

**INTRODUCTORY WORKSHOP ON CLIMATE CHANGE EFFECTS ON  
BIOLOGICAL INDICATORS**

**Radisson Plaza Lord Baltimore Hotel  
Baltimore, Maryland  
March 27–29, 2007**

*THIS INFORMATION IS DISTRIBUTED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PRE-DISSEMINATION PEER REVIEW UNDER APPLICABLE INFORMATION QUALITY GUIDELINES. IT HAS NOT BEEN FORMALLY DISSEMINATED BY THE US EPA. IT DOES NOT REPRESENT AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO REPRESENT ANY AGENCY DETERMINATION OR POLICY.*

## CONTRIBUTORS

Numerous people contributed to the conception, development, and successful implementation of this workshop. Contributors included

### EPA/ORD/GCRP

Dr. Britta Bierwagen  
Mr. Joel Sheraga  
Ms. Susan Julius  
Ms. Jordan West  
Dr. Tom Johnson  
Dr. Chris Weaver

### EPA/OST

Mr. William Swietlik  
Ms. Susan Jackson  
Mr. Evan Hornig  
Ms. Heidi Bell

### Academia/NGOs

Dr. David Allen  
Dr. Diane McKnight  
Dr. David Yates  
Dr. Connie Woodhouse  
Dr. Lara Kueppers  
Dr. Lara Hansen

### Tetra Tech, Inc. Center for Ecological Sciences

Dr. Michael Barbour  
Dr. Jeroen Gerritsen  
Dr. Michael Paul  
Ms. Anna Hamilton  
Dr. Lei Zheng  
Mr. David Bressler  
Mr. Bill Mills  
Ms. Gia Grier  
Ms. Kristen Pavlik  
Ms. Carolina Gallardo  
Ms. Yukiko Ichishima

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

The goal of this workshop was to provide state and tribal biocriteria managers with information on how climate change may affect their monitoring and assessment programs for protecting and restoring their water resources. This workshop focused primarily on stream and river systems, as these are generally the most advanced in the development of bioassessment and biocriteria programs. These systems thus provided the most developed base from which to analyze climate change effects on program components and results and to evaluate alternatives. This workshop is the beginning of a process to assess program vulnerabilities and to define an approach for adapting management of streams and rivers, as well as other aquatic ecosystems). Inputs from the participating state and tribal bioassessment/biocriteria managers will help identify existing concerns and observations of sensitive indicators and help focus further analyses on the most vulnerable aspects of bioassessment and monitoring programs in different regions of the country.

## **2 PARTICIPANTS**

Overall there were approximately 50 participants attending this workshop, including representation by 25 states, 3 tribes/tribal organizations, 1 territory, 5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) representatives from the Office of Research and Development (ORD), 4 staff members from the Office of Water (OW), 1 staff member from the U.S. Geological Survey, 1 speaker from National Center for Atmospheric Research(NCAR), 1 speaker from the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), 2 staff members from the Environmental Law Institute (Washington, DC-based NGO), and 5 academic researchers. All workshop participants are listed with contact information in Appendix A.

## **3 WORKSHOP STRUCTURE**

Keynote presentations progressing from an overview of global climate change effects to regional applications of climate change models and biological responses to climate change set the foundation for the workshop. Breakout sessions focused on biological indicators and drivers of environmental condition, vulnerability of biocriteria programs in WQ agencies, and adaptations of program elements to recognize effects of climate change. Case studies were presented to aid in understanding the technical ramifications of adapting existing biocriteria

programs. A brief synopsis of each presentation is given below; the PowerPoint presentations associated with each talk were printed and distributed to each workshop participant, and are available online.

## **4 SUMMARY OF KEYNOTE AND CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS**

### **4.1 Climate Change Effects on Aquatic Ecosystems**

Dr. Diane McKnight of the University of Colorado, Department of Civil, Environmental and Architectural Engineering, presented an overview of major aspects of climate change effects expected on aquatic ecosystems. She familiarized the workshop participants with a range of studies (e.g., a 1995-97 joint ASLO/NABS synthesis study) and extant evidence that represents the current basis of thinking about aquatic ecosystem effects considered likely in response to projected future climate change. Dr. McKnight summarized issues including changes in the global water cycle and impacts on fresh water supplies, nutrient cycles and water quality; changes in stream hydrographs that could have trophic consequences in stream ecosystems; and potential interactions between changes in stream hydrodynamics with other stressors. Her presentation effectively illustrated the numerous, complex, and important interactions that must be considered with regard to aquatic ecosystems (for example, the changes in timing of nutrient pulsing and metals retention in snow-pack dominated streams with projected changes in amount of snow pack and timing of melting). Dr. McKnight also emphasized the need for but lack of detailed, real-time environmental data (e.g., from *in situ* sensors), and for better development and use of ecological models that can be linked with detailed (regional) climate change models.

### **4.2 Climate Change: A Perspective from Paleoclimatology and Observations**

Dr. Connie Woodhouse of the University of Arizona, Department of Geography and Regional Development, established a background for understanding the “long-term” range of natural variability in climate as a basis for understanding probable components of current and future change resulting from anthropogenic sources. Types of paleoclimatic and observational data relied on for such evidence range from ice cores and ocean sediments which provide records with the longest time frame (hundreds of thousand years) but with coarse resolution (100-500 years); to lake and dune sediment of intermediate duration (~10,000 years); to tree rings and corals which provide shorter duration records (centuries) but with annual or sub-annual resolution. Overall, evaluation of the paleorecords supports a trend of increasing temperatures

over the last 100 years and shows that global temperatures of the decades are the warmest of the past 4 or more centuries. However, there are no clear trends (i.e., high variability) in precipitation, and recent periods of drought still fall within historic ranges. Dr. Woodhouse showed that analysis of tree ring records is able to support detailed and long-term evaluation of drought conditions for different regions, providing highly useful comparisons to present and projected future trends as well as a basis for evaluating expected ecological changes associated with variable drought conditions. Dr. Woodhouse provided an interesting example of the value of using long-term paleorecords in managing water resource issues, showing that allocation of Colorado River Basin water (compact signed in 1922) was actually based on estimates of water availability during an extremely wet period when compared to a 500-year period of record defined from tree ring analysis.

