

Developing a novel approach to analyse the regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart, N. Prat, E. M. García-Roger, J. Latron, M. Rieradevall, P. Llorens, G. G. Barberá, D. Brito, A. M. De Girolamo, A. Lo Porto, R. Neves, N. P. Nikolaidis, J. L. Perrin, E. P. Querner, J. M. Quiñonero, M. G. Tournoud, O. Tzoraki, and J. Froebrich

Comments to the Editor

This manuscript should have been provided in a form other than a pdf. PDF's are very awkward and in my opinion inappropriate for doing detailed editing.

This manuscript needs a complete and thorough editing of the English. The text is very difficult and awkwardly written. Frequently, the words that the authors use are frequently quite bad choices.

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of HESS? Yes, the linking of the hydrology and ecology of temporary rivers and distinguishing it from perennial rivers is a potentially important contribution.
2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? The paper proposes an analysis framework that should provide a basis for guiding the analysis of ecological monitoring of temporary rivers. Done well this would be very useful. However, the paper needs many improvements to accomplish this effectively.
3. Are substantial conclusions reached? Not actual conclusions, but a framework that could guide monitoring.
4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? No, this is a major shortcoming – the paper does not provide sufficient rigour and in many places the support offered is the opinion of the authors and not analysis or theory.
5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? The results provided are illustrative and not used in support of conclusions.
6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? No. See detailed comments and suggestions for alternatives

<p>7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Generally. A short-coming of the paper is the focus on only eight Mediterranean streams these authors have studied and little consideration of the breadth of temporary rivers. The ‘framework’ is deficient as it will not be applicable to “all” temporary streams. See detailed comments provided to the authors.</p>
<p>8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? The title of the paper is poor. A suggestion for a title that might fit an extensively revised paper is:</p> <p>Developing a method to analyse the regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota</p>
<p>9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Given the need for scientific revisions and improvement of the English language it would be better to assess a future revision of the abstract.</p>
<p>10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? No – see comments provided below</p>
<p>11. Is the language fluent and precise? The paper needs a thorough and complete revision to correct the English.</p>
<p>12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? See detailed comments provided</p>
<p>13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? See detailed comments provided</p>
<p>14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Generally with respect to ecological aspects. Less so for the hydrological side.</p>
<p>15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? This was not assessed. This should be assessed following revisions.</p>

Despite this, the manuscript has considerable promise, but requires major and extensive revisions. The major concerns are identified in my comments to the authors, but are:

- The paper suffers greatly from the lack of detail about the hydrology of these temporary rivers. In general this class of rivers is very diverse and different types have unique properties and it is difficult to determine if these eight represent much of that breadth.

- The graph they propose should not be based on percentage of available habitat, but amount of actual habitat and the amount of streamflow.
- The 'classification' they propose suggests new uses for words that are part of the temporary rivers lexicon and will only confuse the situation if adopted. A better solution would be to use the hydrological terms for the hydrology and ecological terms for the habitats.
- The manner of determination of thresholds is unclear and does not appear to be robust or generic to temporary rivers. This might only require them being more specific about how they determine the thresholds for these eight rivers, but they should be much more cautious about suggesting that these could be used more broadly.

Manuscript Evaluation Criteria

Principal Criteria	Excellent	Good (2)	Fair (3)	Poor (4)
Scientific Significance: Does the manuscript present a		potentially		
Scientific Quality: Are the scientific approach and applied methods valid? Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way			Relies very much on opinion and very little on substantial analysis	
Presentation Quality: Are the scientific results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well-structured way (number and quality of			Structure and organization could be improved	The English is not adequate

General comments

This large group of authors has proposed a framework that can be used to conduct assessment of temporary rivers using information extracted from the hydrologic record, or from streamflow simulations. Clearly, temporary streams are hydrologically and ecologically distinct from perennial streams, and the simple adoption of classical methods from perennial streams is inappropriate. In this reviewer's opinion, the authors are not sufficiently assertive in making it clear that methods from perennial streams are a poor fit.

The manuscript has considerable promise, but requires major and extensive revisions and further review. The major concerns are identified in my comments to the authors below, but the main points are:

- The paper suffers greatly from the lack of detail about the hydrology of these temporary rivers. In general this class of rivers is very diverse and

different types have unique properties and it is difficult to determine if these eight represent much of that breadth.

- The graph they propose should not be based on percentage of available habitat, but amount of actual habitat and the amount of streamflow.
- The 'classification' they propose suggests new uses for words that are part of the temporary rivers lexicon and will only confuse the situation if adopted. A better solution would be to use the hydrological terms for the hydrology and ecological terms for the habitats.
- The manner of determination of thresholds is unclear and does not appear to be robust or generic to temporary rivers. This might only require them being more specific about how they determine the thresholds for these eight rivers, but they should be much more cautious about suggesting that these could be used more broadly.

Throughout the manuscript the English is difficult to follow. Sentences are frequently unclear, very awkward, or often not even sentences. As none of the authors appears to be a native English speaker, I have tried to suggest alternative wordings that might address these problems, at least sufficiently so that I could make my points. The manuscript clearly remains in need of a thorough English edit. These types of sentences are highlighted in the accompanying pdf. In many places, I have made suggestions in my detailed comments below. These have been highlighted in the attached ms, and so suggestions made in the detail comments.

Key parts to the process:

While the plot is an intriguing proposal, it might be better to develop this not in a percentage basis but an area basis, since the amount of aquatic habitat is also highly variable. In addition, it is likely that within a type there will be large community differences between the start of a type and the end of a type. As a hypothetical example, when a pool forms there will be early colonizers, yet after prolonged dry periods the pool will be smaller in volume/area, the community is likely to have changed and as the pool disappears, the community will no doubt be different to when it was formed.

Need to provide a convincing argument that a hydrometric record can provide generalized criteria that are 'universally' applicable to temporary streams. They propose the same for approach for simulated flows. It is never made clear how the turn points are 'assigned' on the flow duration curve.

The authors should reconsider their proposed terminology. The terms they suggest are already in the temporary streams vocabulary, and I suspect that this will promote confusion. A solution would be to adopt the hydrological definitions of ephemeral, intermittent, and episodic, and then couple these to the ecotype: pool, riffle etc. Then one could associate a difference between a perennial pool, an intermittent pool, an ephemeral pool, and an episodic pool. Such definitions

would more clearly link the hydrological mechanism to the temporary nature of the ecosystem feature.

Specific comments

The title needs improvement. It seems confused between the 'developing' and 'novel approach'. I suggest:

Developing a method to analyse the regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

Page 3 line 2

Temporary streams are those water courses that undergo the recurrent cessation of flow or the complete drying of their channel.

Line 16 [underlined] This classification and these types have been already defined in the literature. The manner in which this is written suggests that these are 'new'. Do the authors mean that this classification is used to address the differences in the influence over the development of aquatic life?

Line 19. [yellow] Sentence is awkward and unclear.

Line 24. This is the exact same sentence as at line 2. A different wording would be appropriate.

Page 4 line 2 'prevalence' is not the correct word. There are expected to be more of these types of systems in the future.

Line 8 split sentence into two and reverse their order.

The traditional perception among managers that a "healthy" stream must flow all the year round can no longer be supported [or continued] (Boulton et al., 2000). Indeed, though there are still severe gaps in our knowledge of these streams that affect their sound management.

[As an aside, It is worth noting that the traditional history of hydrology and limnology focused our attention on perennial streams and lakes, and has resulted in a frameworks that are not application to the entirety of streams and lakes.]

Lines 12-27

In this paragraph it would be better to deal with 'hydrological' studies separately from 'ecological' studies. Something like:

Many hydrological and ecological studies have been devoted to the characterization of temporary streams using diverse metrics (refs). The frequency of the zero-flow periods is the most important criterion for most of them (e.g. Hedman and Osterkamp, 1982; Poff, 1996), and the seasonality of these periods is also used in some classifications (Uys and O'Keefe, 1997; Rossouw et al., 2005; Kennard et al., 2010). In hydrological

studies In ecological studies ~~Nevertheless~~. While the information recorded at network gauging stations consists of water discharges, the occurrence of the diverse habitats and particularly of pools in reaches above and below the station during periods of zero discharge are not recorded (e.g. Uys and O’Keeffe, 1997; Bond and Cottingham, 2008).

Page 2 line 28 to page 3 line 16. This paragraph needs to be rewritten as most of the sentences are either unclear or awkward. My suggestion is that the authors take a more assertive stance and indicate that methods developed for perennial streams are basically inappropriate for temporary streams as in perennial streams sampling riffles is much simpler than sampling pools, but in temporary streams the pools are the most permanent features.

Page 2 line 28 to page 3 line 2 – sentence is very awkward.

If predictability hypotheses concerning the hydrological controls on aquatic life **are to be constructed** for temporary streams, **robust** methods for measuring the ecological status of these streams and rivers, mainly based on the biological conditions (primary producers, macro-invertebrates and fish) **need to be developed**.

Page 5 line 2 [blue]

According to the Water Framework Directive (WFD; European Communities, 2000), the current regulations for the management of waters, The ecological status is the key condition of European streams to be evaluated.

Page 5 line 5

When the ecological status of a stream is **assessed to be** less than “good”, the water authorities ~~should~~ **are expected to establish set-up** measures within a River Basin Management Plan **to return the stream to that status**.

Page 5 line 11 – [green] awkward.

Biological sampling to determine the ecological status of temporary streams needs to accommodate different mesohabitats that are present and change over time unlike sampling designed for perennial streams. Such strategies need to adapt if water is not present on the sampling date or if the aquatic life is reduced to those animals found in isolated pools.

Page 5 Line 21 Start a new paragraph at “Several authors...” as there is a subject change. And expand upon this as it pertains to linking hydrology, hydrological data, and ecological conditions.

