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B. Effectiveness of restoration practices at the project scale

B.4. Biological Community Restoration: Recent research has shown that in many situations, especially in watersheds with relatively high impervious cover, stream restoration may result in improved physical habitats but not restored biological communities (macroinvertebrates, fishes, etc.). ...

D. Trade-offs in resource improvements incurred by restoration practices and the resulting net ecological change as measured by a common “currency”

D.10. Resource trade-offs in different types of restoration projects. The decision to install a restoration project at any given site implies that an existing condition at that site will be modified, replaced, and/or improved. The hypothesis of the restoration practitioner is that the net condition will be improved. However, a value judgment is placed on the existing condition, (e.g., deeming the existing condition to be inferior to the desired “restored” condition) that is often not based on quantification. ...
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What are RSCs?

• **Regenerative stream conveyances (RSCs) typically**
  - *transform* degraded, single-channel, lower-order streams (some with wetlands)
  - *into* stream-wetland complexes designed to provide more opportunity for sediment retention and nutrient removal

• **RSCs result in channel widening and partial impoundments that**
  - slow flow rates
  - typically reduce shading
  - create periodic anoxia
  - increase diel dissolved oxygen variation and ecosystem gross primary production (GPP)
What are RSCs?

Immediate post-construction

16 and 10 years post-construction

Wilelinor 2004 and 2020

North Cypress Branch 2010 and 2020
Specific Study Questions

• What trajectory should we expect vertebrate communities to follow in Regenerative Stream Conveyances (RSCs)?

• How can practitioners and regulators more appropriately
  - quantify the biotic resource changes that occur when defined-channel stream systems are transformed into less-defined stream-wetland complexes
  - consider those changes in the context of nutrient reduction benefits expected from restoration
**Figure 1.** Graphical comparison of habitat-related differences associated with regenerative stream conveyance (RSC) construction relative to the putative initial condition (LSS: low-quality single channel stream), and reference conditions for three potential vertebrate community trajectories (HSW: high-quality stream-wetland complex; HSS: high-quality single channel stream; LSS).
HSS – High-quality Single Stream
HSW – High-quality Stream Wetland
LSS – Low-quality Single Stream
Site Selection for Field Study

• Natural factors were similar among stream types, except for larger catchment sizes that are inherent to HSWs

• 8 HSS  *High-quality Single Streams* = 453–664 acre catchments
• 8 HSW  *High-quality Stream Wetlands* = 552–52,936 acres
• 8 LSS  *Low-quality Single Streams* = 134–669 acres
• 11 RSC  *Regenerative Stream Conveyances* = 30–4550 acres

• Total of 35 sites sampled during August-September 2020
## RSCs with Age and Catchment Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSC</th>
<th>RSC Site Name</th>
<th>Date constructed</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Catchment (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSC-1</td>
<td>Bacon Ridge</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-2</td>
<td>N Branch Cypress Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-3</td>
<td>Crofton Tributary</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-4</td>
<td>Dividing Creek</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-5</td>
<td>Howard's Branch</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-6</td>
<td>Cabin Branch Saltworks Creek</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-8</td>
<td>Wilelinor</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-9</td>
<td>Church Creek at Allen Apartments</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-10</td>
<td>Cowhide Branch to Weems Creek</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-11</td>
<td>Church Creek at Bywater</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC-12</td>
<td>Church Creek at Annapolis Harbour Center</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field Sampling Methods

Sampling Protocols

- MBSS for Fish, Herps, Habitat
- Basic Water Quality of Dissolved Oxygen, Temperature, Conductivity
- Stream Metabolism

- High flow days after rain were not sampled
- All sites were sampled in August-September 2020 with sampling of each stream type spread across the calendar
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Fish Abundance but not Diversity Increases with Time since RSC Construction

Age_1 = 1.9–4.3 yrs
Age_2 = 5.3–7.4 yrs
Age_3 = 8.9–16.2 yrs
Herp Abundance and Diversity Increases with Time since RSC construction
Herp Abundance takes 8 years to Increase after RSC construction
Fish Diversity Increases with DO and Decreases with Conductivity
Herpetofauna is Not Reduced by Water Quality
RSC Fish Communities Only Partially Approach High Quality
Conclusions

1. Overall, fish and herp communities in RSCs are similar to low-quality streams, not to high-quality streams
2. Fish Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) was lower in RSCs than high-quality streams, with RSCs non-significantly higher than low-quality streams
3. Fish and frog abundance in RSCs are higher than both low- and high-quality streams
4. RSCs recreate stream-wetland structure (such as width and depth) typical of high-order streams in reaches that are low-order, but reference DO, conductivity, and flow levels are not attained
5. Vertebrate uplift in RSCs appears constrained by continuing poor water quality, but may improve as RSCs mature
6. Refinements to RSC designs (and stream restoration in general) may improve vertebrate trajectories, but our understanding of ecological states may also limit uplift
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What are the key take-home points?

Two questions:  

B.4. Biological community restoration  
D.10. Resource trade-offs based upon the type of restoration

- **Fish assemblage in RSCs**
  - Low diversity & low FIBI scores
  - Affected by water quality (DO and Conductance)
  - Fish abundance increases over time (not diversity or FIBI)

- **Herp community in RSCs**
  - Herp abundance and diversity increase over time
  - Not affected by water quality (DO, Temp, or Conductance)
  - Take 8-10 years post construction to show community maturation
What does this mean for me?

• As a practitioner
  – Increase pool size for increased numbers of fishes, but maintain sediment transport
  – Increase the amount and diversity of habitat, for biological lift
  – Look to high-quality stream-wetland complexes for designs and biological trajectories

• As a regulator
  – Acknowledge there may be urban/suburban thresholds that limit restorative improvements
  – Fundamentally, RSCs create different habitat/geomorphology from single thread channels
  – Would want to ensure 10+ years of monitoring to see changes to Herp community

• As a PMAC member
  – We may want to fund additional research comparing perennial RSCs with stream-wetland complexes and not single thread channels
  – Does landscape composition / water quality affect the assemblages more that the type of restoration?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSC Site Name</th>
<th>Date constructed</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Catchment (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacon Ridge</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Branch Cypress Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofton Tributary</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividing Creek</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard's Branch</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabin Branch Saltworks Creek</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilelinor</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Creek at Allen Apartments</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowhide Branch to Weems Creek</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Creek at Bywater</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Creek at Annapolis Harbour Center</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Variation in RSCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSC site</th>
<th>Herpetofauna</th>
<th>Amphibians</th>
<th>Reptiles</th>
<th>Fish fauna</th>
<th>Fish area metrics</th>
<th>FIBI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>Total $N$</td>
<td>Total $N$</td>
<td>$Anuran N$</td>
<td>Larval $N$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- RSC 10 (Cowhide Branch to Weems Creek) is most taxonomically diverse with predators (pickerel), several functional groups, and salt tolerants (eel, killfish, stickleback, silverside, mummichog)
- RSC 1 (Bacon Ridge) is next most diverse with lentic character and centrarchids (bluegill, bluespotted sunfish, green sunfish, pumpkinseed)
PCA Clusters of RSCs

- Larger RSCs (1 and 10)
- RSCs more tree canopy and lower temperature (2, 3, 8, 6, and 4)
- RSCs with higher conductivity (9, 12, and 11)
- Variation in design, such as more of less pools and faster or slower flow