### **4.3 Modeling the Climate and Projections of Future Climate Change**

Dr. David Yates (NCAR) explained how global climate models reproduce the climate system and what we learn from them. He gave a good overview of how climate models have become increasingly more detailed and therefore better representations of actual climate patterns (e.g., more reasonably representing climate around mountains and other topographic features), and also summarized major model uncertainties. Dr. Yates indicated that while Global Circulation Models (GCMs—climate models) are not intended to detect anthropogenic climate changes, they shed light on attributions of major sources of changes. He then summarized the major evidences for anthropogenic contributions to climate change, as well as the major global climate change projections.

### **4.4 Regional Climate Change and Ecological Impacts**

Dr. Lara Kueppers of the University of California at Merced, School of Natural Sciences, discussed regional aspects of climate change modeling. She summarized various scales (e.g., continents versus oceans, high versus low latitudes and/or elevations within continents) of regional differences in climate change projections, and presented information on regional “hotspots” of vulnerability to climate change around the globe. On a scale particularly relevant to workshop participants, Dr. Kueppers’ explained the limitations of GCMs in projecting trends for an individual region or watershed, and made particular note of the difficulties in modeling precipitation. She compared two main approaches used to develop refined regional predictions—

statistical “downscaling” and high-resolution Regional Climate Models (RCMs), and provided illustrations of how refinements in scale of RCMs improves projections of precipitation patterns. Dr. Kueppers then showed how important such refinements are to understanding and accurately projecting ecological responses to climate change, using range shifts of the California blue oak as an example. During the discussion after her talk, Dr. Kueppers explained that many academic institutions have regional models that could be useful in establishing partnerships and that the North American Regional Climate Change Assessment Program is developing a Web site which would be a central location for regional data.

#### **4.5 A Framework for Incorporating Climate Information into Impacts Management**

Dr. Chris Weaver, an AAAS Science and Technology Policy Fellow at the USEPA National Center for Environmental Assessment (NCEA), Global Change Research Program (GCRP) discussed a systematic strategy for incorporating climate change information into the decision-making process used by biocriteria managers, essentially how to bridge the gap between climate science and biological management endpoints. In addition to the value of codifying an approach for incorporating such new and intrinsically different information into an existing management structure, some of Dr. Weaver’s main points were that climate modeling has a separate research agenda and generally produces information at a coarser scale than that needed by the impact assessment community. In addition, bioassessment managers often need different metrics as outputs from climate modeling than are typically produced, specifically related to ecological drivers in the systems which are being managed. Sensitivity analysis of response endpoints to the range of probable driver changes is a key step in focusing on the most relevant data. He suggested that managers shift the overall way they think about climate change from a prediction paradigm to a vulnerability paradigm.

#### **4.6 Watershed-Scale Modeling of the Hydrologic and Water Quality Effects of Climate Change: The Monocacy River Basin Example**

Dr. Thomas Johnson of the USEPA, NCEA, GCRP expanded on the framework introduced by Dr. Weaver using a specific watershed-scale modeling study of climate change effects on hydrology and water quality in the Monocacy River Basin as an example. Dr. Johnson’s study team is using the BASINS-CAT model to simulate watershed-scale physical, chemical and biological processes that link regional projections of future climate changes in

temperature and precipitation to hydrologic and water quality endpoints that are important to water resource managers. It turns out that watershed hydrology and pollutant loadings are very sensitive to climate change, highlighting the importance of considering climate-associated changes in biological responses to these factors within the context of bioassessment and biocriteria programs.

#### **4.7 Climate Change Effects on Rivers and Streams**

Dr. David Allan of the University of Michigan outlined the key mechanisms by which climate change may affect river and stream ecosystems, relating these to major stream ecological processes, as a foundation for understanding the range of biological responses that may be expected. Dr. Allan presented temperature and flow as the primary environmental drivers through which climate changes will impact stream ecological processes. He highlighted numerous factors to be considered in predicting effects, including daily, seasonal, and interannual variability; stream size and longitudinal position; and elevation, topography, and geology; as well as indirect and interactive effects. Dr. Allan summarized evidence for changes in temperature regime influencing dissolved oxygen and water quality, biological productivity, bioclimatic envelopes (species adaptations/requirements for particular temperature regimes), phenology, life cycle events, and others. He gave several examples of various expected changes in flow characteristics (magnitude, timing of peaks, flashiness, frequency of drought, frequency of floods) that may in turn influence channel shape, in-stream habitat, export of organic matter, sediments, nutrients, and others. Biological responses may be seen in shifts in distributions; changes in abundance and composition that reflect different feeding types and tolerance ranges; changes in productivity; changes in riparian vegetation; redistribution of invasive species; and others. Dr. Allan summarized several points relevant to bioassessment programs: 1) changes in species composition, richness, and relative abundance can be expected; 2) changes are at least initially disruptive, and most systems are already stressed; and 3) restructuring of biological assemblages may extend over long time periods (centuries). These changes will require managers to adjust assessment tools (e.g., metrics, indices), probably on an ongoing basis. Other management responses may need to include adjustment of targets and expectations, specific habitat management for species of interest, and management of dispersal corridors.