Line 27 to **page 6 line 25**

Within this context, the present study proposes **how** analysis of the hydrological regime of temporary streams **using** the temporal patterns of the aquatic mesohabitats occurrence **is** relevant to the development of aquatic life **metrics** at the reach scale. **First**, the concept of Aquatic State **is introduced**; it summarizes the set of aquatic mesohabitats occurring on a given reach at a particular moment depending on the hydrological conditions is introduced. Six **aquatic** states are defined: flood, riffles, connected pools, disconnected pools, dry, and arid (definitions provided below). The set of aquatic mesohabitats **that occurs on a reach of a temporary stream** is known to be

Comment [phw1]: The use of ‘first’ suggests a numbered list – this one seems to be ‘first, and finally’??

crucial for the presence and abundance of aquatic fauna. ~~when sampled~~ Pools act as refuges for fish, providing places of survival during the absence of flow (Magoulik and Kobza, 2003) or influencing their fitness (Spranza and Stanley, 2000). The connection of the aquatic state to the community of macroinvertebrates has been studied in some detail (Feminella, 1996; Bonada et al., 2006; Acuña et al., 2005), as well as the interactions between different trophic levels (Lundlam and Magoulick, 2009). Comparing communities before and following multiyear droughts (Magalhães et al., 2007) or the comparison between communities in temporary and permanent streams (Mas-Martí et al., 2010) emphasized the importance of knowing both the present aquatic state and its evolution over time. Fauna in temporary streams are more complex and taxa richness may be even higher than in permanent ones; the replacement of different aquatic states through the year gives opportunities to a succession of species, making the richness higher than in many permanent streams (e.g. Bonada et al., 2006; García-Roger et al., 2011). The index EPT (Number of taxa of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera) and EPT versus OCH (Taxa of Odonata, Coleoptera and Heteroptera) are good indicators of the change of aquatic state (Bonada et al., 2006). The six aquatic states we define below encompasses the five “hydrologic conditions” defined by Fritz et al. (2006), from “no surface water” (0) to “surface flow continuous” (4), but we place more emphasis on the relevance of the states for biological communities than in the specific hydrological conditions.

Comment [phw2]: Not clear what this means.

Page 6 line 26 to page 7 line 1 [tan] is not a sentence. The sentence which follows may also need to be rewritten.

Presently, there are almost no data on the presence, duration, and inter-annual variability of different aquatic states in temporary streams; it is unlikely that this type of data will be observed operationally in the near future. To meet this need, it is anticipated that the temporal patterns of occurrence of these states will need to be derived from either flow records or flow simulations., which is the second step proposed below. We propose a procedure for each of these.

Page 7 line 12. The sentence is awkward in several ways. Really, the authors are suggesting that a graph can help explain the temporal variations in habitats. They suggest monthly frequency of occurrence; but this choice is not justified, and may not be at all relevant. In addition, while later on this graph is shown to be interesting, it represents the amount of habitat quite poorly [more on this later].

The Aquatic States Frequency Graph (ASFG) shows the annual variation in the occurrence of the diverse aquatic states; this type of plot makes apparent the complex temporal patterns of occurrence of aquatic states.

Page 7 line 15. not a new paragraph. The wording in this paragraph is awkward.

In this section, a numbered list would be an efficient way of describing what the authors intent to propose. The present wording seems more like a summary with the undertext that these things have all been adequately demonstrated. Rather, this should be written as we intend to demonstrate “four” things. Then describe the “four” things. Then suggest that these four tools can be shown to be useful in assessment of temporary river ecotypes. As presently written, it is more a summary or discussion than an introduction.

Page 7 line 22. Finally, follows on from 'first' and is an odd construction.

Page 7 line 23-25. Sentence is awkward. What is meant by "their relevance for monitoring purposes"?

Page 7 line 29 to page 8 line 3. The meaning of this sentence is difficult to understand. Awkward.

Page 8 line 4 to line 13. This is not the place to "summarize". See the comment in bold above.

Line 22-25. [tan] The first and second steps are sequential; the third and fourth steps can follow in any order.

Line 26-27 [blue] Implementing the methods depends on data extracted from hydrometric gauging stations; here we focus on eight stations from the European Mediterranean.

Page 9. line 8-14. These choices [month, 10 years, and 50-100 m] seem pretty arbitrary and do not seem to be supported in any way in the text. Broad implementation of such a framework will require more critical thought. In other geographical locations, the presence of water is seasonal and regular [monsoons, snowmelt] but of much shorter duration than months. In other place the presence of water is shorter and less reliable – winter convective storms – but occurs over a much longer time period. The framework needs to be adaptable to these other condition and not only to a few streams in the European Mediterranean. Similar for the other measures – is 100m a reasonable length for all streams? Is 10 years of data sufficient? It is not appropriate to propose a framework the limits these parameters and assume that these are sufficient.

Page 9 lines 18 to page 11 line 9. These categories seem a bit confused between types. Pools, riffles, and connected pools are more physical types and are different from temporal types of floods, dry and arid.

The authors might find it useful to construct a figure or table that compares their classification [some part highlight in magenta] to those of Fritz et al and Boulton. Something like

Present classification	Fritz et al	Boulton
Flood		
Pool		
Riffle		
Dry		
Arid		

Page 10 line 21-24 awkward wording.

Page 11 lines 14-17. This statement can be challenged on many different levels: If the data is daily then monthly cannot be 'more easily available'. It is not certain that models are able to provide data of the same quality as daily observations. The issue of monthly has been mentioned previously.

Line 18-24. Before the authors provide a spreadsheet to do such an extraction they need to demonstrate how and why this threshold / flow duration curve provide a robust extraction of the types. I suspect that this would not hold in streams other than those used to develop these thresholds; it would be useful to have hydrographs for these rivers to allow the reader to understand the hydrology of these streams in relation to this procedure. There are a wide range of temporary streams – in some the timing of flow is regular with seasons, in others flow only exists during precipitation events.

Line 25 to page 12 line 3. There is insufficient information to understand how the turning points are assigned to the flow duration curve.

Lines 16 to 23. See the general comment about these graphs made above. The authors should consider changing these plots to they more clearly link the amount of habitat to the amount of water. Doing this should also address the issue of how the turning points are assigned to the flow duration curve.

Page 13 line 27. The authors need to define what they mean by a 'good predictor'.

Page 15 line 8-10. awkward. Also, the authors have not addressed the issue of metrics with different time scales – how do they suggest that a 6month metric be compared to a monthly metric?

Page 16 line 1. Need to explain what 'deeper analyses' are?

Page 16 line 4 'Awkward and weak. Deemed sufficient' is not supported by any critical analysis or thought. For this framework to be useful, and I do believe that it has potential, it needs to be robust and informative – 'deemed sufficient' suggests otherwise.

Page 16 line 15-page 17 line 21. [grey] See previous comments about the use of a table made for page 9. This seems like another permutation and confused rather than strengthens. I would reiterate the comment that using the vocabulary of temporary streams in this way does not help with terminology. *A solution would be to adopt the hydrological definitions of ephemeral, intermittent, and episodic, and then couple these to the ecotype: pool, riffle etc. Then one could associate a difference between a perennial pool, an intermittent pool, an ephemeral pool, and an episodic pool. Such definitions would more clearly link the hydrological mechanism to the temporary nature of the ecosystem feature.*

Page 18 line 27 to page 19 line3. wording is awkward. Second sentence is unclear.

Line 4 – explain why this is expected and if it is indeed true.

Page 20 line 19-24. The authors are suggesting that modelled monthly streamflows will meet their needs – without any demonstration of proof of concept, or even any critical thought.

Page 21 line 1-5. Awkward. This might be true, but needs some more support than an opinion. Also, the temporal scale is important in this.

Page 21 lines 6-12 – again opinion with no support.

Page 21 lines 14-17 – Awkward and unclear.

Page 21 line 18 . Awkward. The results for these eight streams [from MIRAGE] suggest

Page 22 line 1-4. This result

Page 29 Table 1. I find this table problematic, perhaps since I am unfamiliar with Mediterranean streams. The meaning of “Operational basin” should be clearly defined. Are these station something like Vene at Karst? [Vene is also spelled Vène in several figures]. Are there station numbers? Who collects the data and what methods are used? Would it be possible to describe these in a general sense so that readers who are not familiar could better understand them? Slope, complexity, intermittent, ephemeral, episodic? Also, do all of these have daily observations or are some modelled? Are the MAP and MAR for the specific watershed or from a climate network? What variability are there is these and MAR?

Table 2. The columns and rows would be better if more fully defined. i.e. Average monthly flow (Mf). Also it would be useful to show the sample size. Caption could be more informative.

Table 3. The footnote indicates that the bold values are > 0.7. Does this mean statistical significance? Caption could be more informative.

Figure 1. Caption could be more informative. The stations shown in Figure 1 do not match the stations listed in Table 1. sometimes this is because the operational basin replaces the station but “Enxoé” and “Cobres” are on the figure but not in the table.

Figure 3. Reverse the order of the elements in the legend. The caption needs rewriting “Flow duration curve with the thresholds between the aquatic states identified for the Vallcebre at Can Vila site.” The thresholds are not ‘minimum discharges’ and it should not refer to them as **diverse** aquatic states. Are the three lowest values actually real measurements? The authors should settle on referring to these stations in a single fashion; they seem to jump about in the way they refer to the stations – this only confuses the reader.

Figure 4., Yet another method to refer to stations is used here. This form would be the one that seems most appropriate. Eg “Rambala Minateda at Minetada”. However consider the suggestions for a different format for these figures. The text suggests the basis of the layout of these figures, that should be in the caption provide for this figure.

Some additional references that might be considered in a revision.

