 10-12. Integration of data from habitat, fish, and benthic assemblages.**

*Box-and-whisker plots*— used to illustrate population attributes (via percentile distribution). Distinction among plots illustrates degree of similarity/differences (Figure 10-13).



**Figure 10-13. The response of the benthic macroinvertebrate assemblage (ICI) to various types of impacts (provided by Ohio EPA).**

## 10.2.2 Report Format

Two basic formats are recommended for reporting ecological assessments. Each of these formats is intended to highlight the scientific process, focus on study objectives, and judge the condition of the assessed sites. The first format is a summary report, targeted for use by managers in making decisions regarding the resource. This report format can also be an invaluable public information tool. The second report format is patterned after that of peer-reviewed journals and is primarily designed for informing a more technical audience.

The *Ecosummary* is an example of the first report format. It has an uncomplicated style and conveys various information including study results. The simplicity of this format quickly and effectively documents results and assists a non-technical audience in making informed decisions. An executive summary format is appropriate. An executive summary format is appropriate to present the “bottom line” assessment for the Ecosummary, which will be read by agency managers and decision-makers. Technical appendices or supplemental documentation should either accompany the report or be available to support the scientific integrity of the study.

These Ecosummaries are generally between 1-4 pages in length and lend themselves to quick and easy dissemination. Color graphics may be added to enhance the presentation or findings. An example of an Ecosummary format used by Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is illustrated in Figure 10-14. This 1-page report highlights the purpose of the study as well as the results and significance of the findings. A summary of the ecological data in the form of bar charts and tables may be provided on subsequent pages. Because this study follows prescribed methods and procedures, all of this documentation is not included in the report but is included in agency Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

The second format for reporting is a *scientific report*, which is structured similarly to a peer-reviewed journal. The report should be peer-reviewed by non-agency scientists to validate its scientific credibility. An abstract or executive summary should be prepared to highlight the essential findings. As in a peer-reviewed journal article, the methods and results are presented succinctly and clearly. The introductory text should outline the objectives and purpose of the study. A discussion of the results should include supporting literature to add credence to the findings, particularly if there is a discussion of suspected cause of impairment. Preparation of a report using this format will require more time than the Ecosummary. However, this report format is more inclusive of supportive information and will be more important in litigious situations.




Figure 10-14. Guidance for Florida Ecosummary — A one-page bioassessment report. (Contributed by Florida DEP).