#### **4.8 A Framework for Categorizing Biological Indicators According to their Sensitivity to Climate Change**

Dr. Britta Bierwagen of the USEPA, NCEA, GCRP, presented a preliminary categorization framework in response to the evidence that biological indicators will be affected by climate change, that climate change effects will confound interpretation of biological indicators, and that unaccounted for the shifting ecological baseline will make it difficult to meet biocriteria program goals. Dr. Bierwagen summarized the hallmarks of climate change effects as an additional stressor on ecosystems and one that effects both reference and non-reference sites. The framework concept is that categorization of indicators according to their climate sensitivity would serve as one step in controlling for or detecting climate change effects. Dr. Bierwagen defined the critical characteristics of potential climate sensitive and insensitive indicators as being: 1) temperature sensitive (narrow tolerances, temperature used to cue life history events) or insensitive (broadly tolerant, temperature not an important ecological cue); 2) hydrologically sensitive (intolerant of particular flow conditions) or insensitive (tolerant of a wide range of hydrologic conditions). She summarized classes of indicators that could be considered as including phenology, number of reproductive periods, vulnerable life stages, thermal tolerance, and hydrologic tolerance. Application of this framework will require understanding of how existing indicators used in bioassessment programs respond to climate change, and evaluation of novel indicators to detect climate change. Dr. Bierwagen highlighted the need to also understand how climate-sensitive indicators affect the Biological Condition Gradient and how it affects biocriteria in standards. This concept of indicator classification by climate sensitivity ultimately will be integrated with adaptations of monitoring and analysis approaches (see 4.9 and 4.10) to account for climate change in order to meet bioassessment goals.

#### **4.9 Case Study 1: What Can We Detect and When: Program Implications**

Dr. Michael Paul of Tetra Tech, Inc., Center for Ecological Sciences, presented results of a preliminary case study analysis to evaluate the ability of a typical existing bioassessment program to detect climate change, with specific questions focusing a power analysis approach on how long to have a fixed probability of detecting a change at a reference site population, and how long to detect a change at a particular site. He used native taxa richness as a representative bioassessment metric and calculated variances in this metric using the Maryland Biological Stream Survey (MBSS) data. The basis for modeling climate-driven taxa changes were published projections for changes in climate (temperature) and literature information on taxa richness responses to temperature changes. An example result, Dr. Paul showed a difference of

4.5 benthic taxa was needed to be able to detect this change with high power and confidence (power =95% and confidence= 95%). Assuming the higher available estimates for rates of temperature increase and taxa loss, this effect size would be reached in about 15 years. Dr. Paul similarly evaluated and summarized how program ability to detect this climate change-driven effect would change if replication was increased, by assuming samples could be evaluated cumulatively over a period of years, by reducing the level of confidence applied to the detection of difference, and by assuming higher and lower rates of climate change and biological response. He reported the comparable results for fish sampling data. Some of Dr. Paul's main conclusions were that: 1) site-specific estimates of variance in metrics, as well as regionally specific projections of rates of climate change and rates of biological responses should be used for program evaluation whenever possible; 2) choices between targeted and probabilistic sampling designs need to be based on both implications for the questions being asked and on implications for ability to account for climate change within the sampling design; 3) ongoing sampling as well as protection of reference sites is important to biomonitoring program ability to account for climate change.

#### **4.10 Case Study 2: Consequences of Climate Change for Biocriteria**

Dr. Jeroen Gerritsen of Tetra Tech, Inc., Center for Ecological Sciences, presented results of a second case study examining the vulnerabilities of existing bioassessment programs to climate change effects, with specific regard to 1) detection of reduced biological condition, and 2) the ability to assign cause to impaired condition. Dr. Gerritsen used proxy estimates of climate changes expected to be influential in stream ecosystems, including temperature, drought, flooding, and flashiness of flow. Stressors evaluated because of their expected vulnerability to or interactions with climate change effects included several measures of habitat condition, impervious surface, nutrients, and conductivity. Both fish and benthic IBIs (indices of biotic integrity), fish taxa richness and benthic EPT (mayflies, stoneflies and caddisflies) taxa richness were selected as response variables. Dr. Gerritsen presented evidence for climate change effects on biological indicators, for example, indicator variability increased markedly in reference sites in dry and wet years compared to average conditions, and there were slight reductions in median indicator values. Greater variability during “non-normal” conditions (wet or dry years as surrogates for climate change) and declines in reference values reduced ability to detect impairment. Changes in some stress-response relationships would affect ability to attribute

cause. Overall, Dr. Gerritsen characterized these climate effects as not devastating to the viability of biomonitoring programs, but requiring adaptation. For instance, further development of analytical methods accounting for climate change over time; of indicators, and of stressor identification approaches is needed.

#### **4.11 Adapting Management to Climate Change**

Dr. Lara Hansen, Chief Scientist at the WWF Climate Change Program, summarized the available information for considering climate change from the perspective of adapting management actions. She provided examples of a variety of potential interactions with climate change that will impact toxicity regulation, management of ocean resources, and interpretation of a range of lake and stream chemical and physical conditions. Dr. Hansen outlined the WWF approach for management adaptation to climate changes, which includes: 1) protection of adequate and appropriate space; 2) limitation of non-climate stresses; 3) use of active adaptive management strategies; and 4) reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and provided specific examples. Of particular interest to state/tribal stream and river managers was the discussion of management approaches that would include consideration of: refugia; latitudinal and elevational gradients; heterogeneity of habitats; and possibilities for connectivity and gene flow. Considerations for adaptation of monitoring approaches, such as assuring that sampling sites and times account for regional change and variability, is also important. Dr. Hansen wrapped up her talk by discussing the WWF's "Climate Camp" initiative as an example of how 15 innovative management projects have been developed and funded by a wide variety of stakeholders, including NGOs, foundations, private businesses, and government agencies. Dr. Hansen's take-home message was that failure to address climate change might make all other environmental management efforts meaningless.