- Belmonte, A.M.C., and F.S. Beltran. 2001. Flood events in Mediterranean ephemeral streams (ramblas) in Valencia region, Spain. *Catena* 45:229-249.
- Belnap, J., J.R. Welter, N.B. Grimm, N. Barger, and J.A. Ludwig. 2010. Linkages between microbial and hydrologic processes in arid and semiarid watersheds. *Ecology* 82 (2):298-307.
- Beschta, R.L., and W.S. Platts. 1986. Morphological features of small streams: Significance and function. *Water Resources Bulletin* 22 (3):369-379.
- Blasch, K.W., T.P.A. Ferre, and J.A. Vrugt. 2010. Environmental controls on drainage behaviour of an ephemeral stream. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*:DOI: 10.1007/s00477-010-0398-8.
- Bloss, D.A., and J.D. Brotherson. 1979. Vegetation response to a moisture gradient on an ephemeral stream in Central Arizona. *Great Basin Naturalist* 39:161-176.
- Bobba, A.G., P.A. Chambers, and J. Spoelstra. 2010. Environmental impacts in arid and semiarid floodplains. *Journal of Environmental Hydrology* 18(19):1-15.
- Brooks, R.T. 2009. Potential impacts of global climate change on the hydrology and ecology of ephemeral freshwater systems of the northeastern United States. *Climatic Change* 95:469-483.
- Crocker, K.M., A.R. Young, M.D. Zaidman, and H.G. Rees. 2003. Flow duration curve estimation in ephemeral catchments in Portugal. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 48 (3):427-439.
- Fritz, K.M., and W.K. Dodds. 2005. Harshness: Characterisation of intermittent stream habitat over space and time. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 56:13-23.
- Grimm, N.B., A. Chacon, C.N. Dahm, S.W. Hostetler, O.T. Lind, P.L. Starkweather, and W.W. Wurtsbaugh. 1997. Sensitivity of aquatic ecosystems to climatic and anthropogenic changes: The basin and range, American Southwest and Mexico. *Hydrological Processes* 11:1023-1041.
- Hansen, W.F. 2001. Identifying stream types and management implications. *Forest Ecology and Management* 143:39-46.
- Harms, T.K., and N.B. Grimm. 2010. Influence of the hydrologic regime on resource availability in a semi-arid stream-riparian corridor. *Ecohydrology* :DOI: 10.1002/eco.119.
- Sandercock, P.J., and J.M. Hooke. 2010. Assessment of vegetation effects on hydraulics and of feedbacks on plant survival and zonation in ephemeral channels. *Hydrological Processes* 24:695-713.
- Svec, J.R., R.K. Kolka, and J.W. Stringer. 2005. Defining perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral channels in Eastern Kentucky: Application to forestry best management practices. *Forest Ecology and Management* 214:170-182.

Levick, L.R., Goodrich, D.C., Hernandez, M., Semmens, D., Stromberg, J., Leidy, R., Apodaca, M., Guertin, D.P., Tluczek, M., Kepner, W.G. (*Not yet published*). Hydrology and Ecology of Intermittent Stream and Dry Wash Ecosystems. Southwest Region Threatened, Endangered and at Risk Species Workshop: Managing within Highly Variable Environments, Oct. 22-27, 2007, Tucson, AZ.

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Hydrology and Earth System Sciences (HESS). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in HESS if available.

Developing a novel approach to analyse the regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart¹, N. Prat², E. M. García-Roger², J. Latron¹, M. Rieradevall², P. Llorens¹, G. G. Barberá³, D. Brito⁴, A. M. De Girolamo⁵, A. Lo Porto⁵, R. Neves⁴, N. P. Nikolaidis⁶, J. L. Perrin⁷, E. P. Querner⁸, J. M. Quiñonero³, M. G. Tournoud⁷, O. Tzoraki⁶, and J. Froebrich⁸

¹Surface Hydrology and Erosion Group, IDAEA, CSIC, Jordi Girona 18, 08034 Barcelona, Spain

²Freshwater Ecology and Management (FEM), D. Ecologia, UB, Barcelona, Spain

³Department of Soil and Water Conservation, CEBAS, CSIC, Murcia, Spain

⁴Instituto do Mar (IMAR), Coimbra, Portugal

⁵Water Research Institute (IRSA), CNR, Bari, Italy

⁶Environmental Engineering Department (ENVENG), TUC, Chania, Greece

⁷Hydrosciences Montpellier, Maison des Sciences de l'Eau, Université Montpellier 2, Montpellier, France

⁸Centre for Water and Climate (CWK), Alterra, Wageningen, The Netherlands

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Received: 14 October 2011 – Accepted: 21 October 2011 – Published: 31 October 2011

Correspondence to: F. Gallart (francesc.gallart@idaea.csic.es)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

HESSD

8, 9637–9673, 2011

**The regimes of
temporary streams
and their controls on
aquatic biota**

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Abstract

see notes

Temporary streams are those water courses that undergo the recurrent cessation of flow or the complete drying of their channel. The biological communities in temporary stream reaches are strongly dependent on the temporal changes of the aquatic habitats determined by the hydrological conditions. The use of the aquatic fauna structural and functional characteristics to assess the ecological quality of a temporary stream reach can not therefore be made without taking into account the controls imposed by the hydrological regime. This paper develops some methods for analysing temporary streams' aquatic regimes, based on the definition of six *aquatic states* that summarize the sets of mesohabitats occurring on a given reach at a particular moment, depending on the hydrological conditions: *flood, riffles, connected, pools, dry* and *arid*. We used the water discharge records from gauging stations or simulations using rainfall-runoff models to infer the temporal patterns of occurrence of these states using the developed *aquatic states frequency graph*. The visual analysis of this graph is complemented by the development of two metrics based on the permanence of flow and the seasonality of zero flow periods. Finally, a classification of the aquatic regimes of temporary streams in terms of their influence over the development of aquatic life is presented forward, defining *Permanent, Temporary-pools, Temporary-dry* and *Episodic* regimes. All these methods were tested with data from eight temporary streams at the Mediterranean from MIRAGE project and its application was a precondition to assess the ecological quality of these streams using the current methods prescribed by the European Water Framework Directive for macroinvertebrate communities.

1 Introduction

Temporary streams are water courses that undergo the recurrent cessation of flow or the complete drying of their channel. This type of water course is not only widespread in dry climate areas (e.g. Rossouw et al., 2005; Levick et al., 2008), but constitutes

This choice of terminology should be reconsidered. Is this the right way to prevent confusion when these same terms are used to describe specific hydrological aspects? See comments in report.

HESSD

8, 9637–9673, 2011

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page
Introduction
References
Figures
▶ I
▶
Close
Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



also the first-order stream network in most drainage basins in wetter climates (Fritz et al., 2006). The prevalence of these streams is expected to increase in the near future because of both climate warming and rising water consumption due to human activities (Tooth, 2000; Larned et al., 2010). The interruption of the aquatic conditions in temporary streams plays a determinant role in their ecological communities (Boulton, 1989; Arscott et al., 2010), so much so that temporary streams should be considered a distinct class of ecosystems instead of simply hydrologically challenged permanent streams (Larned et al., 2010). Indeed, though there are still severe gaps in our knowledge of these streams that affect their sound management, the traditional perception among managers that a “healthy” stream must flow all the year round can no longer be sustained (Boulton et al., 2000).

Many studies have been devoted to the hydrological characterization of temporary streams using diverse metrics. The frequency of the zero-flow periods (or its complementary, flow permanence) is the first criterion for all of them (e.g. Hedman and Osterkamp, 1982; Poff, 1996), whereas the seasonality of these periods is also used in some classifications (Uys and O’Keeffe, 1997; Rossouw et al., 2005; Kennard et al., 2010). A few authors also take into account the occurrence of isolated pools during periods without flow (Uys and O’Keeffe, 1997; Boulton et al., 2000). In fact, in ecological terms, the more relevant features of the water regime in temporary streams are the temporal and spatial patterns of occurrence or disappearance of the features of the aquatic habitats that depend on the presence and flow of water (hereafter called meso-habitats), such as riffles and pools, as well as the connectivity of water flow between them (e.g. Lake, 2007; Bonada et al., 2007; Chaves et al., 2008). Nevertheless, the information recorded at network gauging stations consists of water discharges, but the occurrence of the diverse habitats and particularly of pools during periods of zero discharge is not recorded despite their prominent ecological role (e.g. Uys and O’Keeffe, 1997; Bond and Cottingham, 2008).

If predictability hypotheses concerning the hydrological controls on aquatic life may be launched for temporary streams, the methods for measuring the ecological status of

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

these streams and rivers, mainly based on the biological conditions (primary producers, macro-invertebrates and fish) may be established. The ecological status is the key condition of European streams to be evaluated, according to the current regulations for the management of waters, the so called Water Framework Directive (WFD; European Communities, 2000). When the ecological status of a stream is less than good, the water authorities should set up measures to recover this status within a River Basin Management Plan. But biological sampling to determine the ecological status of temporary streams cannot be the same if different mesohabitats are present or not as the sampling designed for permanent ones (plenty of riffles); is inadequate if water is not present on the sampling date or the aquatic life is reduced to those animals found in isolated pools. In this latter case the biological communities found (even if they are pristine) may be significantly poorer in taxa or lower in diversity than the reference ones living in permanent streams. The importance of pools for establishing the ecological status in Mediterranean streams was highlighted by Buffagni et al. (2009) and suggested that pool mesohabitat may give a better indication of biological quality than riffles during the riffle or connected pool phase when sampled separately. How biological metrics defining the ecological status using macroinvertebrates may change from wet to dry periods was investigated recently by Munné and Prat (2011). In another study, the comparison between years (Rosave similar values of the year (dry or wet). Several authors have shown that only when the hydrological controls on aquatic life are completely understood, can the impact of human changes on the duration and predictability of dry conditions in biota and ecological status be assessed (Benejam et al., 2010; Dewson et al., 2007). So, for temporary rivers it appears necessary that before the evaluation of biological condition of the streams for calculating the ecological status, the hydrological conditions (e.g. the mesohabitat phase) should be studied.