#### **4.12 Linking Science to Policy**

Dr. Joel Scheraga, National Program Director of the USEPA, ORD, GCRP gave a final presentation on translating existing scientific knowledge around climate change into sound policy decisions. Dr. Scheraga encouraged managers to take on this issue by describing USEPA's commitment to help stakeholders incorporate climate change information through the GCRP's research and activities. He described GCRP initiatives in the Everglades and the Sacramento River as examples. Dr. Scheraga also described plans for developing a strategic

plan with the Office of Water, including the beginning of a National Water Program Climate Change Workgroup. Dr. Scheraga stated that while the science is still incomplete, it is good enough to move forward in the policy arena.

## **5 SUMMARY OF BREAKOUT SESSIONS**

### **5.1 Regionally Important Climate Change Drivers, Region-Specific Sensitive Indicators (First Day Breakouts)**

The main and subsidiary questions focusing this set of breakout sessions were:

- How will anticipated regional climate change affect drivers of biological community condition and expected community responses? Can we identify regionally specific sensitive biological indicators?
- In each region, what are the most important/influential changes to environmental drivers (note: hydrology, temperature, physical habitat, etc.) from climate change, and what components of the biological system will they affect?
- On a regional basis, what are the key biological attributes that are likely to be sensitive and insensitive to climate change?
- Which common indicators are likely to be sensitive or insensitive?

Participants were divided into regional groups with concentration on particular stream types, to establish groups with common points of reference from which to consider these questions.

The four regional groups were:

- Midwest/Mid-Atlantic Warm-water;
- Subtropical/Southern Warm-water;
- Western/Northwestern Cold-water; and
- Northern Cold-water

Inputs from the four regional breakout groups are summarized in Table 5-1. The general importance of hydrologic and temperature regimes to stream and river ecology lead to some fundamental similarities in results among regional groups. But there also were some notable differences between regions in environmental changes that were of most concern and in species and other biological attributes that were perceived as most sensitive.

#### **5.1.1 Influential Changes to Environmental Drivers**

Drought was an aspect of hydrologic regime widely considered important, including its severity, frequency, and/or duration (Mid-West/Mid-Atlantic, North, and Pacific Islands). Also of concern were the related questions of the duration of low summer flows (West/Northwest), and the change of streams from perennial to intermittent flow (West/Northwest and Mid-west/Mid-Atlantic).

Changing patterns of precipitation were emphasized in the north and the southeast, including larger storms with more precipitation contributing to flashiness, both of which would have substantial effects on habitat, erosion, pollutant runoff, and other related processes. Changes in timing of already variable precipitation was mentioned for the Pacific Islands. Increased hydrologic variability and winter precipitation changing from snow to rain was a concern in the west/northwest and in the northern regions, while sea level rise expanding tidal influence in fresh waters and salt water intrusion was specified in the Mid-Atlantic and southeast.

Temperature was considered especially important in the west/northwest region, citing its importance in defining macroinvertebrate distributions and community transitions. Temperature increases and dissolved oxygen reductions were listed as influential in the Southeast, while temperature effects on the timing of ice melt and freeze was considered significant by the northern regional group.

### **5.1.2 Key Biological Attributes/Indicators**

Several regional groups listed at least a few species or taxonomic groups they thought would be sensitive to particular aspects of climate change (see Table 5-1). For example, EPT taxa were specifically mentioned in both the Mid-west/Mid-Atlantic and the Southern/subtropical regional groups; trout were listed in the Subtropic/southern, Mid-Atlantic and the Northern regional groups. The biological attributes discussed were of particular interest. Transitional faunas and taxa at the edges of their ranges were expected to be sensitive indicators (mentioned in the mid-west/mid-Atlantic and the west/northwest). The other most common potential indicators listed were diatoms, phenology, P/R ratios, life history traits, voltinism, and invasive species.

### **5.1.3 Insights**

Numerous participants from different regions perceived common issues associated with the question of accounting for climate change within bioassessment programs (Table 5-1). One widespread concept is that responses to climate change will vary with ecoregion, and that sensitivities will similarly vary with ecoregion. There is a related question that the sensitivity of particular metrics needs to be further evaluated, as many participants recognized that there are too many unknowns to predict with certainty which indicators are likely to be most sensitive. Questions related to interactions between climate change and other stressors, especially land use change, was recognized as an issue that will be difficult to tease apart. An interesting related question was whether the approach is intended to document climate change or tease out the climate change signal.

## **5.2 Program Vulnerability (Second Day Morning Breakouts)**

The overarching question for the second set of breakout groups was:

How are our bioassessment and biocriteria programs vulnerable to climate change effects with regard to interpretation of data?

Subsidiary questions were used to focus the discussions and organize participant inputs.

### **5.2.1 How are our bioassessment programs currently equipped to deal with climate change?**

Some existing bioassessment/biomonitoring programs have long data sets, which are needed to analyze temporal trends and define climate change-associated effects. The problem is, some programs do not. In addition, some states do not conduct repeat sampling (year to year) at fixed reference locations so that evaluating time trends and possibly detecting climate change effects are not well supported.

### **5.2.2 How do we assess cause, interpret condition in the context of climate change?**

State programs attribute probable causes to observed biological effects through the Stressor Identification (SI) process. At this time, however, this process is not put in the context of climate change. There is no accepted process in place to tie sampling/monitoring approach, data analysis, and interpretation of results for determination of cause that specifically accounts for contributions from and interactions with climate change.

### **5.2.3 What aspects of our assessment process are vulnerable because of climate change?**

Two major components of state biomonitoring programs were identified by participants as vulnerable to climate change. **Reference stations** were perceived as vulnerable to degrading habitat conditions with climate change. This would lead to loss of key species and changes in community composition over time. In addition, the **index period** for sampling was seen as shifting over time. That is, ongoing climate change is likely to shift the timing of sampling, as well as impact logistics. There will be a need to recalibrate or adjust the index sampling period.

### **5.3 Modifications, Needs, and Recommendations to Incorporate Climate Change into Monitoring Programs (Second Day Afternoon Breakouts)**

Recommendations from states/tribes were categorized based on technical assistance needed by various USEPA offices. Needs were categorized as either being resource needs or technical needs. These recommendations and needs are meant to serve as a starting point for next steps. Ways of modifying impairment decisions were also discussed.

#### **5.3.1. Modifications: How do we modify impairment decisions under climate change?**

There was much discussion around the possible alternatives of treating climate change as an adjustment to the thresholds for other stressors, or treating climate change as a stressor itself. There was overall agreement that treatment of climate change as a stressor is important for assessments. This should be approached by tracking any changes in reference sites from expected condition.

#### **5.3.2 Needs: What are major information needs for states and tribes to adapt their programs to climate change?**

Two categories of needs, resource needs and technical needs, were outlined by the workshop participants. Resource needs were limitations recognized by the states as limits to implementing new and/or additional efforts related to revising and adapting their existing programs to account for climate change. These mainly included:

- Funding Support;
- Lack of adequate Personnel;
- Priority setting for Management actions; and
- Sharing resources among agencies to expand capacity.

Technical needs were focused on information needed to better understand the interactions between expected effects of climate change and biomonitoring program endpoints, additional technological support, and general policy support. Participants specifically listed the need for:

- Additional research on hydrologic indicators;
- Filling gaps between regional, hydrologic, and ecological models;
- Technology transfer for use of equipment, including incorporation of processes, guidance;
- Inclusion of language in EPA grants, policies, etc. on climate change as a stressor for monitoring and assessment programs; and
- Incorporation of traditional ecological knowledge as well as non-traditional, such as citizen monitoring and phenological knowledge, in adapting bioassessment programs.

### **5.3.3 Recommendations: How might we adapt our programs to deal with climate change? What are recommendations to EPA for providing more specific guidelines and approaches?**

#### *5.3.3.1 Feasible adaptations with support and technical assistance from EPA (general).*

- Conduct regular and repeat reference site sampling; consider strategies for maintenance/protection of reference sites and areas, identifying waterbodies in the best condition;
- Evaluate the need to shift the sampling index period and/or expand sampling seasons;
- Establish sentinel sites for trend monitoring;
- Improve hydrological and temperature data collection;
- Mine historical data records to establish a basis for evaluating climate change;
- Incorporate traditional ecological knowledge, citizen monitoring, phenological knowledge in assessment of biomonitoring data;
- Continue the refinement of biocriteria programs to incorporate the Tiered Aquatic Life Use (TALU) strategy;
- Accept moving target paradigm versus steady state model and adapt accordingly;
- Perform critical elements reviews of individual programs to identify relevant refinements; and
- Engage in collaborative data and resource sharing to maximize limited resources.

### *5.3.3.2 Recommendations falling within the purview of EPA/ORD*

- Conduct research to determine the best hydrologic and biological response indicators, to define biologically sensitive measures to hydrologic changes, and to identify species traits responsive to climate change (temperature, flow, sediment);
- Conduct research to fill gaps between regional, hydrologic, and ecological models;
- Investigate how taxa replacement will affect biological indices used in state programs. Will there be little or no change in biological indices if specific metrics change?
- Provide technical support for data management tools (e.g., R code) to manage temperature logger data and reduce it to useable metrics; and
- Develop tools to make climate data available to other models (e.g., CADDIS).

### *5.3.3.3 Recommendations falling within the purview of EPA/OW*

- Provide assistance to state bioassessment and resource management programs to integrate the concept of climate change as a significant issue that must be accounted for in assessing the condition of aquatic resources;
- Incorporate language referencing climate change in grants, policy, and regulations; and bring climate change into the monitoring strategy and listing guidance;
- Evaluate WQS to be protective in the face of a changing condition paradigm;
- Provide funding support for state/tribal WQ programs to assist in adaptations to existing programs;
- Partner with ORD and other federal agencies on a comprehensive climate change strategy to address mandates of CWA; and
- Provide a summary of this meeting to EPA top management for information and support for making informed decision-making..

Table 5-1. Summary of inputs from the four regional breakout groups during the first breakout session.

	Midwest/Mid-Atlantic Warm-water	Subtropical/Southern Warm-water	Western/Northwestern Cold-water	Northern Cold-water
Influential Changes to Environmental Drivers	<p><u>Hydrology</u> is key: severe drought; flashiness; sea level rise resulting in tidal fresh expansion; streams changing from perennial to intermittent.</p> <p><u>Interaction</u> between climate change and water drawdown.</p> <p><u>Character</u> (intensity, frequency, duration) of change may be most important early warning.</p>	<p><u>Southeast:</u> More overall rain, but fewer events (flashy precip). Increased coastal salinity intrusions. Increased pollutant runoff, especially sediment. Altered estuarine blooms due to flow timing. DO reductions. Temperature increases Variable energy source changes – GPP increases, reduced inputs. Flashiness – altered channel dimensions, reduced organic matter.</p> <p><u>Pacific Islands:</u> Trade winds may stop – increased drought. Flashiness a natural condition – timing may change. Increased sediment loads, landslides. Organic matter generally low in streams.</p>	<p><u>Hydrology</u> Flashiness Low summer flows/duration of summer dry period (and increase in intermittent streams) Increased winter flooding (and erosion, sedimentation) More rain/less snow in winter More hydrologic variability (or regime shift)</p> <p><u>Temperature</u> Strong correlation with bug assemblages in Montana. Also day of year, elevation. Oregon considering temp IBI. Transition zone important in NM.</p> <p><u>Insensitive/uncertain:</u> Moisture variation dominated by natural variation Habitat/substrate (may or may not be insensitive) Flow-normalized ion concentrations(may or may not be insensitive) Tough! (almost none)</p>	<p><u>Hydrology:</u> Bigger storms, more frequent droughts. Increased stream power: erosion, scouring, habitat effects. Similar to effects of urbanization.</p> <p><u>Temperature</u> Timing of <u>freeze and ice melt</u> (affects hydrology, temperature) More <u>rain replacing snow</u> (affects hydrology)</p>
Key Biological Attributes / Indicators	<p>Species at the extremes of their ranges will be most affected</p> <p>Mixed fauna (cold &amp; warm) in transitional areas</p> <p>EPT – stoneflies will decrease;</p>	<p><u>Current Indicators</u> <i>Southeast</i> Sensitive – EPT (and certain families), mussel taxa, trout, darters, Insensitive – odonates, Some</p>	<p>Consideration of species traits/sensitivities will be important</p> <p>Temperature sensitivity/species on edge of range</p> <p>Most stress indicators</p>	<p>All attributes affected by hydrologic changes will be sensitive</p> <p>Similar to effects of urbanization</p>