Within this context, the present study proposes the analysis of the hydrological regime of temporary streams on the basis of the temporal patterns of the aquatic mesohabitats occurrence relevant to the development of aquatic life at the reach scale.

start a new paragraph here as the subject has changed.

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

First, the concept of Aquatic State, which summarizes the set of aquatic mesohabitats occurring on a given reach at a particular moment depending on the hydrological conditions is introduced. Six states are defined: flood, riffles, connected pools, disconnected pools, dry and arid (definitions provided below). The set of aquatic mesohabitats occurring on a temporary stream reach is known to be crucial for the presence and abundance of aquatic fauna when sampled. Thus, pools act as refuges for fish, providing places of survival during the absence of flow (Magoulik and Kobza, 2003) or influencing their fitness (Spranza and Stanley, 2000). The effect of the aquatic state on the community of macroinvertebrates has been studied in some detail (Feminella, 1996; Bonada et al., 2006; Acuña et al., 2005), as well as the interaction between different trophic levels (Ludlam and Magoulick, 2009). The comparison of communities following multiyear droughts (Magalhães et al., 2007) or the comparison between communities in temporary and permanent streams (Mas-Martí et al., 2010) emphasized the importance of knowing the actual aquatic state and its evolution over time. It is known that fauna in temporary streams are more complex and taxa richness may be even higher than in permanent ones, because the replacement of different aquatic states through the year gives opportunities to a succession of species, making the final richness higher than in permanent streams (e.g. Bonada et al., 2006; García-Roger et al., 2011). The index EPT (Number of taxa of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera) and EPT versus OCH (Taxa of Odonata, Coleoptera and Heteroptera) has proved to be a good indicator of the change of aquatic state (Bonada et al., 2006). The six aquatic states defined below somewhat embrace the five “hydrologic conditions” defined by Fritz et al. (2006), from “no surface water” (0) to “surface flow continuous” (4), but here we put more emphasis on the relevance of the states for biological communities than in the hydrological conditions “per se”.

However, there are nearly no data on the presence, duration and inter-annual variability of different aquatic states in temporary streams, and we can not expect that this kind of data will be operationally recorded in the near future. Therefore, it is necessary to anticipate the temporal patterns of occurrence of these states from the available

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Discussions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

flow records or simulations, which is the second step proposed below. If the water discharge thresholds that separate the aquatic states are defined, the available flow statistics may be transformed into aquatic states statistics. A similar procedure is in common use to assess the chronicle of mesohabitats for fishes from water discharge data, in permanent streams (e.g. Capra et al., 1995). Boulton (2003) outlined the existence of “critical stages” in macroinvertebrate aquatic systems, defined by critical thresholds of discharge or water level at which mesohabitats become isolated or dry during a drought; the approach in the present study is consistent with that scheme, although more attention is paid here to the states between the thresholds and their linkages with hydrologic data for making possible the operational application to regimes analysis. Moreover the analysis of the complex temporal patterns of occurrence of aquatic states is then made more apparent through the development of the Aquatic States Frequency Graph (ASFG), which shows the monthly frequency of occurrence of the states throughout the year.

This graphic method allows a quick visualisation of the aquatic regime of a temporary stream, but its efficient characterisation needs the use of some metrics to represent and compare regimes, as well as to analyse relationships with biological indices or indices. This is undertaken furthermore, through the development and testing of some metrics based on the statistics of the more ecologically relevant feature of water discharge records: the periods with zero flows. This is also one of the novelties of our approach compared with previous works.

Finally, a classification of the aquatic regimes of temporary streams is introduced. This is a conceptual classification based on the controls imposed by the temporal patterns of occurrence of aquatic mesohabitats on biological communities and their relevance for monitoring purposes. This is an important step to be used in the future for stream managers, specially when the WFD rationale is applied to determine the Ecological Status of these streams. Nevertheless, to be operational, this classification should be able for application to stream reaches using recorded or modelled hydrological data. Using this approach we emphasize the fact that prior to any biological sampling, the

this is a jump in logic - why is 'monthly' the appropriate scale - particularly in light of these being applied to temporary streams where the time scale will depend on the system.

application of the metrics proposed has to be calculated and the actual mesohabitat condition known for judging if the current methodologies available for the measure of Ecological Status may be applied.

In summary, this analysis is intended to be useful for three main purposes: improvement in the investigation of the hydrological constraints on the development of aquatic life, the characterisation and classification of aquatic stream regimes (mesohabitat conditions), and the design of the biological sampling calendars (i.e. scheduling biota sampling at the more ecologically significant moments: see Bond and Cottingham, 2008). The ultimate goal is the development of tools for characterising the hydrological constraints on the development of aquatic life in stream reaches for both research and management applications. This method is being developed within the European MIRAGE project, which addresses the improvement of the Water Framework Directive by including temporary streams properly.

2 Methodological approach

The approach developed consists of four steps, as introduced above. In the first step, the mesohabitat conditions (here called aquatic states) relevant to the growth of aquatic life in temporary streams are clearly defined. The second step investigates the temporal patterns of occurrence of the aquatic states at the reach scale, inferred from gauging stations data and shown in a graph. As the periods with zero flow are the key identifiable hydrological driver of biological communities, investigating the metrics that best characterize the frequency and predictability of these periods is the objective of our third step. Finally, classification of the aquatic regimes of the temporary streams is attempted in the fourth step. The first and second steps follow a logical sequence, but the third and four steps are rather independent although they remain consistent with the first two.

The data used for implementing the methods come from the records from gauging stations at several sites around the European Mediterranean (Fig. 1). Table 1 shows the

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



location and main hydrological characteristics of the gauging stations are located in streams with discharges that are not affected by human activities, or only slightly, except for the Vène S station where summer flows are sustained by effluents from urban sewage systems (David et al., 2011). The Vallcebre and Vène streams are research areas where flow data were directly recorded by the teams involved in the MIRAGE project (Latron and Gallart, 2008; Perrin and Tournoud, 2009), whereas the flow data from the other stations were obtained from the respective basin authorities.

The time scale used here is the month, because it is easier to manage and to obtain from records or models and it is presumed sufficient for most ecological applications; data from 10 yr were used, whenever available. The spatial scale is the stream reach (50–100 m long), which is the scale of gauging station measurements and usual field observations. The analysis of spatial patterns along stream courses or networks would need the use of distributed field observations or the simulations made with a model designed for this purpose (e.g. Arscott et al., 2010).

2.1 First step: defining the ecologically relevant aquatic states

The aquatic states summarize the set of aquatic mesohabitats occurring on a given reach at a particular moment, depending on the hydrological conditions. From a review of the literature (Hawkins et al., 1993; Gasith and Resh, 1999; Boulton, 2003; Fritz et al., 2006; Lake, 2007) and the expertise of some of the authors (e.g. Rieradevall et al., 1999; Bonada et al., 2006, 2007), the following aquatic states may be defined as relevant in the ecology of temporary stream reaches, in a sequence from the wetter to the drier.

– *Flood*: high-water state occurs when stream water velocity and discharge cause major movement of stream bed alluvium and the drift of most of the aquatic fauna in the reach. In permanent streams, this state would correspond to flow above bankfull discharge, but temporary streams may not show distinct channel banks. Observations of temporary streams suggest that floods cause a strong but short-lived disturbance in aquatic communities (Boulton and Lake, 1992; Lake, 2000; Arscott et al., 2010),

should be speeled out in full here.

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



whereas their occurrence is considered highly relevant to the health of river systems (Junk et al., 1989). This state is not differentiated from the following one neither in the Fritz et al.'s. (2006) nor in the Boulton's (2003) arrangements.

– *Riffles*: water discharge is high enough to allow the occurrence of all the available aquatic habitats in the reach, including the abundant presence of riffles, allowing optimum hydraulic connectivity between the diverse habitats. This is the habitual state in permanent streams and the one with the wider range of discharges in temporary streams. This state corresponds to the “surface flow continuous (4)” condition defined by Fritz et al. (2006), whereas Boulton (2003) differentiated two intermediate states above or below the critical step of water body “isolation from the littoral vegetation”.

– *Connected pools*: water discharge is low but sufficient to connect most pools in the reach through water rivulets. Riffles are absent or limited to scarce rapid flow areas between main pools (Bonada et al., 2006). This state corresponds to the “flow only interstitial (3)” condition by Fritz et al. (2006), and below the “loss of riffle” Boulton's (2003) critical step.

– *Pools*: surface discharge is close to zero, but a number of water pools remain in the stream bed. If this is alluvial, some sub-surface connectivity of water may occur that allows the preservation of the physico-chemical quality of the water in the pools. If the stream bed is impervious, the pool waters may suffer quality deterioration trends or cycles. The ecological importance of pools remaining after the cessation of flow has been highlighted in many papers (e.g. Boulton, 1989; Buffagni, et al., 2009). This state corresponds to both “surface water present but no visible flow (2)” and ‘surface water in pools only (1) conditions defined by Fritz et al. (2006), whereas it is just mentioned but not differentiated from the former one by a critical step in Boulton (2003).

– *Dry*: most of the stream bed is devoid of surface water in the reach, although alluvium may remain wet enough to allow hyporheic life (alluvium water content is higher than the field capacity point). The hyporheic zone may be a refuge for many animals when surface water is absent (Boulton, 1989; Boulton et al., 1998), so it should be considered also as an aquatic mesohabitat. This state is included within the “no surface

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Judgemental language

Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
⏪	⏩
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	



water (0)” condition defined by Fritz et al. (2006), and below the “loss of surface water” critical step defined by Boulton (2003).

– *Arid*: the entire stream bed is devoid of surface water in the reach and alluvium is dry, impeding active hyporheic life (alluvium water content is lower than field capacity and similar to the surrounding soils in terrestrial locations). **Some invertebrates may survive as desiccation-resistant stages in dry substrata for some time (Boulton, 1989). This state is also included within the “no surface water (0)” condition of Fritz et al. (2006), and below the “drying hyporheic zone” critical step of Boulton (2003).**

2.2 Second step. Time patterns of occurrence of aquatic states

Although temperature and electrical conductivity of either water or bed sediments may be used for recording the timing of hydrological conditions in the absence of flow (Constantz et al., 2001; Blasch et al., 2003; Fritz et al., 2006), the only information currently available on stream water regimes is from flow discharge records, from either measurements at gauging stations or simulations using rainfall-runoff models. Although in many cases daily flows are available, a monthly time scale (as mentioned above) is proposed for the analysis of the regimes, since it is more **easily** available from the records and **models**.

Flow data from a gauging station may be used to obtain the statistics of the occurrence of the wetter aquatic states (flood, riffles, connected, pools), following the procedure shown in Fig. 2 that is made easy to the reader through the use of the ASFG.xls spreadsheet available as Electronic Supplementary Material to this paper. Flow simulations obtained with a rainfall-runoff model may be alternatively used, but as most models will not be able to simulate zero water discharges, the identification of a discharge threshold equivalent to zero will be necessary.

The most critical step of the procedure is the selection of the threshold flow values that separate the occurrence of the diverse aquatic states. This that can be done with the help of the shape of the flow duration curve (distribution function of flow discharges, Fig. 3). To identify these thresholds correctly, field observations on the aquatic states

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



synchronous with discharge measurements are needed. However, in the absence of these observations, thresholds can be provisionally estimated by taking into account the width and regularity of the stream bed reach near the gauging station.

The aquatic state corresponding to minimum recorded discharge values (close to zero) depends on the design of the gauging station and the characteristics of the reach. For reaches over alluvial sediments with gauging stations designed to impede sub-surface flow below them, very low flow may be expected to correspond approximately to the threshold between *dry* and *pool* aquatic states. In contrast, for stream reaches over impervious bedrock or alluvial ones with gauging stations allowing the bypass of sub-surface flow, minimum recorded flow may be expected to represent the threshold between *pool* and *connected* states. Consequently, discharge data cannot be used to derive information on the occurrence of the *arid* aquatic state in the first case and of the *dry* and *arid* aquatic states in the second case. Once the discharge thresholds between aquatic states are defined, they are used to convert the table of monthly discharges into the tables of occurrence of these aquatic states.

Then, the long-term monthly frequencies obtained for the diverse aquatic states are obtained and plotted on an Aquatic States Frequency Graph (ASFG), with the frequencies accumulating from drier to wetter states for every month. In this study, data from 10 yr of daily flows were used, whenever available. Figure 4 shows the examples of ASFGs obtained for the various study sites. The discharge threshold values between aquatic states were estimated without field observations, using the expertise of the authors, and minimum measured flows were taken as the threshold between *dry* and *pool* states in the interim.

2.3 Third step: metrics for characterizing the aquatic regime in temporary rivers

The ASFG method given above allows appraisal of the aquatic regime of the reach, as it describes the mean annual prevalence and timing of aquatic states for a stream reach by month. Nevertheless, the displayed information is too complex to be synthesized in a few metrics, and it depends on the selection of flow thresholds.

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

⏪ ⏩

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

To circumvent these limitations, from the original discharge information we selected the metrics that synthesize the two main parameters that are relevant to river ecology: the duration and predictability periods with flow. Many studies are devoted to characterizing the flow regime of streams for ecological or management purposes with diverse metrics, but most of these metrics are conceived for permanent flow. For example, the Richards-Baker flashiness index (Baker et al., 2004) assigns zero flashiness values during the periods without flow because there is no change in the discharge values within them; subsequently but inconsistently, the longer the annual period without flow in a stream, the less flashy its regime is. In the present study, only metrics focusing on the analysis of the statistics of the cessation of flow were considered, as this is the only flow discharge feature directly linked to some major change in the aquatic states available from flow records. It may be hypothesized that the cessation of flow is the key feature defining the aquatic regime in a temporary stream (Boulton, 1989), and therefore the statistics of its metrics will summarize the main characteristics of the regimes of its aquatic states, seen in its ASFG.

The relative time with or without water flow is usually the metrics used for identifying temporary streams (e.g. Hedman and Osterkamp, 1982; Hewlett, 1982). Among regional flow regime studies, Poff (1996), in a widely used approach, employed only the mean number of days with zero flow per year; and Kennard et al. (2010) used both the mean and the coefficient of variation of the number of days with zero flow per year, although there are no studies analysing the ecological significance of this latter metric. In an ecological study of a single stream in New Zealand, Arscott et al. (2010) characterised the aquatic regime at several points by using flow permanence (long-term annual average of the percentage of time a given site had flowing water), flow duration (days of flow at a site prior to each sample date) and drying frequency (average number of drying transitions per year). Arscott's results showed that flow permanence and duration correlated closely, with the former being a good predictor of ecological features (see also Larned et al., 2010).

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



From these studies, it can be concluded that two metrics deserve to be retained for further investigation here: a measurement of flow permanence (a concept less ambiguous than flow duration), as the long-term mean annual relative number of months with flow, M_f (taking values between 0 and 1), and the drying frequency D_f , as in Arscott et al. (2010).

As well as ~~these~~ flow permanence and drying frequency metrics, several authors point to the relevant ecological role of the predictability of wetting or drying periods, because this predictability allows the development of taxa specialized in living in temporary conditions (e.g. Williams, 2006; Wissinger, 2006). As ~~many~~ **predictable** metrics were found in the literature, the predictability of wetting or drying periods was analysed using the P , C and M predictability metrics. The predictability metric, measurement, seasonality of drying (Sd_6), was developed by Colwell (1974), on the basis of Shannon's entropy, defined three metrics adequate for analysing the periodicity of the qualitative states of a system. These metrics were first defined on the basis of monthly system states for analysing seasonal periodicity during the year, but other time scales may be used. Following this author, seasonal predictability (P) of the monthly states of a system may be attained **by** two separable additional components: constancy (C), a measurement of state permanence, and contingency (M), a measurement of the repeatability of the time pattern in successive years. Here, the two system states considered are zero and positive values of discharge in the records of the gauging stations.

In addition to these metrics, **the six-month seasonal predictability of dry periods (Sd_6) defined in Eq. (1) is here proposed** as a new metric for characterizing the seasonality of the dry (zero-discharge values) conditions on a stream reach:

$$Sd_6 = 1 - \left(\frac{\sum_1^6 Fd_i}{\sum_1^6 Fd_j} \right) \quad (1)$$

where Fd_i represents the multi-annual frequencies of 0-flow months for the contiguous 6 wetter months of the year and Fd_j represents the multi-annual frequencies of 0-flow

Sd6 needs to be defined here and not later as is presnetly the case

months for the remaining 6 drier months. Wet and dry 6-month periods mean here those with fewer and more zero-flow frequencies, respectively. The calculation of this metric is also made easy to the reader through the use of the ASFG.xls spreadsheet available as Supplement to this paper.

This variable is dimensionless and takes the value of 0 when zero flows occur equally throughout the year in the long run and 1 when all the zero flows occur in the same 6-month period every year. When the regime is fully permanent, this metric cannot be computed, so the value of 1 is set to indicate full predictability. It is worth stating that Sd_6 is defined at the 6-month scale, whereas the Colwell (1974) metrics were applied at the monthly scale.

The redundancy between these six metrics (M_f , Sd_6 , D_f , P , C and M) was analysed by calculating the linear correlation coefficients when applied to the eight basins studied here (Table 2). All three of Colwell's (1974) predictability metrics (P , C and M) correlated significantly with flow permanence (M_f) and the first two correlated negatively with drying frequency (D_f), whereas Sd_6 only correlated significantly with predictability (P). Indeed, a factor analysis (maximum likelihood factors method) built with this correlation matrix showed that two factors explained 89% of variance, in which M_f , D_f , P , C and M metrics had high absolute loads in the first factor, whereas only Sd_6 had a high load in the second factor (Table 3). The possible role of the time scale in the use of P , C and M metrics was analysed by calculating them on the same 6-month periods used for the Sd_6 metric; the resulting 6-month values had correlation coefficients higher than 0.98 with the monthly values, showing weak -what "tests" are they referring to? with this change of scale.

As a result of these tests, only flow permanence (M_f) and the seasonal predictability of dry periods (Sd_6) were selected for the subsequent analyses. The former (or its conversion into the number of days with zero-flows) has been widely used and found to be significant for explaining the aquatic fauna, whereas the latter is the more orthogonal of the metrics tested and is easy to put in plain words in interviews when instrumental information is not available. This does not mean that the other metrics tested might not

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

⏪ ⏩

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



be useful for deeper analyses or for the investigation of aquatic regimes in other types of climate.

2.4 Fourth step: classifying temporary stream aquatic regimes

Although the ASFG and regime metrics shown in the preceding sections are deemed sufficient for analysing and comparing temporary stream regimes, a classification of temporary streams within the perspective of the present paper is necessary for operational purposes, as different stream regimes will need different sampling strategies and standards for defining the biological quality of stream waters (e.g. Bond and Cottingham, 2008), which is one of the most important objectives of the MIRAGE project.

Although there is some agreement on the main terminology for classification of temporary stream regimes, the criteria used to establish the limits between the regime classes vary between different authors (Rossouw et al., 2005; Levick et al., 2008). On the basis of the above considerations and the classifications proposed by Uys and O’Keeffe (1997) and Boulton et al. (2000), four main conceptual types of streams were defined by the MIRAGE project in function of the controls imposed by the time patterns of occurrence of aquatic mesohabitats on biological communities and their relevance for monitoring purposes:

P (permanent or perennial): no relevant recurrent controls imposed on biological communities by lack of flow. Monitoring methods have already been defined (e.g. Hering et al., 2006).