	<p>caddis will increase</p> <p>Reduced lithophilic species</p> <p>Frequency of fish DELT</p> <p>Invasive species</p> <p>Periphyton relationship to hydrology</p>	<p>EPT families, midges and worms, tolerants, invasives (red shiner), carp,</p> <p><i>Hawaii</i></p> <p>Sensitive – odonates, neridids, atyid shrimp, 2 native fish taxa, trout,</p> <p>Insensitive – 3 native fish taxa, tolerants, invasives.</p> <p><u>Novel Indicators</u></p> <p>Novel but unrealistic</p> <p>Reptile sex ratios, emergence, life history indicators, voltinism, size-frequencies,</p> <p>Novel and realistic</p> <p>Amphibian indicators, disease/parasitism, mussel mortality</p>	<p>P/R (food/trophic) may be useful</p> <p>Life cycle/voltinism</p> <p>Diatoms</p> <p>Phenology</p>	<p>Temperature sensitive</p> <p>Brook trout, slimy sculpin, Am. Brook lamprey</p> <p>Blephariceridae</p> <p>Warmwater invaders: dusky darter, hydropsychids?</p> <p>Amphibians</p>
Insights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need reliable hydrological indicators.</li> <li>• Characterization and monitoring of reference conditions is important to detect climate change.</li> <li>• Collaborate with LTERs.</li> <li>• Use temperature monitors to obtain “minimum” data records.</li> <li>• Most programs will NOT likely change; however, awareness will be heightened.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will happen to plant pests and riparian forests?</li> <li>• Southeast is a small dot region – relatively smaller climate change effects?</li> <li>• Southeast has diverse ecoregions – affects will vary by ecoregion</li> <li>• How will optima and tolerance along land cover gradients change?</li> <li>• What will happen to invasive species? Hawaii has a few...</li> <li>• Interactions between stressors and climate are difficult to evaluate</li> <li>• Will western water law come east?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Almost no inverts not climate sensitive</li> <li>• Most “climate insensitive” species are the “weedy” species (broadly tolerant, etc)</li> <li>• Maybe construct a climate-insensitive IBI</li> <li>• Not enough specific info on conventional metrics to specifically classify sensitivity</li> <li>• Warm-water fish are sensitive to climate change (habitat loss due to lower flows)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty in separating climate from other stressors (esp. land use change) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Some stream types, ecoregions different sensitivity than others: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater systems vs. hard rock watersheds</li> </ul> </li> <li>– Many changes subtle, slow; some not: severe drought</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Indicators used now are stable, and sensitive to hydrologic and WQ changes</li> <li>• No protocol for managing uncertainty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Not always as bad as</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limitations – LA does not have bioindicators, HI does not know what healthy is.</li> <li>• Signal to noise ratios – which will climate affect more?</li> <li>• Are we documenting climate change or teasing climate signals out?</li> <li>• What water quality standard are we protecting?</li> </ul>		it's made out to be
--	--	--	--	---------------------

## Appendix A: Participant and Presenter List

**J. David Allan, PhD (P)**

Professor  
School of Natural Resources and Environment  
University of Michigan  
440 Church Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109  
E-mail: dallan@umich.edu

**Michael T. Barbour, PhD (W)**

Director, Center for Ecological Sciences  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
400 Red Brook Blvd., Suite 200  
Owings Mills, MD 21117  
Phone: (410) 356-8993  
E-mail: Michael.Barbour@tetrattech.com

**Alex Barron**

Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  
629 East Main St.  
Richmond, VA 23218  
E-mail: ambarron@deq.virginia.gov

**Heidi Bell**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Mail Code: 4304T  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 566-1089  
E-mail: bell.heidi@epa.gov

**Britta G. Bierwagen, PhD (P)**

Physical Scientist  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
ORD/Global Change Research Program  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Mail Code: 8601-D  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 564-3388  
E-mail: bierwagen.britta@epa.gov

**Edna Buchan**

American Samoa Environmental Protection Agency  
P.O. Box PPA  
Pago Pago, American Samoa  
Phone: (684) 633 2304  
Fax: (684) 633 5801  
E-mail: ebuchan3@yahoo.com

**Bob Bukantis**

Montana Dept Environmental Quality  
P.O. Box 200901  
Helena, MT 59602  
Phone: (406) 444-5320  
Fax: (406) 444-6836  
E-mail: bbukantis@mt.gov.