IP (intermittent-pools): stream’s aquatic regime allows every year the development of biological communities similar to those in permanent streams, but after the wet season flow is discontinued and only pools with impoverished communities remain. Ecological quality may be assessed as for permanent streams, though the biological sampling calendar may need adaptation to the hydrological regime. Sampling has to be done during the period with the more persistent flow.

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



ID (intermittent-dry): streams usually cease to flow and dry out in summer, but in the wet season biological communities similar to those of permanent streams can be found, even if these may vary from year to year. Biological quality assessment needs to be measured with specific biological metrics somewhat different than those of permanent streams and (very important) a calendar adapted to the hydrological regime.

E (episodic-ephemeral): water flow and pools are short-lived and occasional. Therefore, most of the organisms found are opportunistic, adapted to a quick development of their biological cycle. Biological quality assessment needs other methods beyond the customary study of aquatic fauna (e.g. desiccation-resistant stages of aquatic fauna or terrestrial fauna).

As defined above, the classification of a stream reach in this scheme would need the analysis of its aquatic biology, in non-impacted water quality conditions, under diverse aquatic states and in comparison with other streams in the region (Reference approach, Bailey et al., 2004). Research is ongoing within the MIRAGE project to define the threshold values of the hydrological metrics defined in the former section for operationally classifying a stream reach on the basis of the statistics of zero-flow occurrence, and some interim trials were attempted in the Results section. The definition of these thresholds would allow the operational use of this classification for assisting the biological sampling strategy, as well as the interpretation of the biological communities found in terms of the ecological quality of the stream waters.

3 Results

Once the interim water discharge aquatic states were assessed, ASFGs for the eight g as shown in Fig. 4. The relative importance of wet ar and the degree of seasonality of the regime may be assessed at a glance from these graphs. These

was this done iteratively?
What criteria was used to determine improvement?

simple criteria were used to order the graphs in the figure, placing the wetter basins at the top and the more seasonal ones on the right-hand side.

The results obtained with the metrics of flow permanence, M_f , and seasonal predictability of dry periods, Sd_6 , are shown in Fig. 5. Here, the stations with the highest flow permanence are located on the right and those with higher seasonal predictability at the top. The boundaries between the regime types are tentative, because more sites should be analyzed.

The wetter streams, Rambla Minateda and Vène at station S, are both at the outlets of karstic systems and have near-permanent regimes. Nevertheless, the Vène stream undergone occasional dry periods in some summers, whereas, in the Rambla de Minateda, dry periods were more scattered throughout the year. Therefore, the respective Sd_6 metrics had different values for these streams and are clearly separate in Figure 5. The aquatic communities found in these streams should be no different from those living in perennial streams in the region (*Permanent* type).

At Vallcebre, the regime followed the equinoctial regime of precipitation: flow is more frequent in spring, whereas floods occur mainly in autumn and scattered over 9 months of the year. The Evrotas stream showed flow permanence and a more regular seasonal pattern, with a high M_f in Fig. 5. It may be expected that the aquatic communities in both to those in perennial streams (*Permanent* type), whereas at Vallcebre might be expected to be temporarily affected by the cessation of the complete drying of the stream, but expected to be similar to perennial streams if sampled sufficiently after the scarce dry periods (*Irregular* type).

Both the Manol and Celone streams had similar flow permanence. Fig. 4 shows much greater regularity for the Celone stream, where continuous flow normally occurs from January to April. Indeed, the Celone stream had higher seasonality, as shown by the higher value of the Sd_6 metric in Fig. 5. It is worth noting that the features shown for the Manol stream in Fig. 4 and the low Sd_6 metric are linked to the occurrence of some sporadic periods of flow every year but with irregular

This would be cleared if these graphs were formed considering the amount of water present, this is not immediately self evident.

While the precipitation pattern might be aligned to this time in the year, it seems odd to link the precipitation pattern to the equinox.

2011

of
streams
on

aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Discussion Paper | Discussion Paper | Discussion Paper

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



seasonal organisation in diverse years (low predictability). This may also be seen by analysing the drying frequency Df metrics for these streams, which gives 1.17 annual drying sequences for the Manol, but only 0.92 for the Celone. The characteristics of the aquatic communities living in these stream reaches may be expected to differ in spite of the similar value of their flow permanence. Indeed, as habitat conditions are very predictable in the Celone stream, during the wet season (from December to May) aquatic fauna are likely to be similar in richness and variety to those in perennial streams (*Intermittent-pools* type). On the contrary, as aquatic habitats are much less predictable in the Manol stream, aquatic fauna living in this stream are likely to be always less abundant and diverse, yielding low values of the biological metrics due to the hydrological constraints (*Intermittent-dry* type).

Finally, both the Vène stream at station K and the Cobres stream show the lowest frequency of flow occurrence, although the Cobres stream had higher predictability of flow (during winter), as shown in Fig. 4, and a much higher value of the Sd₆ metric, as shown in Fig. 5. This difference is also shown here by the drying frequency Df metrics, which is as high as 1.63 for Vène at station K, but only 0.95 for the Cobres. As in the former example, the characteristics of the aquatic fauna living in these streams are likely to differ because of the large difference in habitat predictability: the aquatic communities living in the Cobres stream may be well adapted to a dry but predictable regime (*Intermittent-dry* type), whereas those living in the Vène K are expected to be rather opportunistic (*Ephemeral* type).

4 Discussion

4.1 Stream regime analysis

In spite of the difficulties in working out the limits between the aquatic states defined above, the interim assessment of the flow thresholds used for the ASFGs and the use of the flow permanence Mf and seasonal predictability of dry periods Sd₆ metrics

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



provided a clear and nuanced analysis of the establishment of aquatic regimes that were relevant for ecological and management purposes on the gauged reaches. When more field information is available on the threshold discharges that define the aquatic states on these reaches, the boundaries between states may be refined in the ASFGs, but their general shape will not change much because they are driven by the statistics of the objective zero flow values.

The analysis of the ASFG suggests that the duration of the states might be calculated for every month. However, as this graph is a long-term probability analysis, the actual duration (in a given year) must be analysed directly from the data series using other metrics. Here, although only the mean annual frequency of drying transitions D_f has been tested, other annual or monthly metrics might be useful to characterize the statistics of periods with or without flow. Indeed, at the test gauging stations the two metrics on flow permanence and predictability were sufficient to characterise and compare the aquatic regimes. However, if this kind of analysis is to be applied to temporary streams in other climates, some other metrics may be needed such as the timing of the drying period if its predictability is high.

Nevertheless, since most temporary streams are ungauged or poorly gauged, the methodology described above will be applicable to the relatively rare existing records from gauging stations. **Rainfall-runoff models may be used to obtain simulated flow series for many sites at the monthly scale used, but there are two main difficulties: first, most models will not be able to simulate zero water discharges, so the identification of a discharge threshold equivalent to zero will be necessary to use the above-defined metrics (see also Kirkby et al., 2011); and second, simulated values will be natural ones not actual ones if these are affected by human activities.**

~~Beyond the use of flow data and models,~~ the permanence of flowing water in head-water streams has been operationally estimated from field surveys or topographic map data (Svec et al., 2005; Fritz et al., 2008). The presence of water at the pool scale has also been monitored by using temperature or electrical conductivity observations (Constantz et al., 2001; Blasch et al., 2002; Fritz et al., 2006) or, at the basin scale, remote

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



sensing (Marcus and Fonstad, 2008). The estimates of flow permanence obtained through some of these methods might be used to find the zero discharge threshold of a model. Furthermore, the relatively simple meaning of the M_f and Sd_6 metrics may also allow the operational classification of a stream's aquatic regime assessment from interviews with people living near the streams.

Unfortunately, the drier aquatic states, particularly the *arid* state, cannot be suitably analysed from flow discharge records or simulations. The statistics of these states need other types of data beyond the water discharges usually measured or modelled in scientific or operational hydrology. Nevertheless, the examination of the ASFG may provide some insight into the possibilities of occurrence of these states over the course of the year and, when seasonality is high, it shows when pool occurrence or alluvium moisture needs to be tested for their recognition.

4.2 Ecological implications

As the six aquatic states and the subsequent analyses developed above were designed on the basis of preceding ecological studies in temporary waters, they can be expected to be useful for analysing the controls of the aquatic regime in the aquatic biological communities.

The first results obtained in the European MIRAGE project do indeed suggest this. Table 4 gives data on biological community metrics obtained with the methods described in Garcia-Roger et al. (2011) which are similar to those used at pan-European scale (Buffagni et al., 2006). The resulting biological water quality metrics are provided for four streams currently investigated in the MIRAGE project. Three of them have high flow permanence M_f and seasonality Sd_6 values (Vallcebre, Vène S station and Evrotas). Compared with permanent streams in the same area, their biological community metrics do not deviate very much in the wet period (i.e. spring). On the contrary, the Vène K stream, which has much lower values in the two metrics (see Fig. 5), would be classified as of poor ecological quality using the biological standards developed for permanent streams, in spite of its near-pristine quality. The low ecological

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



values observed at Vène S station in spite of its favourable regime are attributed to the fact that, as shown by chemical analyses, the water quality of this reach is highly disturbed because of the spill of effluents from urban waste water treatment plants (David et al., 2011).

5 These methods described above offer the possibility of extending the biological meth-
ods used in permanent streams to the range of temporary stream types if an adequate
definition of the sampling period is made. The recovery of the community is highly
dependent not only on the duration of the dry period, but also on the predictability of
such a period over years. However, if flow is present in the wet period for several
10 months (usually spring), riffles offer the opportunity to measure biological quality us-
ing macro-invertebrates (Rose et al., 2008). Nevertheless, the time of sampling must
be determined by the hydrological conditions rather than the time of year because, as
demonstrated by Munné and Prat (2011), wet summers and springs give higher values
of metrics than dry springs do. Therefore, the moment when the sample is taken is cru-
15 cial in establishing ecological status and should not be linked to a specific time of the
year, but to a specific condition of the hydrograph. This was a key issue in the MIRAGE
project and data in Table 4 were collected following this rule. From these data and the
works of Rose et al. (2008) and Munné and Prat (2009), we can conclude that in tem-
porary streams, if samples are taken at the appropriate stage of the hydrograph (after
20 flow has resumed in the stream and been present in it for at least a month), ecological
status may be measured by the same methods as in permanent streams if the val-
ues of the Mf and SD₆ metrics are rather high. Despite the fluctuations in community
assemblages described in Feminella (1996), Bonada et al. (2006, 2007) and Bêche
and Resh (2007) and despite the changes from riffle-dominant species (EPT) to pool-
25 dominant species (OCH), consistency of ecological status may be measured in both
riffle-dominant and connected-pool conditions (Bonada et al., 2007; Rose et al., 2008).

Nevertheless, in streams with low flow permanence Mf and/or low seasonal pre-
dictability Sd₆, such as the Vène at K station, the hydrological controls on biological
communities are so high that the ecological quality must be measured using either

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

standards particularly designed for them or other alternative methods (e.g. desiccation-resistant stages of aquatic fauna, terrestrial fauna, riparian environment. . .).

5 Researchers with data on biological water quality metrics in temporary streams are invited to test the methods described above, in order to investigate how temporary stream aquatic regimes control aquatic fauna. The preparation of the Aquatic States Frequency Graph and the calculation of the Mf and Sd₆ metrics from flow data may be made through the use of the ASFG.xls spreadsheet available as Electronic Supplementary Material to this paper.

Supplementary material related to this article is available online at:

10 <http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/8/9637/2011/hessd-8-9637-2011-supplement.zip>.

Acknowledgements. The research leading to these results received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2011) under grant agreement 211732 (MIRAGE project). Investigations in the Vallcebre Research Catchments are supported by the Probase (CGL2006-11619 HID), Montes (CSD2008-00040) and ResPHiMed (CGL2010-18374) projects, funded by the Spanish Government. J. Latron was the beneficiary of a research contract (Ramón y Cajal program) funded by the "Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación". The authors are indebted to M. J. Kirkby, Claudia Campana and Vazken Andréassian for their comments. The recommendations made by two anonymous reviewers of an early manuscript helped to improve the quality of the paper.

References

- Acuña, V., Muñoz, I., Giorgi, A., Omella, M., Sabater, F., and Sabater, S.: Drought and post-drought recovery cycles in an intermittent Mediterranean stream: structural and functional aspects, *J. North. Am. Benth. Soc.*, 24, 919–933, 2005.
- 25 Arscott, D. B., Larned, S., Scarsbrook, M. R., and Lambert, P.: Aquatic invertebrate community structure along an intermittence gradient: Selwyn River, New Zealand, *J. North. Am. Benth. Soc.*, 29, 530–545, 2010

HESSD

8, 9637–9673, 2011

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Bailey, R. C., Norris, R. H., and Reynoldson, T. B.: Bioassessment of freshwater ecosystems using the Reference Condition Approach, Kluwer Amsterdam, 2004.
- Baker, D. B., Richards, R. P., Loftus, T. T., and Kramer, J.: A new flashiness index: Characteristics and applications to Midwestern rivers and streams, *J. Am. Water Resour. As.*, 40, 503–522, 2004.
- Bêche, L. A. and Resh, V. H.: Short-term climatic trends affect the temporal variability of macroinvertebrate in California Mediterranean streams, *Freshw. Biol.*, 52, 2317–2339, 2007
- Benejam, L., Angemeier, P. L., Munné, A., and García-Berthou, E.: Assessing effects of water abstraction on fish assemblages in Mediterranean streams, *Freshw. Biol.*, 55, 628–644, 2010
- Blasch, K. W., Ferre, T. P. A., Christensen, A. H., and Hoffmann, J. P.: New Field Method to Determine Streamflow Timing Using Electrical Resistance Sensors, *Vadose Zone J.*, 1, 289–299, 2003.
- Bonada, N., Rieradevall, M., Prat, N., and Resh, V. H.: Benthic macroinvertebrate assemblages and macrohabitat connectivity in Mediterranean-climate streams of northern California, *J. North. Am. Benth. Soc.*, 25, 32–43, 2006.
- Bonada, N., Rieradevall, M., and Prat, N.: Macroinvertebrate community structure and biological traits related to flow permanence in Mediterranean river network, *Hydrobiologia*, 589, 91–106, 2007.
- Bond, N. R. and Cottingham, P.: Ecology and hydrology of temporary streams: implications for sustainable water management, eWater Technical Report, Canberra, available at: http://www.ewater.com.au/uploads/files/Bond_Cottingham-2008-Temporary_Streams.pdf, 2008.
- Boulton, A. J.: Over-summering refuges of aquatic macroinvertebrates in two intermittent streams in central Victoria, *T. Roy. Soc. South. Aust.*, 31, 23–34, 1989.
- Boulton, A. J.: Parallels and contrasts in the effects of drought on stream macroinvertebrate assemblages, *Freshw. Biol.*, 48, 1173–1185, 2003.
- Boulton, A. J. and Lake, P. S.: The ecology of two intermittent streams in Victoria, Australia. III. Temporal changes in faunal composition, *Freshw. Biol.*, 27, 123–138, 1992.
- Boulton, A. J., Findlay, S., Marmonier, P., Stanley, E. H., and Valett, H. M.: The Functional Significance of the Hyporheic Zone in Streams and Rivers, *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 29, 59–81, 1998.
- Boulton, A. J., Sheldon, F., Thoms, M. C., and Stanley, E. H.: Problems and constraints in managing rivers with variable flow regimes, in: *Global perspectives on river conservation: science, policy and practice*, edited by: Boon, P. J., Davies, B. R., and Petts, G. E., John

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶


Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Wiley & Sons, London, 415–425, 2000.
- Buffagni, A., Erba, S., Cazzola, M., Murria-Bligh, J., Soszka, H., and Genomi, P.: The Star common metrics approach to the WFD intercalibration process: full application for small, lowland rivers in three European countries, *Hydrobiologia*, 566, 379–399, 2006.
- 5 Buffagni, A., Armanini, D. G., and Erba, S.: Does lentic-lotic character of rivers affect invertebrate metrics used in the assessment of ecological quality?, *J. Limnol.*, 68, 95–109, 2009
- Capra, H., Pascal, B., and Souchon, Y.: A new tool to interpret magnitude and duration of fish habitat variations, *Regul. River*, 10, 281–289, 1995.
- Chaves, M. L., Rieradevall, M., Chainho, P., Costa, J. L., Costa, M. J., and Prat, N.: Macroinvertebrate communities of non-glacial, high altitude intermittent streams, *Freshw. Biol.*, 53, 55–76, 2008.
- 10 Colwell, R. K.: Predictability, constancy and contingency of periodic phenomena, *Ecology*, 55, 1148–1153, 1974.
- Constantz, J., Stonestrom, D., Stewart, A. E., Niswonger, R., and Smith, T. R.: Analysis of streambed temperature in ephemeral channels to determine stream flow frequency and duration, *Water Resour. Res.*, 37, 317–328, 2001.
- David, A., Perrin, J. L., Rosain, D., Rodier, C., Picot, B., and Tournoud, M. G.: Implication of two in-stream processes in the fate of nutrients discharged by sewage effluents in a temporary river, *Environ. Monit. Assess*, 181, 491–507, doi:10.1007/s10661-010-1844-2, 2011.
- 20 Dewson, Z. S., James, A. B. W., and Death, R. G.: Invertebrate community responses to experimentally reduced discharge in small streams of different water quality, *J. North. Am. Benth. Soc.*, 12, 197–200, 2007.
- European Communities: Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, *O.J. L 327*, 22.12.2000, 1–73, 2000.
- 25 Feminella, J. W.: Comparison of benthic macroinvertebrate assemblages in small streams along a gradient of flow permanence, *J. North. Am. Benth. Soc.*, 15, 651–668, 1996.
- Fritz, K. M., Johnson, B. R., and Walters, D. M.: Field Operations Manual for Assessing the Hydrologic Permanence and Ecological Condition of Headwater Streams. EPA/600/ R-06/126, US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington DC, available at: <http://www.epa.gov/eerd/manual/headwater.htm>, 2006.
- 30 Fritz, K. M., Johnson, B. R., and Walters, D. M.: Physical indicators of hydrologic permanence in forested headwater streams, *J. North. Am. Benth. Soc.*, 27, 690–704, 2008.