**Dr. Lilian Busse**

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board  
9174 Sky Park Court  
San Diego, CA 92123  
Phone: (858) 467-2791  
Fax: (858) 571-6972  
E-mail: lbusse@waterboards.ca.gov

**Kimberly Cornelison**

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality  
P. O. Box 4314  
Baton Rouge, LA 70821  
Phone: (225) 219-3598  
E-mail: Kimberly.cornelison@la.gov

**Lee Currey**

Maryland Department of the Environment  
Science Services Administraton  
TMDL Technical Development Program  
Watershed and Nontidal Modeling Division  
E-mail: lcurrey@mde.state.md.us

**Katie DeGoosh**

New England Interstate Water Pollution Control  
Commission  
Rhode Island Department of Environmental  
Management  
235 Promenade St.  
Providence, RI 02908  
Phone: (401) 222-4700 x 7211  
Fax: (401) 222-3564  
E-mail: katie.degoosh@dem.ri.gov

**Jeff DeShon**

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency  
Division of Surface Water  
Ecological Assessment Section  
4675 Homer Ohio Lane  
Groveport, OH 43125  
Phone: (614) 836-8780  
Fax: (614) 836-8795  
E-mail: jeff.deshon@epa.state.oh.us

**Ellen Dickey**

Delaware Department of Natural Resources and  
Environmental Control  
Division of Water Resources  
89 Kings Hwy.  
Dover, DE 19901  
Phone: (302) 739-9942  
Fax: (302) 739-3491  
E-mail: ellen.dickey@state.de.us

**Richard Eskin**

Director  
Maryland Department of the Environment  
Science Services Administration  
E-mail: reskin@mde.state.md.us

**John Fiorentino**

Massachusetts Department of Environmental  
Protection  
Division of Watershed Management  
627 Main St., Second Floor  
Worcester, MA 01608  
Phone: (508) 767-2862  
Fax: (508) 791-4131  
E-mail: john.fiorentino@state.ma.us

**Steve Fiske**

Vermont Department of Environmental  
Conservation  
Water Quality Division: Biomonitoring Section  
103 So. Main St.  
Waterbury, VT 05671  
Phone: (802) 241-1378  
Fax: (802) 241-3008  
E-mail: Steve.Fiske@state.vt.us

**Carolina Gallardo**

Center for Ecological Sciences  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
400 Red Brook Blvd., Suite 200  
Owings Mills, MD 21117  
Phone: (410) 356-8993  
E-mail: Carolina.Gallardo@tetrattech.com

**Jeroen Gerritsen, PhD (P/W)**

Principal Scientist, Center for Ecological Sciences  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
400 Red Brook Blvd., Suite 200  
Owings Mills, MD 21117  
Phone: (410) 356-8993  
E-mail: Jeroen.Gerritsen@tetrattech.com

**James B. Glover, PhD**

The South Carolina Department of Health and  
Environmental Control  
Aquatic Biology Section  
2600 Bull St.  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone: (803) 898-4081  
Fax: (803) 898-4200  
E-mail: GloverJB@dhec.sc.gov

**Gia Grier**

Center for Water Resources/Center for  
Ecological Sciences  
400 Red Brook Blvd., Suite 200  
Owings Mills, MD 21117  
Phone: (410) 356-8993  
E-mail: gia.grier@tetrattech-ffx.com

**Anna Hamilton (W)**

Aquatic Ecologist, Center for Ecological Sciences  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
502 W. Cordova Rd., Suite C  
Santa Fe, NM 87505  
Phone: (505) 982-0573  
Fax: (505) 982-0584  
E-mail: Anna.Hamilton@tetrattech.com

**Lara J. Hansen, PhD (P)**

Chief Scientist, Climate Change Program  
World Wildlife Fund  
1250 24<sup>th</sup> St. NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
Phone: (202) 778-9619  
E-mail: lara.hansen@wwfus.org

**Evan Hornig**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Mail Code: 4304T  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 566-1099  
E-mail: hornig.evan@epa.gov

**Yukiko Ichishima**

Center for Water Resources  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
10306 Eaton Place, Suite 340  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
Phone: (703) 385-6000  
E-mail: Yukiko.Ichishima@tetrattech-ffx.com

**Thomas E. Johnson, PhD (P)**

Physical Scientist  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
ORD/Global Change Research Program  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Mailcode 8601-D  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 564-3406  
E-mail: Johnson.thomas@epa.gov

**Susan Jackson**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Mail Code: 4304T  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 566-1112  
E-mail: jackson.susank@epa.gov

**Susan Julius**

Global Change Research Program  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 564-3394  
Fax: (202) 565-0061  
E-mail: Julius.Susan@epa.gov

**Austin Kane**

Environmental Law Institute  
2000 L St. NW, Suite 620  
Washington, DC 20036  
Phone: (202) 939-3243  
Fax: (202) 939-3868  
E-mail: kane@eli.org

**Rodney Kime**

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental  
Protection, Assessment Section Chief  
Rachel Carson State Office Building  
P.O. Box 8467  
Harrisburg, PA 17105  
E-mail: rkime@state.pa.us

**Ronald Klauda**

Resource Assessment Service  
Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
580 Taylor Ave., C-2  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
Phone: (410) 260-8615  
Fax: (410) 260-8620  
E-mail: rklauda@dnr.state.md.us

**Linda Koch**

Hawaii State Department of Health  
Environmental Planning Office  
919 Ala Moana Blvd., Rm. 312  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814  
Phone: (808) 586-4349  
Fax: (808) 586-4370  
E-mail: linda.koch@doh.hawaii.gov

**Lara M. Kueppers, PhD (P)**

Assistant Professor, School of Natural Sciences,  
University of California, Merced  
P.O. Box 2039  
Merced, CA 95344  
Phone: (209) 228-4054  
E-mail: lkueppers@ucmerced.edu

**Lewis Linker**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
410 Severn Ave.  
Annapolis, MD 21403  
Phone: (410) 267-5741  
Fax: (410) 267-5777  
E-mail: linker.lewis@epa.gov

**Trish MacPherson**

North Carolina Division of Water Quality  
1621 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1621  
Phone: (919) 733-6946  
Fax: (919) 733-9959  
E-mail: trish.macpherson@ncmail.net

**Diane McKnight, PhD (P)**

Department of Civil, Environmental and  
Architectural Engineering  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80309  
Phone: (303) 492-4687  
Fax: (303) 492-6388  
E-mail: diane.mcknight@colorado.edu

**Gerard McMahon**

U.S. Geological Survey  
3916 Sunset Ridge Rd.  
Raleigh, NC 27607  
Phone: (919) 571-4068  
Fax: (919) 571-4041  
E-mail: gcmahon@usgs.gov

**Glenn Merritt**

Environmental Assessment Program  
Washington Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 47710  
Olympia, WA 98504-7710  
Phone: (360) 407-6777  
Fax: (360) 407-6884  
E-mail: gmer461@ecy.wa.gov

**Michael A. Miller**

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 7921  
Madison, WI 53707-7921  
Phone: (608) 267-2753  
Fax: (608) 266-2244  
E-mail: millema@dnr.state.wi.us

**Bill Mills**

Research and Development  
Tetra Tech, Inc  
3746 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Suite 300  
Lafayette, CA 94507  
Phone: (925) 283-3771  
Fax: (925) 283-0780  
E-mail: Bill.Mills@tetrattech.com.