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- García-Roger, E. M., Sánchez-Montoya, M. M., Gómez, R., Suárez, M. L., Vidal-Abarca, M. R., Rieradevall, M., Latron, J., and Prat, N.: Do seasonal changes in habitat features influence aquatic macroinvertebrate assemblages in permanent vs. temporary Mediterranean streams?, *Aq. Sci.*, 73, 567–579, 2011.
- 5 Gasith, A. and Resh, V. H.: Streams in Mediterranean climate regions: abiotic influences and biotic responses to predictable seasonal events, *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 30, 51–81, 1999.
- Hawkins, C. P., Kershner, J. L., Bisson, P. A., Bryant, M. D., Decker, L. M., Gregory, S. V., McCullough, D. A., Overton, C. K., Reeves, G. H., Steedman, R. J., and Young, M. K.: A hierarchical approach to classifying stream habitat features, *Fisheries*, 18, 3–12, 1993.
- 10 Hedman, E. R. and Osterkamp, W. R.: Stream flow characteristics related to channel geometry of streams in western United States, *USGS Water-Supply Paper*, 2193, 17 pp., 1982.
- Hering, D., Johnson, R. K., Kramm, S., Schmutz, S., Szoszkiewicz, K., and Verdonschot, P. F. M.: Assessment of European streams with diatoms, macrophytes, macroinvertebrates and fish: a comparative metric based analysis of organism response to stress, *Freshw. Biol.*, 51, 1757–1785, 2006.
- 15 Hewlett, J. D.: *Principles of Forest Hydrology*, University of Georgia Press, Athens, Ga, 183 pp, 1982.
- Junk, W. J., Bayley, P. B., and Sparks, R. E.: The flood pulse concept in river-floodplain systems, in: *Proceedings of the International Large River Symposium*, edited by: Dodge, D. P., *Can. Spec. Publ. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, 106, 110–127, 1989.
- 20 Kennard, M. J., Pusey, B. J., Olden, J. D., MacKay, S. J., Stein, J. L., and Marsh, N.: Classification of natural flow regimes in Australia to support environmental flow management, *Freshw. Biol.* 55, 171–193, 2010.
- Kirkby, M. J., Gallart, F., Kjeldsen, T. R., Irvine, B. J., Froebrich, J., Lo Porto, A., and the MIRAGE team: Characterizing temporary hydrological regimes at a European scale, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 8, 4355–4379, doi:10.5194/hessd-8-4355-2011, 2011.
- 25 Lake, P. S.: Disturbance, patchiness, and diversity in streams, *J. North. Am. Benth. Soc.*, 19, 573–592, 2000.
- Lake, P. S.: Flow-generated disturbances and ecological responses: Floods and droughts in: *Hydroecology and Ecohydrology: Past, Present and Future*, edited by: Wood, P. J., Hannah, D. M., and Sadler, J., P., John Wiley & Sons, London, 2007.
- 30 Larned, S. T., Datry, Th., Arscott, D. B., and Tockner, K.: Emerging concepts in temporary-river ecology, *Freshw. Biol.*, 55, 717–738, 2010.

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Latron, J. and Gallart, F.: Runoff generation processes in a small Mediterranean research catchment (Vallcebre, Eastern Pyrenees), *J. Hydrol.*, 358, 206–220, 2008.
- Levick, L., Fonseca, J., Goodrich, D., Hernandez, M., Semmens, D., Stromberg, J., Leidy, R., Scianni, M., Guertin, D. P., Tluczek, M., and Kepner, W.: The Ecological and Hydrological Significance of Ephemeral and Intermittent Streams in the Arid and Semi-arid American Southwest, US Environmental Protection Agency and USDA/ARS Southwest Watershed Research Center, EPA/600/R-08/134, ARS/233046, 116 pp, 2008.
- 5 **Lundlam, J. P. and Magoulick, D. D.: Spatial and temporal variation in the effects of fish and crayfish on benthic communities during stream drying. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* 28, 371–382, 2009.**
- 10 **Not cited in text - is it Ludlam? cited on page 5?**
- Magalhães, M. F., Beja, P., Schlosser, J., and ... year
droughts on fish assemblages of seasonally ... Biol.,
52, 1494–1510, 2007
- Magoulick, D. D. and Kobza, R. M.: The role of refugia for fishes during drought: a review and synthesis, *Freshw. Biol.*, 48, 1232–1253, 2003.
- 15 Marcus, W. A. and Fonstad, M. A.: Optical remote mapping of rivers at sub-meter resolutions and watershed extents, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, 33, 4–24, 2008.
- Mas-Martí, E., García-Berthou, E., Sabater, S., Tomanova, S., and Muñoz, I.: Comparing fish assemblages and trophic ecology of permanent and intermittent reaches in a Mediterranean stream, *Hydrobiologia*, 657, 167–180, 2010.
- 20 Munné, A. and Prat, N.: Use of macroinvertebrate-based multimetric indices for water quality evaluation in Spanish Mediterranean rivers: an intercalibration approach with the IBMWP index, *Hydrobiologia*, 628, 203–225, 2009.
- Munné, A. and Prat, N.: Effects of Mediterranean climate annual variability on stream biological quality assessment using macroinvertebrate communities, *Ecol. Ind.*, 11, 651–662, 2011.
- 25 Perrin, J. L. and Tournoud, M. G.: Hydrological processes controlling flow generation in a small Mediterranean catchment under karstic influence, *Hydrol. Sci. J.*, 54, 1125–1140, 2009.
- Poff, N. L.: A hydrogeography of unregulated streams in the United States and an examination of scale-dependence in some hydrological descriptors, *Freshw. Biol.*, 36, 71–91, 1996.
- 30 Rieradevall, M., Bonada, N., and Prat, N.: Community structure and water quality in Mediterranean streams of a Natural Park (Sant Llorenç de Munt, NE Spain), *Limnetica*, 17, 45–56, 1999.
- Rossouw, L., Avenant, M. F., Seaman, M. T., King, J. M., Barker, C. H., du Preez, P. J.,

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- Pelser, A. J., Roos, J. C., van Staden, J. J., van Tonder, G. J., and Watson, M.: Environmental water requirements in non-perennial systems, Water Research Commission, WRC Report No: 1414/1/05, available at: <http://www.wrc.org.za/KnowledgeHubDocuments/ResearchReports/1414.pdf>, 2005.
- 5 Rose, P., Metzeling, L., and Catzikiris, S.: Can macroinvertebrate rapid bioassessment methods be used to assess river health during drought in south eastern Australia streams?, *Freshw. Biol.*, 53, 2626–2638, 2008.
- Spranza, J. J. S. and Stanley, E. H.: Condition, growth, and reproductive styles of fishes exposed to different environment regimes in prairie drainage, *Environ. Biol. Fish.*, 59, 99–109, 10 2000.
- Svec, J. R., Kolka, R. K., and Stringer, J. W.: Defining perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral channels in eastern Kentucky: application to forestry best management practices, *Forest Ecolo. Manag.*, 214, 170–182, 2005.
- Tooth, S.: Process, form and change in dryland rivers: a review of recent research, *Earth-Sci. Rev.*, 51, 67–107, 2000.
- 15 Uys, M. C. and O’Keeffe, J. H.: Simple Words and Fuzzy Zones: Early Directions for Temporary River Research in South Africa, *Environ. Manage.*, 21, 517–531, 1997.
- Williams, D. D.: *The biology of temporary waters*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2006.
- Wissinger, S. A., Greig, H. S., and McIntosh, A.: Absence of species replacements between 20 permanent and temporary lentic communities in New Zealand, *J. North. Am. Benth. Soc.*, 28, 12–23, 2008.

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Table 1. Main characteristics of the studied basins. Catchment area in km²; MAP= mean annual precipitation (mm); ETP= mean annual reference evapotranspiration (mm); MAR= mean annual runoff (mm).

Operational basin	Stream	station	Catchment area	MAP	ETP	MAR
Thau lagoon	Vène	Karst (K)	1.4*	668	1336	590*
Thau lagoon	Vène	Sanglier (S)	35	668	1336	332*
Candelaro	Celone	S. Vincenzo	85.8	723.6	1024	176
Guadiana	Cobres	Entradas	51	500	1080	116
Segura	Minateda	Minateda	1166*	316	770	9.6*
Llobregat	Vallcebre	Can Vila	0.56	823	862	260
Muga	Manol	Santa Llogaia	163	748	794	118
Evrotas	Evrotas	Vrontamas	2418*	802	980	47*

* Karstic areas with uncertain real groundwater recharge area.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Table 2. Linear correlation coefficients between the metrics tested to analyse the statistics of zero flow periods in the basins studied.

	Mf	Sd ₆	Df	<i>P</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>M</i>
Mf	1	0.50	-0.82	0.77	0.89	-0.74
Sd ₆	0.50	1	-0.72	0.80	0.58	0.11
Df	-0.82	-0.72	1	-0.95	-0.92	0.45
<i>P</i>	0.77	0.80	-0.95	1	0.93	-0.38
<i>C</i>	0.89	0.58	-0.92	0.93	1	-0.69
<i>M</i>	-0.74	0.11	0.45	-0.38	-0.69	1

Values in **bold** are significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion


Table 3. Maximum likelihood factor loadings of the metrics analysed in Table 2.

Metrics	Factor 1	Factor 2
Mf	− 0.8799	0.1570
Sd ₆	−0.3221	0.8316
Df	0.7727	−0.53456
P	− 0.7424	0.6278
C	− 0.9200	0.31658
M	0.8765	0.4599

Figures in **bold** show absolute loadings > 0.7.

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

**Fig. 1.** Location of the streams studied.[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.




Fig. 2. Schematic flow chart for the procedure developed to estimate the temporal patterns of occurrence of the aquatic states from the available water flow data. The final products are the aquatic states frequency graphs (Fig. 4).

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[⏪](#)
[⏩](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.




Fig. 3. Flow duration curve for the Can Vila station, with identification of the minimum discharge thresholds that separate the diverse aquatic states.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.




Fig. 4. Aquatic states frequency graphs for the eight stream gauging stations studied.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#) [Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#) [References](#)
[Tables](#) [Figures](#)
⏪ ⏩
⏴ ⏵
[Back](#) [Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)






Fig. 5. Plot of the stations studied using the two metrics tested: Flow permanence (Mf) and seasonal predictability of the zero-flow months (Sd_6). The oblique grey lines show the approximate interim separation between the four regime types: *P* (Permanent), *I-P* (Intermittent-pools), *I-D* (Intermittent-dry), *E* (Episodic-ephemeral).

The regimes of temporary streams and their controls on aquatic biota

F. Gallart et al.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

⏪ ⏩

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