**Mistia Mullins**

Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California  
919 U.S. Hwy. 395 South  
Gardnerville, NV 89410  
Phone: (775) 265-8680 x 1245  
Fax: (775) 265-3111  
E-mail: mistia.mullins@washoetribe.us

**Jeffrey Ostermiller**

Monitoring Section Manager  
Utah Division of Water Quality  
288 North 1460 West  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4870  
Phone: (801) 538-6370  
E-mail: JOSTERMILLER@utah.gov

**Michael J. Paul, PhD (P/W)**

Senior Scientist  
Center for Ecological Sciences  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
400 Red Brook Blvd., Suite 200  
Owings Mills, MD 21117  
Phone: (410) 356-8993  
E-mail: Michael.Paul@tetrattech.com

**Kristen Pavlik**

Center for Ecological Sciences  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
400 Red Brook Blvd., Suite 200  
Owings Mills, MD 21117  
Phone: (410) 356-8993  
E-mail: Kristen.pavlik@tetrattech.com

**Amy Phillips**

Biological Monitoring Unit, Environmental  
Analysis and Outcomes Division  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
520 Lafayette Rd.  
Saint Paul, MN 55155  
Phone: (651) 297-2956  
Fax: (651) 297-8324  
E-mail: amy.phillips@pca.state.mn.us

**Ernest Pizzuto**

Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection  
Bureau of Water Protection and Land Re-use  
79 Elm St.  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Phone: (860) 424-3715  
Fax: (860) 424-4055  
E-mail: ernest.pizzuto@po.state.ct.us

**Daniel Rinella**

Environment and Natural Resources Institute  
University of Alaska Anchorage  
707 A St.  
Anchorage, AK 99501  
Phone: (907) 257-2734  
Fax: (907) 257-2707  
E-mail: rinella@uaa.alaska.edu

**Joel Scheraga (P)**

National Program Director  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
ORD/Global Change Research Program  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Mail Code: 8601N  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 564-3385  
E-mail: scheraga.joel@epa.gov

**Stacey Sobat**

Indiana Department of Environmental  
Management (IDEM)  
Office of Water Quality (OWQ)  
Assessment Branch, Biological Studies Section  
2525 N. Shadeland Ave. Suite 100  
Indianapolis, IN 46219  
Phone: (317) 308-3191  
Fax: (317) 308-3219  
E-mail: ssobat@idem.IN.gov

**Shann Stringer**

New Mexico Environment Department  
Surface Water Quality Bureau  
Harold Runnels Bldg., N2106  
P.O. Box 26110  
Santa Fe, NM 87502  
Phone: (505) 827-2921  
Fax: (505) 827-0160  
E-mail: shann.stringer@state.nm.us

**Scott Sufficool, Esq.**

(Quinault Indian Nation)-Policy Adviser  
EPA National Tribal Operations Committee  
National Tribal Caucus  
5414 152nd St. SW  
Edmonds, WA 98026  
Cell Phone: (206) 992-4373

**William Swietlik (P)**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
OST/HECD  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Mail Code: 4304T  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 566-1129  
E-mail: swietlik.william@epa.gov

**Roxanne Thomas**

Environmental Law Institute  
2000 L St. NW, Suite 620  
Washington, DC 20036  
Phone: (202) 939-3827  
Fax: (202) 939-3868  
E-mail: thomas@eli.org

**Charles M. Thompson**

Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality  
1542 Old Whitfield Rd.  
Pearl, MS 39208  
Phone: (601) 664-3900  
Fax: (601) 664-3938  
E-mail: Charles\_Thompson@deq.state.ms.us

**Chris Weaver, PhD (P)**

AAAS Science and Technology Policy Fellow,  
Global Change Research Program  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
2<sup>nd</sup> affiliation: Assistant Research Professor  
Department of Environmental Sciences  
Rutgers University  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave.  
Mail Code: 8601-N  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 564-0900  
Fax: (202) 564-2018  
E-mail: weaver.chris@epa.gov

**Jordan West**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
ORD/Global Change Research Program  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave.  
Mail Code: 8601D  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 564-3384  
E-mail: west.jordan@epa.gov

**Sandra White Eagle**

Fort Peck Assiniboine-Sioux Tribes  
Office of Environmental Protection  
Water Quality Division  
603 Court Ave.  
P.O. Box 1027  
Poplar, MT 59255  
Phone: (406) 768-5155  
Fax: (406) 768-5606  
E-mail: 2paints@nemontel.net

**Connie Woodhouse, (P)**

Associate Professor  
Department of Geography and Regional  
Development  
University of Arizona  
409 Harvill Building  
Tucson, AZ 85721  
Phone: (520) 626-0235  
E-mail: conniew1@email.arizona.edu

**David Yates, PhD (P)**

National Center for Atmospheric Research  
3450 Mitchell Lane  
Boulder, CO 80301  
Phone: (303) 497-8394  
Fax: (303) 497-8401  
E-mail: Yates@ucar.edu

**Rick Ziegler**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Mail Code: 8623N  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone: (202) 564-2257  
E-mail: Ziegler.rick@epa.gov